

I. Harper Lee and Racial Injustice in *To Kill a Mockingbird*

The novel, *To Kill a Mockingbird* by Harper Lee is set against the background of the 1930s Southern life and it tells about a white lawyer's attempt to defend a black man who is accused of raping a white woman and about the trial ending with a tragedy of the accused black.

Nelle Harper Lee was born in Monroeville, Alabama on April 28, 1926. Lee is best known for writing the Pulitzer Prize-winning best-seller *To Kill a Mockingbird* (1960), her one and only novel. Her father, who was a lawyer, a member of the Alabama state legislature, owned part of the local newspaper. For most of Lee's life, her mother suffered from mental illness, rarely leaving the house. It is believed that she may have had bipolar disorder.

One of her closest childhood friends was another writer, Truman Capote (then known as Truman Persons). Tougher than many of the boys, Lee often stepped up to serve as Truman's protector. Truman, who shared few interests with boys of her age, was picked on for being a sissy and for the fancy clothes he wore. While two friends were very different, they both shared in having difficult home lives.

In high school, Lee developed an interest in English literature. After graduating in 1944, she went to the all-female Huntingdon College in Montgomery. Lee stood apart from other students--she could have cared less about fashion, makeup, or dating. Instead, she focused on her studies and on her writing. Lee was a member of the literary honor society and the glee club.

Transferring to the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa, Lee was known for being a loner and an individualist. She did make a greater attempt at a social life there, joining a sorority for a while. Pursuing her interest in writing, Lee contributed to the

school's newspaper and its humor magazine, the *Rammer Jammer*. She eventually became the editor of the *Rammer Jammer*.

In her junior year, Lee was accepted into the university's law school, which allowed students to work on law degrees while still undergraduates. The demands of her law studies forced her to leave her post as editor of the *Rammer Jammer*. After her first year in the law program, Lee began expressing to her family that writing—not the law—was her true calling. She went to Oxford University in England that summer as an exchange student. Returning to her law studies that Fall, Lee dropped out after the first semester. She soon moved to New York City to follow her dreams to become a writer.

In 1949, a 23-year-old Lee arrived in New York City. She struggled for several years, working as a ticket agent for Eastern Airlines and for the British Overseas Air Corp (BOAC). While in the city, Lee was reunited with old friend Truman Capote, one of the literary rising stars of the time. She also befriended Broadway composer and lyricist Michael Martin Brown and his wife, Joy.

In 1956, the Browns gave Lee an impressive Christmas present--to support her for a year so that she could write full time. She quit her job and devoted herself to her craft. The Browns also helped her find an agent, Maurice Crain. He, in turn, was able to get the publishing firm interested in her first novel, which was first titled *Go Set a Watchman*, then *Atticus*, and later *To Kill a Mockingbird*. Working with editor Tay Hohoff, Lee finished the manuscript in 1959.

The novel carries the experiences of the brutal social discrimination of the white people to the blacks. The white lawyer's deep support into the issue of black boy's case certainly reveals a racial subject matter through the novel. Atticus Finch, a

white lawyer positions himself to save the innocent black, Tom Robinson, despite his earning the hatred of his own community members.

With this support, Atticus has built the whole value system around the idea that a person must examine and respect people whoever they are and where ever they come from. This includes even the most unsavory characters like Bob Ewell and Mrs. Dubose, the former poor white trash of Maycomb and the latter who succeeds in teaching lessons of bravery to Atticus's children even in the face of impossible odds. Bob Ewell is a father of Mayella who hopes to get self respect which he never earned by degrading Tom. When others would discuss and rather like to forget these people, Atticus spends much of his time trying to understand them, it seems from the core of Atticus's belief that "all human beings must be accepted and treated equally" (Lee 213). It equally supports the value of human being and creates not only a line of racial hatred but also racial love as well.

This idea about equal love, respect and treatment of other human beings on humanitarian grounds irrespective of class, race or ethnicity is not something which Atticus is supposed to profess ideally. He must also live these beliefs, not just voice them, which is why he takes the case of Robinson. Tom is an African American in a small Southern town and is accused of raping a white woman. Nevertheless a false accusation, this blame was sufficient to alien him from the atmosphere of prerogative white-dominated society. Informed by a long-existing racial domination of white people and demonization of the black races, Tom being a black is supposed to be submissive to the white-skinned people. He is not expected to see a white woman even with a straight and daring look. When such a situation happens, Tom's rumored attempt to rape a white woman exacerbated his situation.

When no-one in the stands by Tom in such situation, Atticus is there for him defending him to the best of abilities. Racism here is cultural and runs a very deep in the town of Maycomb. In the middle of such an adverse condition, though a white man, Atticus strongly holds a belief in Tom's innocence. Even those who believe in Tom's innocence will not stand for him. It would be against the social mores of most people to defend a black man, especially in a case that contradicts the word and honor of a white woman. But Atticus stands for what he knows is right.

Atticus not only goes after the perception of the individual sidelining the deep-rooted racial hatred but also his children from his ideal. We as readers watch them mature into people who look into a person's soul and life and do not make judgments based on race or social status. For example, in part one of the story, there are two references made to Atticus defending Tom Robinson. In chapter nine Cecil Jacobs makes fun of Scout because her father defends Negroes. Francis, a grandson of Aunt Alexandra who first gives the reader the family's reaction to the Tom Robinson case later refers to Scout's father that "he is nothing but a nigger lover" (Lee 83). In both instances Scout is ready to fight for her father's good name. Though in the beginning she does not exactly understand the Negro's point of view for which she is being humiliated by her own classmates, by her own community members because to have anything to do with Negroes was hateful. However, gradually in continuous touch with the Negro people and her own adventure to the pitiable Negroes or blacks, she sees the openness of the Negroes who allow her sins to be called out publicly. Then there is the generosity of the Negroes who, out of the poverty, give to help Helen Robinson. Helen Robinson is a wife of Tom and she ceases to take Culpurnia for granted. For the first time, she understands what Atticus meant when he explained to

her that she would get along better with people if she learns to climb into her skin once in a while and try to see their point of view.

In such ideal activities of white people, like Scout and Atticus, we can experience a love of human being towards another human being which flouts the boundaries created along the racial, communal or color lines. It is a treatment of man as a man, an unshakable faith in humanitarian values. But it is South of 1930's in which racism is cultural. Whites are dominant in social structure and blacks are merely subservient to them, the subjectivity and a clear human identity. They are brutally treated and the extremity of white atrocity and racial hatred is the example of Tom Robinson's case around which the whole plot of the novel revolves. Tom is in fact blamed of an attempted rape by a white woman, Mayella. She is the daughter of a white family and her blame to Tom in the court were due to fear of her father. But in fact, if we are to believe, Tom's narration of the day of alleged rape, we witness how a Negro was treated in 1930's white dominated South. In such situation of Tom, we see the racial hatred on the one hand by the white supremacy and belongingness of humanity on the other hand by the same society.

Racial ambivalence presented in the book is entirely in white and black society of Maycomb. Mayella Ewell waits for months for a chance to get some true affection. But Tom's life hangs in the balance because of her. Being a Negro, he can not yield to Mayella without getting the blame of her actions. By the same token, he does not dare strike her or push her in order to get away though she violently tries to get him to abide by her desires. But finally when he denies and dismisses any such possibility, he is accused of rape and left alone to struggle for justice. Because he is a Negro in a white community he can count on no safety whatsoever; in this town, Maycomb, townspeople always rally to the defense of a white person, no matter how despicable.

Besides this obvious racial injustice inflicted on black people the text is teeming with evidence in which the readers can have a glimpse of white community's hatred toward black people. Scout is ridiculed by her own community members just because her father Atticus is appointed as lawyer to defend a Negro. Moreover, the novel time and again explores white people's feelings toward Negro through Aunt Alexandra who does not want her family associated with them in anyway. Aunt Alexedra is Atticus' sister, who represents the traditional values of South-hoe, family, heredity, gentility and white supremacy. Alexandra's main concern is the preservation of good family name in order to keep one's place in society. Perhaps, this social dignity gets polluted in the contact with a Negro community and she obviously fears it.

In this way, the novel oscillates between two poles; racial love and racial hatred. Atticus Finch and Scout Finch, though representatives of the white community, disobey the community construction of Negro people as non-humans. They love and perceive black people on the ground of human values and fight for social equality and justice. They represent love and conscience.

In the Southern states of America in the 1950's and 1960's discrimination and prejudice against black people was very common indeed. People in the black community feared that the situation was going to escalate where black people's earnings were only about half of those whites.

Raising such issues since its publication, *To Kill a Mockingbird* has been enormously popular with reading public. *To Kill a Mockingbird*, a novel that was sufficient to make its author Harper Lee (1926-) the winner of the 1961 Pulitzer Prize for fiction. Much appreciated for its author's ability to weave together the vivid eccentric characters of a small town, the observation of a small but sensitive child and

a plea for social justice, the novel has accumulated a variety of criticism since its publication in 1960. The novel has been viewed from different perspectives. Many reviewers lauded the book as a poignant and insignificant expose of social reality of the South, and a powerful rendering of modern heroism. For Laurie Champion, the novel generates new meanings of “right” and “left” ordinarily used for “opposing spatial directions” (234). She sees that they “suggest [...] virtue and [...] inequity” respectively (234). The importance, according to her, of the meaning of these two categories can be seen in the trial scenes of the novel. She writes:

Connotations of ‘right’ and ‘left’ play a crucial role during the climatic trial scenes [...] Directional words ‘right’ and ‘left’ are repeated, emphasizing the dichotomy [of virtue and iniquity]. [...] The term ‘left’ also denotes what remains what is ‘left’ of something and ‘right’ denotes the humanity [...]. [Both refer to] harm [...] and humility [respectively]. (234-236)

Tom Robinson’s physical handicap of crippled left arm--the arm having been “caught in a cotton gin” at the age of twelve-- is emphasized in Lee’s novel as a factor which should have resulted in acquittal or at least serious doubt not only concerning Tom Robinson’s ability to choke and rape Mayella Ewell but to produce the kind of injuries she suffers on the right side of her face.

Another critic, Donald F. Roden, viewing the novel, as “a story of experience”, analyses how children learn the evils of the adult world as they are about to enter it(54). They find the world of adults full of injustice. As per him:

The theme of the novel may be extended even further than either the racial issue or the ideas of trying to see the other person’s point of view. For the three children, this is the story of imitation. At the

beginning, he is an unsophisticated boy but before the story is finished, he has learned much about the ways of adults. Thus, we might say that the theme of this novel is evil seen through the eyes of innocent. The principal evil, of course is that worked upon Tom Robinson. It is performed by the adults of Maycomb. The innocent are the three children Jem, Scout, and Dill. As the story progresses they learn more about the adult world until finally each child has his own reaction to it.

(55)

In this way, the exploration of the moral theme of human beings that is, whether people are essentially good or essentially evil is achieved by dramatizing Scout and Jem's transition from a perspective of childhood innocence in which they assume that people are good because they have never seen evil, to a more adult perspective, in which they have confronted evil and must incorporate it into their understanding of the world.

Steven Lubet, in his attempt to reconstruct the major character, Atticus Finch a lawyer who despite being a white defends a black man, and a much adored figure for his belief in humanitarian causes, argues on "the possibility that Atticus Finch was not quite the heroic defender of an innocent man wrongly accused" (1340). He generates several questions and sets them as premises of his arguments that are generated after a deep concentration on the trial scenes of the novel. The questions are:

But what if Atticus is not an icon? What if he was more a man of his time and place that we thought? What if he were not a beacon of enlightenment, but just another working lawyer playing out his narrow determined role? [...] what if she really was raped or nearly raped by Tom Robinson? (1340)

He further says that the advocate's job is to provide the jury with reasons for an acquittal. He declares, "Mayella lied, perhaps in fantasy, or out of spite, or in shame, or as a result of sexual frustration or may be just because she was confused" (1353). As he remarks, "No real-life lawyer has done more for the self-image or public perception of the legal profession than the hero of Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*. For nearly four decades, the name of Atticus Finch has been invoked to defend and inspire lawyers, to rebut lawyer's jokes, and to justify (and fine-tune) the average system" (1357). After a long discussion on every aspect of the legal scenes of the novel he concludes that:

The moral problem is more difficult, if not intractable. Whether Tom was innocent or guilty, Atticus no doubt fulfilled his obligations under the standard conception of professional ethics. But that only brings us directly to the hardest question of all. Is Atticus still a hero? [. . .] I am able to see the social value to vigorous defense and I can appreciate the principle that all- even the guilty and especially the despised- must be defended. But the willingness to rely upon cruel stereotypes, to play the "gender card" should be criticized not applauded. (1361-62)

But James Barton sees a necessity to reexamine the novel "not because it fails to live up to the empathetic ideal that its canonical status suggests, but because of its treatment of empathy, particularly in relation to the opposing principle of professional detachment" (1682). From a lawyer's perspectives the critic sees the application of empathy as a hurdle for the professional effectiveness of a lawyer, Atticus Finch, in the novel. But when empathy functions it bridges the gap between what is professional and what is personal. He says, "In other words, ritualized empathy makes a personal emotion professional and vice versa" (1702). Similarly, Don Burther,

another critic sees Lee's work with a rare compassion that makes her novel soar. For him, it is the best contemporary novel he has read since 1939. The critic here emphasizes the ability of the author to write with sympathy.

The above mentioned critics have concentrated their views on the different aspects of the novel but none of them has sufficiently focused on its adopting a racial issue. Because of the strict class system of Maycomb County and the extreme prejudice of the town, Tom Robinson was unjustly convicted of, and sentenced to death for a crime he did not commit. The novel indeed draws the case of how a black man is suppressed in the time of racism in America by white people dramatizing a white lawyer's attempt to defend a black; it focuses on the acceptance of black people's existence by white people. Thus, the theme of racism remains a provocative issue to be researched.

For the purpose of textual analysis, the researcher aims at analyzing different critics, for example Anthony Appiah, Paul Gilroy, Peter High, Homi Bhaba and their views on the problem of race or racism and the context is provided by racism in white American society in the 1930s, basically about the ambivalence. So, the study of racism will be included as a background to interpret the novel. For the purpose, a general concept of racism and its study up to the present day, and its practice in American context will be a basic tool. Racial discrimination and its impact on literature will also be dealt to sort out its own literary trends.

II. Race, Racism and Ambivalence

Race, as twentieth century theorists defined, is not biological categorization; rather it is a concept that is socially or politically motivated system of classification. It is a social and cultural construct. Nowadays, a number of voices have been raised claiming that 'race' is not biological, rather social and cultural trait. Today, natural sciences argue that race does not exist; it is a pertinent criterion of classification.

Guillaumin defines race as:

Race is a political and cultural move which can never be neutral, given the facts. Race is a social category of exclusion and murder. It continues to provide the backbone of some ferocious system of domination [. . .]. The idea, the notion of race is a technical mean; a machine, for committing murder. And its effectiveness is not in doubt. It is a way of rationalizing and organizing by murderous violence the domination of powerful social group over other groups reduced to powerlessness. (361-62)

Similarly, Goldberg also defines race as the creation of ruling group in the society. Racial inferiority and superiority on the basis of biological difference has no scientific truth. Such misconception is the social and cultural product that the social groups who handle the socio-economical and political power regulate as natural fact to rationalize their superiority. He writes that "race is nothing other than recourse to social consideration and relation. Race and racial relations is ghost like. Lacking a determining or motivational force of its own, "race is a mystification, a form of false consciousness or misleading ideology" (367).

Regarding the race as social ideology Miles brings the ideas of Jacques Barzun in his *Race, A Study in Modern Superstition (1938)*, and of Ruth Benedict in her *Race*

and Racism. Benedict defines race as "race-thinking is [. . .] a form of erroneous thinking that can be charged with a dozen of ulterior motives", and "racism is temporarily and geographically specific phenomenon. Race is a creation of our time, of high European civilization" (346). Race is the construction of the whites that bears other vicious motives i.e. to perpetuate their racial superiority over the target racial group. Race is not natural, but later constructed belief. Philipsen also asserts his idea of race as "race was developed by the English long after the introduction of various forms of forced labors, worst among them the enslavement of Africans [. . .]. Race does not exist in human biology, but rather was invented as a concept by human beings" (194-95).

Thus, the racists regard race as the biological and genetical identity, but twentieth century thinkers attribute race with social and cultural identity. In this sense, racial inferiority and superiority is not inherited trait, rather it is imposed by the racists who circulate the baseless and false beliefs about race. The term 'race' is merely the discriminatory attitude of ruling group, which they bring into practices through different ideological agents, which disseminate their racist ideology among the racially inferior groups.

The term 'ideology' has a whole range of meanings. No definition of this term provides a single and unambiguous meaning. However, what nearly all commentators agree upon is that the present-day usage of the term refers to a system of ideas that represents the interest of the dominant social or political or economical class or power as a distorted and illusionary body of ideas. In this regard, the term 'ideology' is defined as a body of ideas characteristics of a particular social group or class, or a cluster of ideas or false ideas, which help to legitimate a dominant political power, or as forms of thought motivated by social interests, as socially necessary illusion.

Ideology is a pejorative term, "usually identifying someone who wishes to impose an abstract, extremist, intellectual, political obsession on a moderate mainstream political system" (Kavanagh 306).

Terry Eagleton in his book *Ideology: An Introduction* suggests definitions of the term as "ideas and beliefs (whether true or false) which symbolize the conditions and life experience of a specific, socially significant group or class; the promotion and legitimating of the interests of such social groups in the face of opposing interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation" (29-30). Alvin Goulder in his *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology* writes, "Ideology is the mind-inflating realm of the doctrine, the dogmatic, the impassioned, the dehumanizing, the false, the irrational, and of course the extremist consciousness" (qtd. in Eagleton 4). So, he defines ideology as consisting of ambivalence. Similarly, Terry Eagleton quotes the idea of John B. Thompson about ideology that "to study ideology is to study the ways in which meaning (or significance) serves to sustain relation of domination" (qtd in Eagleton 4). Thompson views it in term of its relation of domination. The process of legitimating seems to involve at different strategies. A dominant power may legitimate itself by promoting beliefs and values congenial to it. It tries to universalize and naturalize them to render themselves-evident and apparently inevitable. The dominant power excludes the rival forms of thought and obscures social reality. So, the legitimating theory of ideology concerns the nature of power. Michel Foucault replaces ideology with the more spacious 'discourse'.

The word 'ideology' has something of a bad name: the 'crude' Marxist notion of ideology is a "false consciousness", "the system of ideas and representation which dominate the mind of man or a social group" (Althusser 122). Marxist notion of ideology is "an imaginary assemblage", a pure dream, empty and vain, constituted by

the "day's residues" from the only full and positive reality, that of the concrete history of concrete material individuals materially producing their existence. Ideology as Althusser says, "represents relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (123). For him, ideology is an imagined representation of reality: it is false, distorted by definition. Ideology is, Terry Eagleton remarks, "set of doctrines, rather, it signifies the way men live out their roles in class society, the values, ideas and images which tie them by their social functions and so prevent them from a true knowledge of society as a whole" (16-17).

Ideology is false consciousness or "false belief that conceal[s] real social relations and services to decide others. Ideologies are beliefs others have; ideologies presuppose the socially or politically self-serving nature of the definition of truth and falsity" (Dijk 21). The critical element of the notion of ideology in this tradition is usually associated with various notions of power and domination. Following Marx/Engels, ideologies were first of all defined as the prevailing ideas of an age. According to the political economy of these philosophers, these dominant ideas were associated with those of the ruling class or group that controls the means of production, including the means of the reproduction of ideas-- most notably these of politics, the media, literature and education-- they are also able to make their ideologies more or less accepted by the ruled or marginalized or inferior ones as the undisputed knowledge in natural ways things are. But with Gramsci, these relations between ideology and society were conceptualized in terms of 'hegemony'. Thus, instead of the imposition of dominant ideology by a ruling class or specific superior group or race, hegemony more subtly works through the management of the mind of the citizens, for example, by persuasively constructing a consensus about the social order.

The function of ideology is to reproduce ideologies themselves through different social practices, institutions or social forces that more or less, directly or indirectly represent the ideology of the state or ruling group or race. Those institutions or forces are as Althusser called "Ideological State Apparatuses" (11). Through these agents the ruling ideologies or beliefs and ideas disseminated are transmitted to the minorities, and make them subjects to ruling class. So the function of ideology is to reproduce the subjection to the ruling idea. Thus, reproducing ideologies through these social practices and institutions ideology helps the superior group or ruling class to continue its control and dominance. So, ideology is associated with power and domination.

About the ideological functions for the social agents Kavanagh writes:

We live in a society with a constantly changing variety of social apparatuses which have heavily ideological functions: the family, churches, schools, sports, network TV, public TV, cable [. . .] various literally genres. Most of these institutions make very effort emphatically to disavow "politics", to avoid thinking about who should control the power of the state, and it would be silly to treat them as if they were indistinguishable from those institutions that do direct address explicitly political questions. (313)

For Louis Althusser the ideas of ruling class are imposed by means of force and also through the imposition of those ideas on to those ruled or dominated. In German Ideology, Karl Marx and Engels remark the function of ideology as:

[. . .] [T]he ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch of the ruling ideas, i.e. the class which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the

means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that, generally speaking; the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subject to it. (qtd. in Hawthorn 165)

According to Marxist theory, those who control economic power in hand control the consciousness of ruled ones. The consciousness of the under privileged people is controlled by the ideas and beliefs of ruling group.

In the Althusserian meaning, "man is ideological animal by nature" (129). Or ideology is bound up with the constitution of the subject. The people constitute or define themselves as humans through ideology. He argues that "the category of the subject is constitutive of all ideology only in so far as all ideology has the function (which defines it) of constituting concrete individuals as subjects" (129). Subjects—people—make their own ideology at the same time as ideology makes them subjects. Ideology makes our reality in constituting us as subjects. Ideology, as Althusser argues, "hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects" (130); it calls us or calls to us as subjects and we recognize ourselves as subjects in our response to this call. To become human, to identify oneself as a subject, then, is an effect of ideology.

The state or the government or the administration is explicitly as Paris Commune and Lenin said on *State and Revolution* a repressive apparatus, and it is the machine of repression, which enables the ruling classes to ensure their domination over the working class, inferior and marginalized groups such as blacks. Exploitation, discrimination, injustice, segregation and prejudice are maintained by the ruling group of people employing different social as well as political and cultural forces. The administration has legal practices. The police, army, church, court, school, mass-

media, literature, art that directly or indirectly are representing the belief- system or ideology of ruling class, and intervene as a supplementary repressive force in the last instance. By state apparatus Althusser means "the force of repressive execution and intervention in the interests of ruling classes" (107). And ideological state apparatuses are according to Althusser, "a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions" (110). The institutions include churches, different public or private schools, family, administrative forces like army, police, court, political system including the different parties, trade union (the powerful merchant's and bankers' guilds and journeyman's association etc), means of communication and cultural and literary works whose functions are to reproduce and transmit the ideologies of specific class or group, and perpetuate the domination of ruling class over poor, inferior and marginalized groups. But, these institutions function both by repression and ideology, but both are not purely repressive and ideological. For example, the army and police also function by both ideology and repression to ensure their own cohesion and reproduction, and in the 'values' they propound externally though they are primarily repressive. Similarly, schools and Churches function massively and predominantly by ideology but they function secondarily by repression also. They use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion and selection. So, these ideological institutions have double functioning. The role of ruling ideology is heavily concentrated on the interests of the ruling class or group, which holds the social, political, economic and cultural power, and expand the exploitation, discrimination, injustice, and infliction through the different institutions.

Regarding Church, it was the dominant and the most powerful agent to rule over the people during Middle Ages, "which concentrated within it not only religious

functions, but also educational ones" (Althusser 115). Media is probably, "more pervasive and influential agent for ideological production and reproduction" (Dijk 187). In news gathering, such ideological concerns, monitors assignment, beats, interviews, press conferences, press release, selection and decision procedures are governed by the ruling group. Events and institutional arrangements in news making are biased towards the reproduction of a limited set of dominant, elite ideologies. This is not only true for news production, but also for current affairs programmes, documentaries, shows and other categories of media discourse. The political apparatuses (the Estate General, the *parlement*, the different political factions and Leagues, the ancestors of the modern political parties or the whole political system of society) function by "subjecting individuals to the Political State Ideology, the "indirect" (parliamentary) or "direct" (Plebiscitary or Fascist), "democratic" ideology" (Althusser 117).

Racism is ideology of racial domination based on beliefs that designated group is either biologically or culturally inferior and the use of such beliefs to determine or prescribe its social position. Racism is an ideology in a sense that it is a beliefs system or a set of implicit assumptions that is socially construct about the superiority of one's racial group or ethnic group over other. *Encyclopedia of Psychology* defines racism as:

Racism is a policy typically associated with the development of ideologies that justify them. Thus, although the belief that race is biologically construct is fundamental to racism; race is actually a social construct that permits the exploitation of one group over another with the development of the ideology that justifies it. (Kazdin 499)

Racism is an active or passive response to the specious belief that genetically transmitted traits are linked to social characteristic. But the definitions of racism have under major revisions in the latter twentieth century.

Now, race and racism is viewed as social and cultural, rather than biological concept. But, racism is conceptualized on the basis of inherited biological difference.

A.J. Krailsheimer writes:

Racism is the doctrine that one group of men is morally or mentally superior to another and that his superiority arises out of inherited biological differences. The distinction between groups of mankind is held to be based on the common biological heredity of the members of each group. (58)

In the same sense, Bill Aschroft defines racism as "a way of thinking that considers a group's unchangeable physical characteristics, and which on this basis distinguishes 'superior' and 'inferior' racial group" (199). So it is a kind of discrimination made by a group of people on the basis of race, color, religion or culture and the discrimination itself is product of prejudice and stereotypical mode of thoughts or assumptions that "attempts to classify humanity according to the idea that 'races' embodied a package of fixed physical and mental traits" (Bulmer and Solomos 8). Banton also defines racism as "the doctrine that a man's behavior is determined by stable inherited characters deriving from separate racial stocks having distinctive attributes and usually considered to stand one another in relation of superiority and inferiority" (qtd. in Miles 348).

Gretchen Gerzina relates racism as "the notion of exclusion and inclusion based on perceived loss of political, economic or social power" (125). Racial ideology is nothing than the justification of relegation of people of color or inferior race to a

permanent status of inferiority. The placing or categorization of people under certain group is all false notions because race is a socially constructed concept rather than an inherently meaningful category. "Race was developed by the English long after the introduction of various enslavement of Africans. It is American obsession" (Philipsen 193).

Human groups are not only discriminated in physical and biological traits, but also their morality, intellect, intelligence and creativity are linked to their physical characteristics. It is claimed that some are 'better', 'stronger', 'higher' or 'more creative' than other physically, intellectually or morally. And the higher race or races have a moral right to dominate, to enslave or even to eradicate the lower race or races. It is also believed or claimed that higher and lower races should not intermarry. Race mixture or 'mongrelization' is against nature. Racism makes biological differences as measuring rod to evaluate the standard of mental capacity and intelligence, but, such parameter is not fact based and scientific. The very concept of race as applied to groups of human being is false. In the very vast number of its traits mankind is "one". Krailsheimer argues:

Racists correlate the physical differences with difference in innate inheritable mental characteristics [. . .]. It isn't possible to devise a satisfactory test to determine whether there are biological differences in intelligence. In most cases, the available methods of classifying by ancestry are quite fallible. (59)

So, it is merely myth that race determines mental aptitude, temperament or social habits.

Two analytical points arise about racism. First, the original concept of racism presupposed the existence of a discourse 'race' because it was defined to refer to

nineteenth century beliefs that the human species consisted of a number of different races, and those races were ranked in lopsided position of superiority and inferiority. And second, the act of labeling the 'race-thinking' of nineteenth century as racism was scientific error. Miles, thus, concludes racism as a falsification of the scientific knowledge about human biology. Racism falsely claims that there is scientific basis for arranging groups hierarchically in terms of psychological and cultural characteristics that are immutable and innate" (348).

Racism does not take the same ideological form for long time. With the interference of social, political and cultural institutions in course of time, instead of following singularity it prefers diverse scholarly ideas shaped by several power politics. In contrast to 'old fashioned racism', 'aversive racism', a subtle, often unintentional form of bias represents those racists who possess strong egalitarian values. Similarly, 'symbolic racism' is as Kadzin writes "negative feeling's towards black whites acquire early in life persist into adulthood but are expressed indirectly and symbolically" (498).

'New-racism' sees race not as biological issue or heredity, but as cultural product. Though in surface level it doesn't believe the superiority of one race, but its main ethos is to segregate the other than the people of one's own race. "The New-racism is primarily concerned with the mechanism of exclusion or inclusion" (Gilroy 250). It has not diminished the gap between the meanings used in past centuries to present century. Thus, "racist ideologies and practice have distinct meanings bounded by historical circumstances and determined in struggle" (Gilroy 248).

Racism takes place both in manifest and latent level. The discrimination made on a direct or open mode of behaviors is the manifest or explicit racism which is also known as overt racism, whereas latent racism is subtle, but occurs more often than

former, and is hidden mode of discriminatory acts. Latent racism which is also known as implicit or covert racism expresses ideas of racism in disguised form; sometimes covert racism expresses ideas of racism in disguised form; sometimes covert racist isn't aware of the fact that he is racist. Racism, it is asserted, is no longer blatant: people nowadays are reluctant to express openly their dislike of and contempt for minorities indeed are not prepared to express publicly a sentiment that could be interpreted as racist. Racism is subtle; it is disguised; kept out of sight. The notion is that consciously or unconsciously racial discrimination is taking place in the social world. "Racial prejudice and racism are the result of motivations to restore status, or support a social hierarchy that favors one's group" (Kazdin 498).

Racism has basically three forms: individual racism, institutional racism and cultural racism. Individual racism is an individual's belief that an entire racial group is inferior or superior on the basis of physical features linked with intellectual and moral characteristics. Gerzina states "racism at the individual level involves misguided personal beliefs 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" (125).

If these personal characteristics get connected with cultural institutions like religion, education and military institutions to exclude or include not a person but also an entire group, it is institutional racism. "Cultural racism is closely aligned with ethnicity, in which race is in itself presumed to indicate cultural norms and in which cultural norms are presumed to indicate racial affiliation" (Gerzina 126). "It involves not only the preference for one group's culture, heritage, and values but also the imposition of his culture on other groups" (Kazdin 499). Idea of indoctrination, i.e. blacks are inferior and the discrimination or the feeling of superiority over 'the other'

on the basis of color, and shape skin, eye, hair, lips etc are the dominant tendency of institutional racism.

Racism is the cultural and social idea that human kind is composed of racial group that are biologically distinct. The concept of 'races' sharply delineates groups that are in reality nebulous with indistinct boundaries. This reality seriously undermines and discredits the whole enterprise of race. The creation of race therefore is a human cultural activity that bears little or no relationship with actual human biological diversity. Thus, "biologically distinct racial groups are entirely cultural and arbitrary, so racism is essentially a faith-based belief. Racism [. . .] enacts and perpetuates the false and dehumanizing notions. It does so as a deliberate exercise of social power that is designed to exclusively benefit one racial group or as a means to discriminate against a selected racial groups" (Hawk and Zimmerman 473). Racism represents the co-ordinate interaction of particular types of stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination.

Racism is a set of ideologies that have a prominent role in the reproduction of ethnic or racial inequality in society. Racism is understood in a broad, political sense, and involves group prejudice and discrimination against ethnic or 'racial' minority group, anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and so on. Racism comprises the discriminatory practices being enacted on the basis of racist ideologies, as well as the social structure of institution involved in the reproduction of racism, such as political parties, education and the media. In other words, "racism is a complex system of domination, which needs to be analyzed at various levels and domains of society, including those cognition, discourse, group relation, organization and culture" (Dizk 138). Racial ideology is functioning in individuals, institutional and social and

cultural practices. All those practices reflect the ruling ideology, and are motivated to dominate and control the ruled. Eagleton says:

A racist is usually someone in the grip of fear, hatred and insecurity, rather than someone who has dispassionately arrived at certain intellectual judgments on other races, but even if his feelings are not motivated by such judgments, they are likely to be entwined with them; and these judgment that certain races are inferior to other, for example, are plainly false. (21)

Racist ideology is fueled by two concepts-- inclusion and exclusion. Racist ideologies and practices basically aim at keeping others down and especially out: of 'our' country, 'our' city, 'our' neighbor, 'our' street, 'our' family, and 'our' group. It implies that we, Our Group are self-assigned a better or higher position and that such a position is deserved and can hence be justified.

Racism is associated with the practices of power abuse, domination and oppression. Thus, the possession and exercise of power of one group usually implies limitation of freedom for the other group. The power of one specific group is exercised through different institutional forces (police, military). The role of those forces is the reproduction of power and dominance. Thus, ideologies are developed and applied as *legitimizing* for the abuse of power and its resulting social inequality. Racism is generally known as the predication of decision and policies on consideration of race for the purpose of subordination racially different group and maintaining control over that group. It is a prejudice conditioned by perceptions. Thus, practices as such are seen in two levels- individual and communal. In the communal level in Althusser's words "Ideological State Apparatuses" are actively or passively in the pursuit of imposing racial ideology among people. But ultimate

victims of this ideology are designated those who are racially inferior. The attitude is that "whites are better than blacks; therefore blacks should be subordinated to whites" (Du Bois 45). The concept is that the whites are 'right' and the blacks are 'wrong'.

Because of false concepts of race, and institutionalization of such concepts blacks become victims of racial injustice in the hands of the agents that represent the interests and beliefs of superior group of race. Racial injustice refers to unfair social behavior, attitude and belief, and treatment towards the target racial group that involves denying "individual or groups of people equality of treatment which they may wish" (Kazdin 497). Discrimination, prejudice and stereotypical images towards the designated racial group are by-products of racist ideology. Racial prejudice is an unfavorable and negative towards a colored group or its individual members. It is characterized by stereotyped beliefs. Racial prejudice can be defined as an attitude of generalized hostility of aversion against a group of human beings who possess different color. Racial prejudice invites different social problems such as disintegration, wars, killing and other criminal activities.

Slavery, imperialism and colonialism are some of the examples of racial injustice because they occurred in the name of racial inferiority and superiority. Colonists in the seventeenth century finding Africans were cheap and relatively immune to tropical diseases rationalized slavery on grounds that blacks are racially inferior. "Slavery is an extreme form of domination and exploitation characterized by a parasitic relationship between the dominant whites and the enslaved blacks. This is a two way relationship of dependence, even though one party holds power of life or death over the other" (Bulmer and Solomos 58). Slavery became legalized institution by state itself during the seventeenth and eighteenth century. The 'slavery system' was the extreme point of blacks' suffering because it destroyed the happy family world of

blacks separating the family members from each others. That colonial mission created ambivalent relation between colonized and colonizer.

The term ‘ambivalence’ first developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite. It also refers to a simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action (Young 161). Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Homi Bhabha, it describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. Rather than assuming that some colonized subjects are ‘complicit’ and some ‘resistant’, ambivalence suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relation within the colonial subject. Ambivalence also characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject, for it may be both exploitative and nurturing, or represent itself as nurturing, at the same time.

Most importantly in Bhabha’s theory, however, ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between colonizer and colonized. Ambivalence is therefore an unwelcome aspect of colonial discourse for the colonizer. The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values – that is, ‘mimic’ the colonizer. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never very far from mockery. Ambivalence describes this fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery. In this respect, it is not necessarily disempowering for the colonial subject; but rather can be seen to be ambi-valent or ‘two-powered’. The effect of this ambivalence (the simultaneous attraction and repulsion) is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse.

Ambivalence therefore gives rise to a controversial proposition in Bhabha's theory, that because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. This is controversial because it implies that the colonial relationship is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonized. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizers – this would be too threatening. For instance, he gives the example of Charles Grant, who, in 1792, desired to inculcate the Christian religion in Indians, but worried that this might make them 'turbulent for liberty' (Bhabha 87). Grant's solution was to mix Christian doctrines with divisive caste practices to produce a 'partial reform' that would induce an empty imitation of English manners. Bhabha suggests that this demonstrates the conflict within imperialism itself that will inevitably cause its own downfall: it is compelled to create an ambivalent situation that will disrupt its assumption of monolithic power.

Robert Young suggests that the theory of ambivalence is Bhabha's way of turning the tables on imperial discourse. The periphery, which is regarded as 'the borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful' by the centre, responds by constituting the centre as an 'equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence' (161). But this is not a simple reversal of a binary, for Bhabha shows that both colonizing and colonized subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse. The concept is related to hybridity because, just as ambivalence 'decentres' authority from its position of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often inflected by, other cultures. The hybridity of Charles Grant's suggestion above, for instance, can be seen as a feature of its ambivalence. In this respect, the very engagement of colonial

discourse with those colonized cultures over which it has domination, inevitably leads to an ambivalence that disables its monolithic dominance.

Homi Bhaba writes that "colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable other as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (86). The colonizer wants and needs the colonized to be similar to himself, but not the same. If the native continues to behave in his traditional ways, he brings no economic gain to the colonizer. But, if the colonized changes too much and is found to be exactly the same as the colonizer, the colonizer is left with no argument for his supremacy. As Bhaba puts it, "in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference" (86). Bhabha argues, hybridity subverts the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures. The series of inclusions and exclusions on which a dominant culture is premised are deconstructed by the very entry of the formerly-excluded subjects into the mainstream discourse. The dominant culture is contaminated by the linguistic and racial differences of the native self. Hybridity can thus be seen, in Bhabha's interpretation, as a counter-narrative, a critique of the canon and its exclusion of other narratives. In other words, the hybridity-acclaimers want to suggest first, that the colonialist discourse's ambivalence is a conspicuous illustration of its uncertainty; and second, that the migration of yesterday's 'savages' from their peripheral spaces to the homes of their 'masters' underlies a blessing invasion that, by 'Third-Worlding' the center creates 'fissures' within the very structures that sustain it.

III. Racial Ambivalence in *To Kill a Mockingbird*

Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Homi Bhabha, ambivalence it describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between black and white. The relationship is ambivalent because the black subject is never simply and completely opposed to the white. Rather than assuming that some black subjects are 'complicit' and some 'resistant', ambivalence suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relation within the racial subject. Throughout the novel, *To Kill a Mockingbird*, by Harper Lee, the characteristic of empathy is ever present. This unique quality is developed through Jem and Scout in their dealings with the characters of Walter Cunningham and Mrs. Dubose. Race itself is not a manifestation of a person's or a group's intellectual and cultural heritage and economic status. Color of skin or hair is not like a uniform that is changeable but has become a glass that changes the reality when reality is perceived in terms of person's appearance-- color of skin, hair, bodily structure, and complexion, it becomes a cause of social disintegration. The prejudice of color may be held by both, one who sees the other and the other who is seen. It can be seen in different forms.

The issue of racism in *To Kill a Mockingbird* is more pervasive and complex than just a case of black and white skins. The entire novel is about unfairness in its many forms and the most prominent case is the version of racial love-hate between the blacks and whites. The whole town of Maycomb is based on stereotypes of its inhabitants that are passed down from generation to generation. Atticus Finch a white lawyer shows love towards a black man while defending his case in the court. Atticus knows that Tom would not win but he defends him anyway. He does not care what people think, he just knows the truth has to be heard even if it is not considered. The

children also show that there is hope in the future for people to be non judgmental. They do not understand how a jury can convict a man whom they know is innocent and it astonishes them. This racial love hate relationship goes through the novel from its beginning to the end.

In Mycomb, like most small Southern towns, has a problem with widespread racism toward the black people. The novel focuses on one family; the Finches where Atticus is lawyer and Scout and Jem are the children. Atticus is defending a black man in court, something that is not often done in the South due to racism.

One characteristic shown of Jem and Scout is their ability to empathize or "...climb into their skin and walk around in it" (31). Jem develops a high level of emotional intelligence that allows him to understand the situation of others, as well as what they may be thinking or possible the way they will act. The reader first discovers this characteristic about Jem when he stops Scout from bashing up Walter Cunningham in the schoolyard and invites him over for dinner. "I [Scout] stomped at him [Walter] to chase him away, but Jem put out his hand and stopped me." (24). Jem stops Scout bashing Walter because he knows the ordeals Walter and his family face every day. To make up for Scout, Jem invites Walter over for dinner because Jem knows Walter is lucky to get a proper meal a day. Scout develops her empathy from this example when Calpurnia takes her into the kitchen and explains the Cunningham's situation. "Yo' folks might be better'n the Cunningham's but it don't count for nothin' the way you're disgracin' 'em . . ." (26). Through the course of events involving Walter Cunningham, both Jem and Scout learn to climb into the skin of Walter and enhance their ability to empathize.

In the name of maintaining good conscience, Finches family undergoes the severe racial intolerance of many of the townspeople and the extreme ostracizing. As

Mrs. Dubose mentions to the children of Atticus- "Your father's no better than the niggers and task he works for" that generates bitter experience to the children (102).

Mrs. Dubose calls all black people "trash" without exception (103). But Atticus wants the children to understand that courage has to do with the fight for one's personal goals, no matter what the odds are against achieving the goal. He wants to see that though many of the townspeople are ignorant and racist they also have personal strengths that keep them from being all bad and give them hope for becoming better.

Further Atticus explains to Scout:

Nigger-lover is just one of those terms that don't mean anything -like snot nos. Its hard to explain-ignorant, trashy people uses it when they think somebody's favoring Negroes over and above themselves. It's slipped into usage with some people like ourselves, when they want a common, ugly term to label somebody. (108)

Jem's learns some lessons in how to remain impassive when his father's judgement is questioned and criticized. But Atticus is constant in his determination and he takes all blames are due to the ignorance and lack of proper understanding of humanity. When major problems come in the society people forget the skin differences for a moment and stay together. We see such atmosphere through out the novel and unifying effect over the neighborhood during the presence of rabid dog. Rabid dog is a deadly, dangerous menace to the town and its presence affects everyone on he community blacks or white irrespective of class or personality. Though, Atticus does not like to shoot, his role as marksman in hitting the rabbit dog calls for him to stand as a defender of all the people not just the blacks or whites. Atticus dislikes handing a gun because it makes him like he has an unfair advantage over all living things that is nature is fair in what in what it has given all beings, and using a tool like a gun to kill allows him

special privileges which nature never intended for him to use. But in the name of public safety, Atticus is willing to put his morals aside in the name of higher goal; the protection of human life. After the death of the dog doors open one by one, and the neighborhoods slowly come alive jointly. All people come together and make everyone equal for a moment. This particular scenario unites both colors' people together for a while and creates a harmonious environment to each other.

Like the gun mentioned above, the situation of white supremacy is a creation of society that contradicts all that is natural to mankind; it separates men into groups and places one ahead of the others. Atticus wishes to do away with these categories and power discrepancies. But we find this inconsistency in the rabid dog case.

Culturnia, a black woman, is the one to recognize the serious nature of the rabid dog situation; she makes the right phone calls, and runs out to warn neighbours. She spares many people from death, yet she gets on credit for it when compared to Atticus who actually shoots the gun to kill the dog. Though Atticus's skill with a gun is remarkable, Culpuria's swift action and knowledge are invaluable. This is an example of how the black community in Maycomb helps the white community in ways that may not always be realized, and despite the amount of prejudice and discrimination that they suffer, they make many unsung contribution to the community.

Culpurina, a black cook in the white family, does not have any racial differences within herself. She takes Scout and Jem in the black church which offers the only real window in to the life and culture of Maycomb's black community. At the Church, a black woman Lula tries to tell Culprina that white children do not belong at the church. She supposes the rejection for the entrance of Scout and Jem in the black church. Lula further says:

I want to know why you bringing white chillum to nigger church.

When Lula came up the path way towards us Culpurnia said, ‘stop right here, Nigger’ Lula stopped, but she said, ‘You aren’t got no business bringing white chillum here. They got their church, we got our’s. it is our church, ain’t it, miss call?’ culpurna said, it is the same god, ain’t it?’ (119)

Though Lula exposes to decades of white racial hatred and discrimination, the entire congregation gives the Finch children a warm welcome except Lula. For the most part the black community seems unified in a sense of solidarity that their poverty and shared hardship help ta collection for Helen Robinson solidify. Likewise, in making on, wife of Tom Robinson, everyone in the community must sacrifice a little more than they are comfortable with in order to help out those in need. In the black community, the needs of the poorest members are felt by everyone else in the group.

Despite the difference, however, between the black and white congregations, Scout notes that most aspects of service are very similar, including the nature of the sermon itself. This demonstrates that the two groups, though so socially segregated, share much in the common when the issues of faith are concerned. Lula’s stand also suggests that there may be some divisiveness in the black community with regards to their attitudes towards the white domination, she wants the black community to, like whites, have their own space and lead mutually exclusive lives. But the others seem more interested in working a peaceful integration between blacks and whites despite historical atrocities and animosity.

Likewise, without people like Atticus going out of their way to help others, the darkness of prejudice could perpetuate at itself indefinitely. As in Atticus’ earlier pose with the gun against the rabid dog, he stands at the door of the jail which is symbolic

of his role throughout the book. The night is dark like the culture of bigotry and ignorance in Maycomb. Atticus' slight illuminates the night, as Atticus strives to teach his community the truth and expose their unfairness. The light is a usual addition to the scene: it would not occur outside the jail unless Atticus brings it there himself. Atticus does not suppose to hold a gun or other weapon, only a book. He will guard the basic human rights of Tom and all people using his knowledge and his experience in law. With his high morals, he will not lower himself to the violent measure used by other, even for his own self-defence. He protests as usual for fairness. So, his entire presence in the case Tom Robinson is remarkable in the story.

Tom Robinson is trial begins with the testimony of the Sherrif, Heck Tate. The Finch children, Jem and Scout find themselves welcomed and even honored among blacks when Reverend Sykes invites them to the balcony, and chairs are vacated in the front row on their behalf where black people sit. Reverend invites all of them "[T]here's not a seat downstairs. Did you all recon it'll be all right if you all come to the balcony with me?"(164). The prosecution's attorney Mr. Gilmer proceeds the case and asks Heck Tate about the events surrounding Tom Robinson and Mr. Ewell come to get him because "some Nigger'd raped his girls"(167). He says that he finds Mayella on the floor, very beaten up and that she says that Tom has taken advantages of her and beaten her. Atticus questions him next asking whether anyone calls a doctor or not we find Tate's response which is 'no' but Tate mentions about the entire right side of Miss Mayella's face which is bruised and sees all scratches all around her face. Similarly, next witness is Mr. Ewell, and claims that he hears Mayella screaming when he is coming in front the woods with kindling, and he runs to the highly offensive language pointing his finger at Tom Robinson "[. . .] I seen that black nigger

yonder ruttin' on my Mayella"(173). This quote sets the court in fervor. Further he explains about the scene and retorts to judge:

I run for Tate quick as I could I know who it was, all right, lived down yonder in that nigger-nest, passed the house every day Judge I've asked this country for fifteen years to clean out that nest down yonder, they're dangerous to live around sides devaluin' my property. (175)

Here we find Mr. Ewell's manner is of one who seems beyond the law. He is described as a bantam cock that struts around arrogantly, yet ridiculously and he tries to invoke the good humor of the audience, whines to the judge about being asked to prove his ability to write, and offends everyone with his language, putting the court into five minutes of uproar. This scene depicts him as brutal, insensitive and confident of his ability to get away with his perjury.

Likewise, after Mr. Ewells, Ms. Mayella is next witness. Her life is one of miserable poverty and deprivation, and she shows that she is accustomed to being treated without respect when she thinks Atticus is deliberately mocking her by calling her 'Miss'. She seems hopelessly immature for nineteen years old and her whiney or tearful attitude suggests a subtle sly manipulation of her audience. And her actions in the court seem motivated by cowardice: her initial reluctance to say Tom's name when asked to tell the court that her rapist is points toward her hesitancy to accuse him when he is innocent. However, she does surrender to fear and accuse him, thus putting her fear over the value of his life. Mayella's sad situation comes out more fully in Tom's testimony. Her short comments about "what her pap do to her don't count," shows that he is probably abused in some way by her father (179). She is as lonely as the 'mixed' children, belonging neither to black nor white circle (194). It shows the ambivalent position of the characters. But Tom's crippled state is more than

just a plot device, but also serves as an emblem for his disadvantage in life as a black man. Tom's arm is injured in cotton fields. The legacy of slavery cripples Tom in the court and in his everyday life, just as his actual injury is a constant burden for him:

Tom seemed to be a respectable Negro, and a respectable would never go up into somebody's yard of his own volition. [. . .] Tom was a black-velvet Negro, not shiny but soft black. The whites of his eyes shone in his face, and when he spoke we flashes of his teeth. If he had been whole, he would have been a fine specimen of a man. (129)

Though Tom is black he seems highly respectable one however he is presented. All of Maycomb's social assumptions refute the idea that a black person feels sorry for a white person. Tom's comment "yes suh. I felt right sorry for her; she seemed to try more'n the rest of 'em-" seems extremely provocative in the courthouse(129). Black life is though to be, by nature, inferior to white life, and the idea of a black man seeing something more wanting in a white person's life, than his own, subverts every thing that the town's social fabric is based upon. As Jem explains every class looks down upon the class below it, so black people should not feel pity for anyone. Atticus points out the case that comes down to the word of a black man against the word of the white people, and that the Ewell's case depends upon the jury's 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 caliber" (204).

Atticus reminds everyone that there are honest and dishonest black people just as there are honest and dishonest white people. He tells the jury that in court of law all men are created equal. A court is, however, no better than the members of its jury, and he urges the jury to do their duty. Atticus appeals to the jury's sense of dignity and in

putting together the facts of the case, he stresses on the simplicity of the evidence and shows that the facts of the case, he stresses the simplicity of the evidence and shows that facts point out towards Tom's innocence. As later becomes apparent, Atticus does not really believe that the jury will set Tom free, even though he does hope that they will, as evidenced by the way he says and all he can hope for is to leave an impression upon the town by exposing the truth for all to see. Atticus' treatment of Mayella reveals that in spite of being a victim of many cruelties, she has chosen to in turn bring cruelty upon Tom, and she must not be excused for this. He writes, "She was white and she tempted a Negro she did some thing that is in our society unspeakable: she kissed a black man. Not code mattered to her before she broke it, but it come crashing down on her afterwards" (204).

Mayella wants to protect herself by placing her guilt onto Tom, knowing that her action will bring about his death because the jury will believe her and not him. Thus she manipulates the unfairness of her society towards her own ends. The Ewells, after all, are a disappointment to their race. In the social outcaste, they are drunk, illiterate, filthy, welfare-dependent, and worse. Tom Robinson on the other hand, is a respectable Negro, polite, hard-working and not a maker. Scout believes Tom, because he fulfills his assigned part in the social structure, as she well understands. Tom is so respectable, that he does not even attempt to shoulder his way past Mayella, desperate as he is to escape from his awful dilemma. Tom knows his place He plays his prescribed part, fitting into Maycomb society, presenting no challenge and no affront. Mayella and her father break the mold, insult the norms, and violate the rules and the culture. They are in very contradiction of everything the fine folks Maycomb stand for.

Jem is sure that the trial would go in Tom's favour after the evidence come out about his left arm. Everyone notices that Tom's left arm is twelve inches shorter than his right due to an accident in cotton gin As Tom tries to put his hand upon the Bible, it becomes evident that his left arm is entirely non-functional and slips off lifelessly. But without any consideration, every jury member declares Tom guilty. This pronouncement of guilt, therefore, comes as a complete surprise to Jem's naïve mind. Miss Maudie makes Jem aware of an entire network of people who are quietly working in Tom's favor. Her use of word "we" to represent them not only creates the sense that there is a cohesive group with a communal vision, but also make the children feel like they are now included as apart of it. The trial has affected their lives in many ways, and now they are aware that they are by default going to part of the ongoing aim of taking "steps" towards fairness and equality.

Jem thinks that the jury decided quickly, but Atticus reminds him that it took a few hours which is much longer than usual-typically a case like Tom's would be settled in a matter of minutes. Atticus sees this as a sign of the beginning of change for better. Atticus responds that some men do not behave rationally in some situation.

In our courts, when it's a white man's word against a black man's, the white man always wins. They're ugly, but those are the facts of life. Doesn't make it right, said Jem stolidly. He beats his fist softly on his knee. You just can't convict a man on evidence like that- you can't. [A]s you grow older, you'll see white men cheat black men everyday of your life but whenever a white man does that to a black man, no matter who he is, how rich he is, or how fine a family he comes from, that white man is trash. (220)

Jem and Atticus talk about what keeps people off of juries. Women can not serve on juries in Alabama, and many people do not want to get involved in court cases because their livelihood depends in some way upon maintaining good favor with both parties involved in a case. Atticus says that men don't behave rationally in the same situations, and will always take a white man's word over a black man's. Atticus tells Jem that any white man who cheats a black man is trash.

Similarly, Miss Maudie thinks that "Atticus Finch wasn't winning, he can't win, but he s the only man in these parts who can keep a jury out so long in case like that. And I thought to myself well, we are making a step-it's just a baby-step but it's a step" (204). Despite the unfavorable verdict, the tribute which the black community pays to Atticus shows that he has achieved, through the way he handled the trial, a worthwhile lesson for the townspeople by exposing the unfairness of their collective options, and just as he teaches Jem and Scout in good moral virtues, he seems to be trying to teach the town a lesson and infuse them with more virtuous ideas. Black community has left Atticus all sorts of appreciative gifts-chickens and breads and produces which make Atticus' eye fill with tears; he says he is very grateful. This shows the intimate love between blacks and whites.

The story of the novel takes turn after the news of Aunt Alexandra. She gives news to Atticus that Tom tried to escape from the prison and was shot to death by the prison guards. They try to tell him to stop and fire warning shots, but he would not listen and keep running. After the death of Tom, Maycomb's reaction to the news of Tom's death demonstrates how willing they will interpret the actions of one black person negatively in order for it to feed into their existing negative feelings for black people. People's reaction on Tom's death is:

To Maycomb Tom's death was typical, typical of a nigger to cut and run. Typical of nigger's mentality to have no plans, no thought for the future: just run blind first chance he saw. Funny thing, Atticus Finch might've got him off Scout free, but wait-? [. . .] they say he kept himself clean, went to church and all that, but when it comes down to the line the veneers mighty thin. Nigger always comes out in'em. (240)

Tom was a black man accused of raping a white woman, a crime that is punishable by death penalty. Even though all the facts prove that he does not do it, the jury still finds him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Tom's life has been sacrificed to racism by the people who are there to protest him. The justice system does not allow this man to have a fair trial because of the color of his skin. They disregard his credibility or that of the other witnesses, all they could focus on is his race because that is all the window let them see. There are many people out there that are willing to lose everything they have to fight for what's right. Atticus Finch for example, he knows that Tom would not win but he defends him anyway. He does not care what people think, he just knows that there is hope in the future for people to be non judgemental. They do not understand how a jury could convict a man whom they know is innocent and it astonishes them. Atticus explains to them that it has happened before and will happen again, sadly he also told them when they do it- it seems that only the children weep.

Scout realizes that the decision to see the world fairly can only occur within each individual's heart and that there is no way to reach a person who has not become personally convinced in the virtue of following a moral course of action. For the black community, however, the news of Tom's death is devastating, as exemplified by Helen's collapse. Atticus could not promise Tom that all would go well for him

because he does not want to promise anything that he can not be sure of. Tom loses the courage and determination to keep living long enough to be potentially released: possibly, like Jem, his hopes that people would listen to the voice of reason are dashed completely, and given all injustices he has experienced in his life, he does not think it is possible that his case will be appealed.

The wife of Tom, Helen Robinson has been working on the property of Mr. Link Deas, but walks nearly a mile out of her way in order to avoid walking past Ewell's house, because they "chunked her" when she passes by(248). Even Helen is also not out of this difference that has been running in the society. She is continuously followed by white skin and mentally disturbed time and gain by the Ewells family. When Mr. Link Deas finds out this difficulty of Helen, he approaches the Ewells house and yells:

Ewells! I say Ewells! I know everything last on of you's in there a –
lying on the floor! Now hear me bob Ewell: If I hear one more peep
outa my girl Helen about not being able walk this road I'll have you in
jail before sundown!" Mr. Link spat in the dust and walked home.

(249)

Mr. Ewell is shown again to be cowardly and evil, threatening those who can defend themselves least. Mr. Link Deas is revealed to be another member of the forces working for fairness in Maycomb by his defense of Helen against the menace of Mr. Ewell. The evil of Mr. Ewells end when Boo kills Ewell. Ewell meant to seriously harm or kill the children of Scout and Jem but Boo becomes savior against the real evil, a man. Their hybrid state of mind fluctuates time and again which reflects the ambivalent position. The novel begins with the description of the Radley House in Maycomb town as being old, dark, closed off, uncivilized in contrast to the rest of the

neighborhood: was once white, it is now a slate-- gray color with rotten shingles, little sunlight, overgrown yards and closed doors on Sunday. Boo, who stays in the house, is to the children only what they have heard from popular legend, and interpret in their own imagination. Scout's retelling of Jem's description about Boo shows how her young mind could not yet distinguished between fact and fiction. Jem explains that Boo "dined on raw squirrels and nay cats he could catch, that's why his hands were blood -stained if you ate an animal raw, you could never wash the blood off" (13). But at the end he represents himself as a rescuer of the children and these happenings shows Boo Rudely stays inside because he wants to.

Injustice, racial discrimination and prejudices are rooted in Maycomb Country so it is very important to make people free from these social ties. Scout shows that even though she has discovered that people can be evil in unfathomable ways she still unfolds her faith in humankind and can face anything with courage. Unlike Dill, she finds that the real world does follow patterns, and once one knows when, the world of fantasy and books is the only place where real fear can exist. Such ambivalent state of mind is not only seen in Maycomb but in Dill also.

Of course in Alabama of race could not be dismissed. Innocent and guilty Tom Robinson had to pay the price for allowing himself to get an unfavorable predicament. But neither could class or gender be overlooked. As surely as Tom had to be convinced, Mayella Ewell again innocent or guilty, had to be disgraced.

Another example of where Jem and Scout show their attribute of empathy is with the character of Mrs. Dubose. Mrs. Dubose is an old lady who is addicted to morphine with a habit she thoughts of Atticus public, in front of Jem and Scout. In a burst of rage Jem gets angry and smashes her flowers; which he then has to repay, by reading to her; and Scout decides to tag along for moral support. About 1 month after

they complete their reading duties, Mrs. Dubose dies and the children feels empathy and some sympathy. Although all the characters are sympathetic and the novel exposes racism as abhorrent and white racists as ludicrous and hypocritical *To Kill a Mockingbird*, like *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, has frequently challenged by African parents chiefly because it contains racial slurs where creoled children live in ambivalent position. .

This book is not only banned or objected by white people but also by black people as well. White people banned because it asks some questions about authority while African-Americans banned the book because it uses the word nigger. This book is an ambivalent experience for many critics as well as organizations. Some people says this book is immoral but on the contrary other stake us as the voice of the contemporary society. So it should not be banned.

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 people even out of the boundary and failed to acknowledge the African Americans' contribution. Harper Lee describes how the new themes become possible in the new world through her book *To Kill a Mockingbird*. The exploration of ethics and morality and the consequence of power are possible only in the presence of black shadow. Self-contradictory nature of Africans' features of self, proves that "[w]hitenedness, alone, is mute, meaningless, unfathomable, pointless, frozen, veiled, curtained, dreaded, senseless, implacable" (59). It is the center that guides intellectual scholarship in America.

Concluding, the culture of America is a projection of hierarchy of whiteness and blackness. This hierarchy has never been broken though many efforts have been

done. 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 products of the imagination which in turn is the product of racial hierarchy. One who does not know the history of American cultural racism and pays no attention to the tropes of darkness, sexuality, desire and class problem, s/he will lose the real study of racism in America. Racism as a content of literature is so powerful that one who discards it is also profoundly included. Thus the history of English literature is itself a study of racism which is in ambivalent position now because of the hybrid culture.

IV. Conclusion

The exploration of this thesis is racial ambivalent relationship between the whites and blacks in American society. Foregrounded against the background of the brutal social discrimination of the whites during 1930s in southern part of America, Harper Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird* is a true representation of racial ambivalence which is pervasive in the American society that really exists and gets fictionally depicted in the novel. The entire novel is about unfairness inherent in the fair skin of the white people. But the most prominent is the case in which the reader can be aware of the racial ambivalence between blacks and whites. The protagonist of the novel Atticus Finch, though he is white, tries to defend a black boy Tom Robinson who faces in charge of attempted rape of white woman.

Tom's being falsely charged of rape is an extreme case of white prejudice against the black. Living in Maycomb, a small southern town that is haunted by the spectra of racism towards black, Tom is certainly surrounded by racial prejudices of the white people. With the rumor of his attempted rape, the whole white community turns hostile to him. He is forced to face the trial of which the only and certain verdict will be death sentence because jurisdiction too is white dominated. In such a situation, Atticus Finch carried out the responsibilities to advocate Tom's innocence before the jury. He overlooks the fairness of the skin and maintains the fairness of heart that binds all the human beings into hope, love and harmony. In other words, the forces that lead him to advocate on behalf of Tom are humanitarian, or stemming from the belief system that humanity includes black people, as well not only whites.

Atticus has built a whole value system around the idea that a human being should be treated like a human being. This is the main force behind his commitment to save Tom despite he earns hatred from his own community. When other white

people tend to forget the black's living in their vicinity, Atticus spends much of his time to understand them. Racism in the town of Maycomb has become a cultural phenomenon. But Atticus goes against culture, this act is seen as a step against the social more of most people. It is to overlook and contradict the honor of a white woman.

Not only Atticus has to face the problems but also his children too face the problem because of his decision to defend Tom. But like him his children mature into people learning how to look into a person's soul and sidelining race and social status. The children realize and humanize the otherwise dehumanized black people, where other community members look down upon the colored people as animals. In their exemplary activities, especially of scout and Atticus, one can experience love of human being toward fellow human being that flouts the boundaries created along the racial, communal our color lines.

Conclusively, the supremacist racial ideology that divides human kind --white and black-- is the cause of un-healthy social structure. Racism as set of beliefs and ideas that advocates the superiority of whites is disseminated among the mass through the social organizations, institutions or state forces creating certain structure in the society that always stood in favor of the groups that grasped the social, political and economical position. Racist ideology is related to the discrimination, prejudice and stereotypes that bring injustice, violence and conflict among racial groups due to the globalization and glo-cal culture the relation between white and black is ambivalent.

Works Cited

- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Mapping Ideology*.
Ed. Slavoz Zizek. London: Verso, 1999. 100-38.
- Andrew, Bennett and Nicholas Royle. *Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory*.
London: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Race." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank
Lentricchia and Thomas Mclaughlin. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 274-87.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post –Colonial
Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Banton, Michael. "The Racializing of the World." *Racism*. Eds. Martin Bulmer and
John Solomos. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 45-49.
- Bhaba, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- . *Ambivalence*. New York: Papastergiadis, 1996.
- Bulmer, Martin and John Solomos, eds. *Racism*. New York: Oxford University press,
1999.
- Champion, Laurie. "Lee's *To Kill a Mockingbird*." 22 Sept, 2002:14 Mar. 14-32.
2006<<http://www.search.epinet.com>>
- Dijk, Van Teun A. *Ideology*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1998
- DuBois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folks*. New York: Bantam Books, 1993.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. New York: Verso, 1998.
- Gilroy, Paul. "The Whisper Wakes, The Shudder Plays: 'Race', Nation and Ethnic
Absoltism." *Contemporary Post- Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Padmini
Mongia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. 246-63.
- Goldberg, David. "The Semantics of Race." *Racism*. Eds. Martin Bulmer and Joan
Solomos. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 362-77.

- Guillaumin, Colette. "The Changing Face of Race." *Racism*. Eds. Martin Bulmer and Joahn Solomos. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 355-62.
- Hawk, Roger Echo and Larry J. Zimmerman. "Beyond Racism." *American Indian Quarterly* 30.4 (Summer 2006): 461-64.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Oxford University Pres, 2000.
- Hins, Elizabeth Jane Wall. "The Spirit of Trade: Olaudah Equiano's Conversion, Legalism, and the Merchant's life." *African American Review* 32.4. (Winter 1998): 635-45.
- Kavanagh, James H. "Ideology." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas Mcclaughlin. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1990. 306-20.
- Miles, Robert. "Racism as a concept." *Racism*. Eds Martin Bulmer and John Solomos. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999. 344-55.
- Philipsen, Dirk. "Investment, Obsession, and Denial: The Ideology of Race in the American Mind." *The Journal of Negro Education* 72.2 (Spring 2003): 193-98.
- Plasa, Corl. *Textual Politics from Slavery to Post Colonialism*. London: Macmillan Press, 2000
- Roden, Donald F. *Harper Lee's To Kill a Mockingbird*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1965.
- Sailllant, John. "An African's Life: The life and Times of Olaudah Equiano, 1745-1799." *African American Review* 35.4 (Winter 2001): 662-64.