

**TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY**

**Nightmarish Living Condition of Oppressed Minority in Mulk Raj Anand's  
*Untouchable***

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts in English**

**By  
Anil Neupane**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**July 2007**

**Tribhuvan University**  
**Faculty of Humanities and Social Science**

This thesis entitled "**Nightmarish Living Condition of Oppressed Minority in Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable***" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by **Anil Neupane** has been approved by the undersigned members of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee

Internal Examiner

External Examiner

Head

Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Acknowledgements**

At the very outset, I'd like to express deep sense of indebtedness and sincere gratitude to my thesis guide Mr. Sarad Chandra Thakur who has been the constant source of inspiration in the completion of this research. It was his scholarly guidance and instructions that made this project a reality.

Similarly, I'm grateful to the Head of the Central Department of English, Dr. Krishna Chandra Shrama for his genuine counseling. I'm also thankful to my teachers Prof. Dr. Shredhar Lohani, Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi, Dr. Sanjeev Uprety, Dr. Arun Gupto, Dr. Sangeeta Rayamajhi, Dr. Shreedhar Gautam, Dr. Beerendra Pandey, Mr. Nagendra Bhattarai, Mr. Devi Gautam, who were kind enough to provide me the great help in the completion of this research work.

Likewise, I can't help thanking my boon companions Tek Bahadur Chhetry, Narayan Ghimire, Dipak Adhikari, Bishnu Prasad Regmi and Ram Saran Yadav for their remarkable contributions in digging out the necessary materials. Also, I'd like to thank Narayan and Deepak Basnet for their computer service supplied with typing, editing and printing as I wanted.

Last but not the least, I'm always grateful to my parents and my beloved Anusha and Anik who have invested a lot of efforts to turn it into reality.

Anil Neupane

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

2007

### **Abstract**

*Untouchable* by Mulk Raj Anand depicts class system as a great social problem which creates fragmentation in the society. Because of the class system sense of humanity is lost in the human world. So-called upper class people exploit the lower class people in the name of religion. Lower class people do not get opportunity to join school, to enter the temple, and touch the wells. This is the exploitation to the lower class people by the higher class people. This exploitation certainly shatters the idea of a harmonious society and society cannot run smoothly.

Hence, humiliated by caste system in society, Bakha nurtures the ambition of living like upper class people but fails flat when he's disillusioned by the element of oppression in Gandhi's assertion of equal space in Hinduism.

## Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

### **I. Introduction 1**

Critical Review of the Literature 9

### **II. Theoretical Discussion 13**

Marxism 13

Karl Marx 15

George Lukacs 18

Raymond Williams 20

Theodore Adorno 22

Leon Trotsky 23

Walter Benjamin 24

### **III. Textual Analysis 26**

### **IV. Conclusion 46**

**Works Cited 49**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Of all the Indian novelists writing in English, Mulk Raj Anand is regarded as the most distinguished social realist. He was born in Peshawar of India on December 12, 1905. His father, Lal Chand, was a coppersmith in Amritsar but later joined the British Indian Army. Anand always enjoyed the company of his father and moved with him wherever the latter's regiment was transferred. His mother Ishwar Kaur came from peasant family. They had five sons of whom four survived, Mulk Raj Anand himself being the third. He studied at Khalsa College in Amritsar. In 1925, he went to London on a scholarship to obtain a doctorate degree. In 1933, he returned to India and studied ancient monuments. He lived in Sabarmati Ashram with Mahatma Gandhi and wrote the first draft of *Untouchable*.

His first novel *Untouchable* depicted the lives of poorer caste in traditional Indian society. His writing goes into the very depth of the social system and issues. As a contribution to Indian novels, he has brought social questions rather than romance and pleasure. He is concerned with the suffering, misery and exploitation of common people.

The text *Untouchable* will be studied as the protest of outcaste people against the Hindu caste system that finally has brought the problem of class discrimination in the society. The will to revolt and sheer impossibility of successfully doing so under the circumstances constitute the basic tensions in the novel. The hero is simultaneously a rebel and a victim of untouchability which is deeply rooted in the Indian society. Though the hero, Bakha, wants to free himself from the chain of untouchability, he has been victim of the so-called high class people. So, the novel deals with a realistic portrayal of Indian social problems that lie under the evils of

caste system as well that is deeply rooted in the mind of the higher caste people to dominate or suppress the lower caste people.

*Untouchable* focuses on the problematic disease of class category which undergoes in the Indian society. The hero of the novel has been dominated by the illogical behaviour of the so-called higher class people.

This research attempts to deal with the cause of social injustice, corruption of humanity, and the loss of self identity of lower class in Indian society. The injustice is done because of the feeling of superiority by the so-called higher class people, but if we observe it very minutely, there is not good reason as such for dominating the lower class people.

Different critics have their own explanations towards the novel *Untouchable*. Ambuj Kumar Sharma focuses on social exploitation as follows:

Such segregation accompanied by miserable living conditions and physically injurious to the sweepers becomes mentally and emotionally hurtful as well when they come into social contact with the people of higher castes. (29)

In *Untouchable* Mulk Raj Anand claims that economic status is more crucial than the religion-based social status for the exploitation. Money decides the people's status like, the poor and the rich and it decides the caste and class too. So, money is important thing to decide the high and low class in the Indian society. Saroj Cowasjee puts it as " Money is the great God, in novel after novel. Anand repeats that there are two types of people, . . . the rich and poor. In the final analysis, money decides both caste and class" (137).

Sexual exploitation is also a part of social exploitation of the higher class people. They sexually exploit the lower class people. Ambuj Kumar Sharma expresses:

To satisfy his lust Pundit Kali Nath in *Untouchable* takes advantage of the lower social position of Sohini and holds her by breasts in the laboratory. He succeeds in getting away with all the mischief because of the girls' very low social position. When she screams, he comes out shouting that he has been defiled and far from being beaten receives the sympathy of the crowd of worshippers in the temple. (56)

Some critics argue that poverty is to dominate the lower class people. Iyenger says, "The problem of caste and poverty squalor and backwardness, ignorance and superstition admits of no easy solution" (338).

Caste system creates classes in society. It creates discrimination which makes evil in society. K.R. Srinivasa Iyenger also has a similar views "In *untouchable* the evil is isolated as caste" (341).

Anand points out human rights and conditions. He wants to fight against anti-human and anti-social conditions. He says, "We are human beings and not soulless machines" (Anand 226). He explains that human being should live with human rights. We must do work but we should not work as machines. Thus, Mulk Raj Anand presents the painful condition of poor people and is akin to Marx in condemnation of their exploitation by the rich. As Cowasjee writes, "One must not lose right of close relationship between Marxism and humanism in Anand's mind, a relationship that is better evident in his works" (15). Marx was always in favour of lower class people who were employees. Economic factors are the root cause of exploitation. This is mere attempt to trace these concepts in Anand's novels. Basically he focuses on exploitation of human beings. Humanism may be regarded as Anand's very religion.



Different critics have demonstrated different views towards *Untouchable*. They have emphasized social discrimination, exploitation, sexual exploitation, caste system, etc. Similarly, some critics have read the novel as oppression. They haven't discussed in detail. So it is relevant to make a research about oppression from Marxist perspective.

### **Critical Review of the Literature**

Anand's *Untouchable*, besides various themes, exposes the themes of oppression. Since the date of its publication in 1935, it has been viewed from different perspectives and there are critical texts that have analyzed Anand from various critical canons of literature.

There are some critics who take the thematic approach. Ambuj Kumar Sharma writes in *The Theme of Exploitation* in the novel of Mulk Raj Anand:

The caste Hindu is armed with the feeling of six thousand years of social and class superiority . . . a feeling which refuses to accept the fact that the Untouchable in a human being, but insists on treating him like a subhuman creature, to be ignored or bullied or exploited as occasion on demands. (36)

Another critic Sastry, Shri M.V.R. Kancha Illaiah's "*Why I am Not a Hindu?*" realizes that the removal of the caste system is not an easy task to continue the struggle in needed to remove it. He states:

Casteism is the major evil affecting all religious communities in India. This evil must be fought continuously till it disappears form the Indian society. Caste based on discrimination against Harijans (Scheduled castes) and Vanavasis (tribals) has been mitigated to a great extent in

the last few decades through legislation, social and religious reforms education, affirmative actions, industrialization and urbanization. (37)

E.M. Forster has tried to depict Anand as an autobiographical novelist. In his preface to *Untouchable*, he writes:

But as a child he played with the children of the sweepers attached to an Indian regiment, he grew to be fond of them, and to understand a tragedy, which he did not share. He has just the right mixture of insight and detachment, and the fact that he has come to fiction through philosophy has given him depth. (VII)

*Untouchable* is the reflection of social evil of contemporary Indian society. It depicts the picture of evil society, practices of the caste system. *Untouchable* has become the classic of Indian English fiction and is instrumental to respectability and serious critical attention. Bakha, the protagonist of the novel, represents the problem of untouchability as:

At such moments he appears, we are told, a 'specimen of humanity' is his fine form rising as a tiger boy. But he is a tiger in a cage, securely imprisoned by the conventions of his superiors who have built up to protect themselves against the fury of those whom they exploit. The instinctive anger gives way, and the slave in him asserts itself.

(Cawasjee 52)

Anand wrote these novels not only to register his protest at certain practices of the Indian social system but also to raise some fundamental questions regarding human dignity and here Anand transcends topical, temporal and spatial determinism and succeeds in striking. A close study of his novel, however, reveals that the tone of protest and treatment there in Anand's novels has undergone noticeable changes

denoting a change of outlook on the part of the novelist. Srinivasa Iyenger focuses on the issue of realities on *Untouchable*, social protest of the Untouchable and different theoretical perspectives as follows:

*Untouchable* strikes us the picture of a place of a society, and of certain persons not easily to be forgotten, a picture that is also an indictment of the evils of a decadent and perverted orthodoxy. As a novelist addressing himself to the tasks of exposing certain evils, Ananda has been very effective in himself. (339)

The class system has become complicated. With much more castes and sub-castes there are more class discriminations in the society. Legally the government has prohibited the practice of caste system but it has a policy of affirmative discrimination of the backward classes. This division now adds two further propositions which distinguish the Indian castes as follows:

The system of caste, based on the division of labour in its earliest days, degenerated later on into a system in which the Brahamins, the Kshetriyas and the Vaishayas looked down upon the lower castes and did not like even to touch the sweeper or to be touched by them. (Sharma 28)

These lines show the division of society in the name of caste. It is the means of exploitation of the lower classes. This is only becoming the cause of division of society between touchable and untouchable people. It is based on the division of labour. Gradually, it becomes cruel means to exploit the low class people.

The untouchability featured in the caste is one of the cruelest features of the class discrimination. It is the strongest racist phenomenon in the world. In Indian society, people, who work in ignominious, polluting and unclean occupations, are

seen as polluting people, and therefore, considered untouchable. The untouchables have almost no rights in the society. There cannot be contact between an untouchable and a member of the high caste. High caste people become defiled and have to wash themselves with water to be purified in strict societies. Especially some religious ceremonies are arranged to purify themselves from that pollution. If lower class people enter the house and touches things of the upper class people, they latter will wash or clean the things or places where they touch in step.

Among the four chapters, the first chapter is a general introduction to the area of this study and the whole direction this study is going to take. In order to provide the cause of disintegration which breaks the familial as well as societal harmony and unity, the second chapter outlines in brief, the Marxist perspective of the society. This study is based on the assumption that Indian society in *Untouchable* is frustrated, alienated, disintegrated by practising capitalistic values. In further studies the failure of capitalistic way of life by breaking harmonious society. The third chapter is oriented towards close reading of the text from Marxist perspective. The final chapter illustrates the finding of this research in brief.

## II. THEORETICAL DISCUSSION

### Marxism

To elaborate the society and literature there must be wide discussion on Marxism. To support the novel, some of the Marxists and their notions are discussed below. Marxism is theoretical discourse which is defined by different scholars in different ways. There is hardly a homogeneity, among the Marxists themselves. As other literary theories challenge the outside, so is Marxism.

The credit of developing Marxism goes to Karl Marx. Economic and political philosophy named for Karl Marx. It is also known as scientific socialism. Marxism had had a profound impact on contemporary culture; modern communism is based on it, and most modern socialist theories derive from it. It has also had tremendous effect on academia, influencing disciplines from economics to philosophy and literary history.

Although no treatise by Marx and his coworker Friedrich Engels covers all aspects of Marxism, *The Communist Manifesto* suggests many of its premises, and the monumental *Das Capital* develops many of them most rigorously. Many elements of the Marxist system were drawn from earlier economic and historical thought, notably that of Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, the Comte de Saint-Simon, J.C.L. de Sismondi, David Ricardo, Charles Fourier, and Louis Blanc; but Marxist analysis as fully developed by Marx and Engels was unquestionably original. The Marxist philosophical method, is dialectical materialism, a reversal of the dialectical idealism of Hegel. Dialectical materialism presumes the primacy of economic determinants in history. Through dialectical materialism was developed the fundamental Marxist premise that the history of society is the inexorable "History of class struggle." According to this premise, a specific class could rule only so long as it best

represented the economically productive forces of society; when it became outmoded it would be destroyed and replaced. From this continuing dynamic process a classless society would eventually emerge. In modern capitalist society, the bourgeois class had destroyed and replaced the unproductive feudal nobility and had performed the economically creative task of establishing the new industrial order. The stage was thus set for the final struggle between the bourgeoisie, which had completed its historic role, and the proletariat, composed of the industrial workers, or makers of goods, which had become the true productive class.

Economic and political theories supporting Marxism's historical premises are its economic theories. Of central importance are the labour theory of value and the idea of surplus value. Marxism supposes that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount labour required for manufacture. The value of the commodities purchasable by the worker's wages is less than the value of the commodities he produces; the difference, called surplus value, represents the profit of the capitalist. Thus the bourgeois class has flourished through exploitation of the proletariat. The capitalist system and the bourgeoisie were seen as riven with weaknesses and contradictions, which would become increasingly severe as industrialization progresses and would manifest themselves in increasingly severe economic crises. According to the *Communist Manifesto*, it would be in a highly industrialized nation, where the crises of capitalism and the consciousness of the workers were far advanced, that the proletarians' overthrow of bourgeois society would first succeed. Although this process was inevitable, Marxists were to speed it up by bringing about the international union of workers, by supporting (for expediency) whatever political party favored "The momentary interests of the working class," and by helping to prepare workers for their revolutionary role.

The proletariat, after becoming the ruling class, was "to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state" and to increase productive forces at a rapid rate. Once the bourgeoisie had been defeated, there would be no more class divisions, since the means of production would not be owned by any group. The coercive state, formerly a weapon of class oppression, would be replaced by a rational structure economic and social cooperation and integration. Such bourgeois institutions as the family and religion, which had served to perpetuate bourgeois dominance, would vanish, and each individual would find true fulfillment. Thus social and economic utopia would be achieved, although its exact form could not be predicted.

### **Karl Marx**

Karl Marx, a German philosopher, revolutionary, sociologist, historian and economist, and his mate Friedrich Engels both announced the advent of communism in their jointly written *Communist Manifesto* in 1848, the most celebrated pamphlet in the history of the socialist movement. Marx's major works: *Das Capital* and *The German Ideology* also depict social structures and values.

Marx reverses the Hegelian notion of 'world spirit' as the controlling force of history and postulates the notion that economic forces control the entire framework of any society. Marx takes it as a base and defines laws, literature, education system, etc. as superstructure.

Jostein Gaarder writes, "[. . .] the way a 'society thinks, what kind of political institution there are, which laws it has and, not least, what there is of religion, morals art, philosophy, and science, Marx called it society's superstructure" (393).

Superstructure is determined by the base structure. Society's superstructure is in fact a reflection of the bases of the society. There is dialectical relationship between base and superstructure. Base structure consists of three levels. According to Marx,

condition (mode) of production consists of natural conditions, resources that are available in society which is the foundation of any society. This foundation clearly determines type of production in the society. Means (forces) of production consists of various kinds of equipment, tools and machinery as well as raw materials to be found there and the last one is production relations: the division of labour and the distribution of work and ownership.

Marx did not believe in natural right that was eternally valid because it is a product of the base of society. Society's ruling class sets the norms for what is right and wrong. Marx says "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle" (*The Communist Manifesto*, 14). History is particularly a matter of who is to own the means of production.

Marx's *Das Capital* was published in 1867. In the life span of Marx, he was not so popular but after his death his ideas became very popular as Vladimir Lenin became a disciple of Marx and got victory over Russian Revolution in 1917. He implemented raw theory propounded by Karl Marx. Its success encouraged and necessitated to revolutionize every aspect of social life to continue to journey towards complete socialism. They hoped literature and art could play influential role to develop human understanding and spread socialism. The communist rulers like V.I. Lelin, Stalin and Trotsky interpreted literature through Marxist perspective.

Lenin established Marx to the forefront of world thought. In *German Ideology*, Marx says, "Life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (625). The economic condition of people determines how they develop language, law, politics, religion and even art. Marx says:

Men are the producer of their conceptions and ideas. The real, active men are conditioned by development of their productive forces and of



the intercourse up to the furthest forms. Consciousness can never be anything else than consciousness existence, and the existence of men is their actual life process. (625)

Like Hegel's dialectics, Karl Marx's dialectical materialism is not static since it conveys that the relation of base and superstructure changes in course of time. The more capitalism tries to go ahead, the more it loses rational control over itself. In order to develop more, capitalism enlarges its exploitation over the working class, which brings alienation in them. Undoubtedly, the commonality of the problem of working class unites them to struggle against the capitalistic system. In capitalistic system, the working class people's condition is like this as Marx describes in *The Communist Manifesto*: "Not only are they the places of the bourgeois class and bourgeoisie static, they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machines, by the overlooker and above all by the individual bourgeoisie manufacturer himself" (26).

In the capitalistic society, there is a vast difference between the haves and have nots. Though capitalist system has administration, landlord, armies, clergymen, they cannot stop the class struggle. Marx says: 'But every class struggle is a political struggle' (27). The concept of class struggle is very radical as Marx says:

The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and to fortify, their missions to destroy all previous securities for and insurance of individual property. (28)

Marx believes that working class gets victory over the capitalistic system. He views that bourgeois art only focuses on capitalism that can't depict what a society really is.

Art should reach the depth of society where proletariats are struggling for their livelihood. So, he says that there is clash between bourgeoisie and proletarians' class.

### **George Lukacs**

George Lukacs (1885-1971) is one of the most significant and influential Marxist literary critics of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He was attracted to revolutionary activities from his early life. While he was a student, he joined a student's club named 'Revolutionary Socialist Students of Budapest' which inaugurated his life long Marxist political and intellectual career. He joined the Hungarian Communist Party in 1918, and, although imprisoned, exiled and expelled at various times, he remained loyal to the party. His most influential philosophical contribution argued for a Hegelian Marxist approach to class consciousness, alienation and reflection. His work differentiates the form and content of realism and aesthetic objectivity.

*Das Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto* of Karl Marx aroused him an unquenchable thirst of economic and political principles, inspiring him a strong dislike to capitalism and inclination towards communism. His rejection of his father's appeal to continue his business shows Lukacs' strong tendency to involve himself in political and intellectual world.

He defended a conception of realism through Marxist readings of novel from Scott, Balzac and Tolstoy to his time. For him, the greatest artists are those who can capture and create the harmonious totality of life. He believes that their works of art reflect the objective reality of the contemporary time. They expose the economic crisis, exploitation and gender violence through their works. According to him, literature should reflect the society. Though the work of art should reflect the reality, the reflection is not a more photographic. As Hazard Adams quotes here:

The goal for all great art is to provide a picture of reality in which the contradiction between appearance and reality, the particular and the general, the immediate and the conceptual etc, is so resolved that the two coverage into a spontaneous integrity in the direct impression of the work of art and provide a sense of an inseparable integrity. (902)

Lukacs does not like the works of modern writers like, Kafka, Beckett, Joyce, Faulkner, etc. These modern writers only focus on the individual psyche. He attacks on the stream of consciousness technique of the writers who pay different geographical details but that does not give reality. Lukacs, as a Marxist, believes in content. He says, "Content determines form. But there is no content of which man himself is not the focal point." He brings Aristotelian dictum: "Man is *Zoo Politikon*", a social animal. The Aristotelian dictum is applicable to all great realistic literature. For Aristotle, man is social and political animal who has socio-political and socio-economic background. He further says, "Man, for these writers is by nature solitary, a social, unable to enter into relationship with other human beings" (293).

Modernists want to emphasize form over content therefore they are anti-realist. Lukacs says that content is man so man should be the "focal point." Aristotle's definition of man as a socio-political should be realized, otherwise it wouldn't be justice, so everyman has his context. This context should be the content of literature that is reality. But modernists give space to man without his background. Therefore, modernists are anti-realist.

Lukacs criticizes Heidegger. For Heidegger, man is hurled into being or man was suddenly thrown into existence. Heidegger says we find ourselves into the network of space and time. Lukacs says Heidegger forgets man's background, his socio-political or socio-economic context. Heidegger forgets all those contexts and

isolates man from the contextual reference. Therefore, Heidegger cannot understand the fact that it is the background which determines person's existence. We are not thrown into being (existence) rather this existence is determined by socio-economic reality. Heidegger, therefore, says Lukacs could not do justice to man for Lukacs.

Lukacs' ideas of reflection has scaled art from Marxist realistic perspective in a radical way. He disagrees Wordsworthan Romantic principle that "The materials of poetry can be found in every subject which can interest the human mind" (Daiches 877) and opines that every interesting thing cannot be subject of art or art itself. Literature must be straightforward in its imitation of immediate truth along with literary characteristics. He does not list literature as a work of art if it does not have a 'touch of reality' no matter whatever the language, style, images, plot, etc. Literature as art belongs to the superstructure as politics, religion and philosophy which are based on socio-economic reality. Therefore, there should be a formal correspondence between the literary work and dialectical reality. Thus through Marxist point of view any art has to have social significance as it is organized in society. For him, the correct form is one that reflects reality in the most objective way. The conflict and contradiction are forms of society and it gets reflected in art. Art must be objective but this objective reality must pass through creative works of artist.

### **Raymond Williams**

Raymond Williams, a leading 20<sup>th</sup> century social and cultural Marxist critic, relates the nature of society and its need to change. He wrote *Culture and Society* (1958) that analyzes the earlier perspectives of society and culture by using various thinkers and shows a new framework for understanding art, society and culture.

He does not believe that literature has digressed from reality and realists have ceased to exist. He has examined various aspects of art and literature in his book *The*

*Long Revolution*. Artists explore the question of authenticity of their creativity by tracing back. The discussion made by their predecessors like how Plato and Aristotle treated art as imitation. All the critical theories existing hitherto are either development, modification or transvaluation of the theories propounded by the classical philosophers. The theories of mimetics have been brought forward to examine the relationship of art with reality.

A prominent endeavour in critical studies is to subvert the distinctions in traditional criticism between "high culture", "high art" and the day-to-day activities we perform in our real life. But he opposes the definition of Mathew Arnold's views about culture. Arnold says culture is trans-historical, universal and it is 'high' and 'low'. On the contrary, Williams says that culture is not universal and it is historical and specific. It is not something like 'high' and 'low' but it is unique and it is located to certain historical situation.

Williams in his work *The Country and the City* (1973) differentiates between the rural and urban lives. Williams is not satisfied with earlier Marxist critics who glorified only rural life but not the city life. They probably dissatisfied with capitalism because they focus only artificial life existed in the city.

According to Williams, the new trend has threatened the old and it is difficult to be glued to the old and neglect the emergence of the new. Williams positively responds the change and observes that "the contemporary novel has both reflected and illuminated the crisis of our society . . ." (Williams 287).

He takes position against other Marxists and says that there is only exploitation in city life and sees rural life free but Williams says that rural life is also exploited and corrupted since the beginning of human civilization. He talks about feudal society when there was conflict between landlord and serf. In this society

agricultural labourers were exploited, their property was looted by landlord. They were treated as working animals and they became propertyless and the labourers for landlord. In the middle ages in the name of religion and theology, the labourers were more exploited. So, was the case in the Renaissance period. He says that when we analyze the history upto now exploitation has not changed only its form has changed.

### **Theodore Adorno**

Adorno (1903-69) is a leading figure of Frankfurt school of German Marxists. He develops his idea that a great work of art or literature manages to present the contradiction between reality and appearance. He is a defender of art against mass culture; he emphasizes culture as a way of finding the expression of the human condition in history. His conception of culture industry saw this split as an irrevocable antagonism within the commodity of capitalism. He was critical of both avant-garde art and the products of the culture industry.

Adorno's *Cultural Criticism and Society* (1955) shows his attitude towards society and literature. For him, society is full of contradictions in which different dialects of different levels exist. He emphasizes that art should show the contradiction of society and dialectical totality. Adorno argues that, Joyce and Beckett make use of the interior monologue to expose reality. The modernists' emphasis on the subject is only an appearance since in reality the social totality exists before the individual. Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer openly denounced the realist theories like Lukac's which take literature as reflection of outside reality.

He observes that it is the negative knowledge for the real world that gives definite value to the works of the modernist writers. Interior monologue or the stream of consciousness as literary technique was criticized by Lukacs. Adorno emphasizes

that "the interior monologue, far from cutting the literary work off from reality, can expose the way reality actually is" (Forgacs 188).

In *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, Horkheimer and Adorno talk about enlightenment which leads towards mass deception. Enlightenment use of 'reason' is used by culture industry for their benefit. This book "has long been seen to have its own dark side: that is the instrumental use of reason to control and dominate rather than to emancipate" (qtd. in "Eighteen Century Studies" by John Bender).

### **Leon Trotsky**

Leon Trotsky is a communist theorist and agitator, a leader in Russia's October Revolution in 1917. He attacked the Russian Formalist School of Criticism and Futurism. Formalists consider literature as use of language and is devoted to the analysis of form. It declared the form as an essence of poetry and analysis of the etymology and syntax of poem. He advocated that any artistic creation is a changing, and transformation of reality in accordance with the peculiar laws of art. According to Trotsky, formalists are victims of the 'superstition' in the world. He says that art should project society, history and environment. It should be influenced by production relation, class and caste. Art should present human kind and folklore. Art teaches society and art enlarges human mind.

Russian formalism is enslaved by form which is everything for them. They think form is autonomous production. But Trotsky says form has long chain of development and the form has relation with society. Formalists are blind supporters of words and they deny the role of development and production relation. They do not accept the fact that art depicts class and caste. Russian formalists reject the social reality.

Similarly, Futurism is also attacked by Trotsky because futurists believe in glorification of machine, war, destruction, future development of science and development of big cities. For them, "the sound of hot iron is more important than the beauty of a girl, they use a lot of images. They only look at the future not the past and present." Trotsky attacks the formalist school of poetry for not realizing social content in art and literature.

### **Walter Benjamin**

Walter Benjamin is a notable German Marxist critic. The originality of his essay lies in his application of the theory of art itself. For him, the revolutionary artist should not uncritically accept the existing forces of artistic production, but should develop and revolutionize those forces. He creates new social relations between artist and audience. The evolutionary artist's task is to develop these new media of camera, radio, photography, musical recording to transform the older modes of artistic production.

He gives his revolutionary idea in his essay *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1933) as:

Traditional works of art, have an aura of uniqueness, privileges, distance and permanence about them; but mechanical reproduction of, say, a painting by replacing this uniqueness with a plurality of copies, destroys that alienating aura and allows the beholders to encounter the work in his own particular place and time. (58)

He says that painting, stamping, photography, lithography, camera, etc. have become the production of capitalism, even in the perfect reproduction, there lacks the originality when the art is reproduced and the art loses the 'aura'. Reproduction affects human perception as well. When human beings desire to get the things closer,



reproduction comes as the best solution. Now the art is exhibited for and from that exhibition capitalist gains lot of money. There is also the exploitation though the art which goes to the common people. Capitalists get upperhand in the production and communicating their ideology and exploit the proletarians.

### III. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

*Untouchable* is the diagnosis of Indian society in which class struggle takes place in the form of caste system. It dramatizes the conflict between lower and higher caste people. People of upper caste enjoy very equipped life style like that of capitalists while untouchable group being in margin are deprived of those privileged condition. They feature condition of proletarians or working class people. The underlying conflict of novel is conflict between two classes in the same society which theories of Marxism observe as a clash of the haves and have nots. Besides, the poverty stricken people, despite the fact of higher caste, are subjected to constant domination which eventually brings class discrimination in the society.

Bakha as a hero of the novel represents the pain and torture, loss of self-identity of poverty stricken people. He reflects the problem of contemporary Indian society. *Untouchable* draws the attention of the society on predicaments faced by outcasted people like Bakha. It also presents the conflicts and contradictions within the Indian caste system that measure the people's rights. The so-called religious orthodoxies are deeply rooted in the mind of the higher class people.

Like most of the Indian writers' dream of a classless society, Ananda also makes his main character's effort to be free from the chain of caste system. Bakha's journey in *Untouchable* is somehow a mission to eliminate the evils of society where untouchables are considered polluted. Bakha is largely disturbed by the nature of the so-called high class Hindus. The Hindu people attack lower class people in the name of ideology like religion and caste. The narrator in *Untouchable* further says:

He was completely unnerved. His eyes were covered with darkness. They could not see anything. His tongue and throat were parched. He wasted to utter a cry. He opened his mouth wide to speak [. . .]. He

tried to rise himself from the awkward attitude of prostration, but his limbs had no strength left in them. (52)

Bakha cannot react immediately because he knows that the priests of temple are in high position. This shows that they are made inferior by the ideologies which are existing in the society.

The novel dramatizes the pitiable condition of lower class people. The narrator says:

The outcaste were not allowed to mount the platform surrounding the well, because of they were ever to draw water from it, the Hindus of the three upper castes would consider the water polluted. Nor were they allowed to access to the near-by brooks as their use of it would contaminate the stream. They had no well of their own because it cost at least a thousand rupees to dig a well [ . . .]. So the outcastes had to wait for chance to bring some caste to the well.

The lower class people are not allowed to reach near the well. If they go there they will be punished by the upper class. Such type of biased attitude shows the pitiable condition of the outcaste people because there is no good distribution of the economy by the government and the so-called higher class people oppress them.

In *Untouchable*, Anand describes the scene of biased situation towards the lower class people. He describes:

He hated suddenly, and facing the shopkeeper with great humility, joined his hands and begged to know where he could put a coin to pay for a packet. Of 'Red-Lamp? The Shopkeeper pointed to a sport on the board near him. Bakha put his anna there. The betel-leaf-seller dashed some water over it with jug with which he sprinkled the betel leaves

and the again. Having thus purified it he picked up the nickel piece and threw it into the counter. Then he flung a packet of 'Red-lamp' cigarettes at Bakha, as a butcher might throw a bone to an insistent dog sniffing round the corner of his shop. (33-34)

This is a way of insulting the lower class people like Bakha.

Similar type of discriminating incident occurs a little ahead in the main street when Bakha stands before a Bengali sweet stall and asks for julebis worth of four annas. Ananda describes:

The confectioner smiled faintly at the crudeness of the sweeper's taste, for jalebis are rather coarse, staff and no one saved a greedy low-caste man would ever by four annas' worth of jalebis. [. . .] he caught the jalebis which the confectioner threw at him like a cricket ball, placed four nickel coins on the shop board for the confectioner's assistant who stood ready to splash some water and walked away embarrassed, yet happy. (37)

Bakha meets such disgusting and humiliating incidents just because he happens to be from the low class family and because of the low of class system which is harsh towards untouchables. Such harsh discrimination is the cruelest thinking by the upper class people. They do not treat lower class people as human beings in general.

Just then a catastrophe takes place. Bakha is walking overwhelmed with joy of having sweets. He forgets to call out "posh, posh, sweeper coming" (46) and accidentally touches high class Hindu, Lallaji. He is very much humiliated in the eyes of the people. So, there is torture to the people of low class. Bakha thinks:

They always abuse me. Because we are sweepers. Because we touch dung. They hate dung. I hate it too. That's why I came here . [. . .] It is

only the Hindus who are not sweepers. For them I am a sweeper, sweeper – untouchable? Untouchable ! Untouchable ! That's why world ! Untouchable ! I am un touchable. (43)

This is how the suppression is going on over the minority people who are devoid of all the unalienable rights. They are always victimized in the society. The oppression is so much bitter that people want to escape from that cruelty but the problem still remains there in the society. This catastrophe of 'touching' proves to be a great turning point in Bakha's life as it brings to him a new realization of his position. And Bakha is careful to announce his movement.

Yet another insult awaits him when he reaches the temple courtyard. He goes near the temple door and catches a glimpse of the dark sanctuary and idols. But in the next moment he is stunned to hear the priest shouting "polluted, polluted" (51). On Bakha's approach to the temple, the worshippers from the steps shout:

The distance, the distance ! A temple can be polluted according to the Holy Books by a low class man coming within sixty-nine years of it, and here he is actually on the steps at the door. We are ruined. We will need to have a sacrificial fire in order to purify ourselves and our shrines. (53)

Temples have become the institutions where priests discriminate the people in the name of religion. So, the religion is an ideology that discriminates people. Karl Marx also views that religion should be cut off from the country that makes people doom in the name of religious orthodoxy. Marx does not believe in religion.

The caste discrimination divides society into two classes: the high class Hindus and the low class untouchables. As mentioned by Matthew Arnold, there are two types of culture 'high culture' and 'low culture' but that culture is blurred by

Marxist critic Raymond Williams. He ruptures the high and low culture. He says that culture is not universal which is historical rather than specific to particular situation.

In *Untouchable* there are two cultures, Bakha represents the low culture and pundit and other Hindus represent high culture. People of low caste are always oppressed by people of privileged class. The novel shows:

But [. . .] shouted the lanky priest historically and never finished his sentence. The crowd on the temple steps believes that he has suffered most terribly and sympathised, for it had seen the sweeper boy such past him. They did not ask about the way he had been polluted. They didn't know the story that Sohini told Bakha at the door of the courtyard with sobs and tears. That man, that man she said, 'that the man made suggestions to me, when I was cleaning the lavatory of his house there. And when I screamed, he came out shouting that he had been defiled. (53)

Nobody would know that a priest can fall into such low behaviour. But more of it, nobody would believe it. Even Lakha, Bakha's father, would not believe it. Lakha could not believe that a priest could seduce a girl who belongs to the low caste family. So, the bourgeois society always treat to the proletariat badly. Because of the power, they always dominated the lower class. This is the tendency of bourgeois class. Bourgeois society does not allow them to take part in the education so, the lower class proletarians only spend their labour without education.

Bakha wants to go to school but he has the problem of hand to mouth. Masters would not teach the outcaste or lower class people. But he is against the view that the outcastes should not study the books. This type of concept is imposed by the high class people for dominating the lower class but Bakha is eager to feel to be

educated and a sudden impulse comes on him to ask the Babu's son to teach him but his dream of learning the books is in vain because of the poverty. Babu and Bakha argue:

'Babu Ji' he said addressing the elder boy, "in what class are you now?"

'In the fifth class' the boy answered.

'Surely now you know enough to teach.'

'Yes', the boy replied.

'Then, do you think it will be too much trouble for you to give me a lesson a day? Seeing the boy hesitate, he added: 'I shall pay you of it'.

[. . .] 'I will pay you an anna per lesson'. The babu's son smiled a hypocritical smile which seemed queer in so young a person. (31)

The lower class people are deprived of education. The government also treats to them badly because the government does not provide any help to the people of minority for uplifting their educational status. Even the teachers do not allow the lower class to enter the classroom. This shows that there is not the good distribution of the means of production by the government.

The high class people think that they are clean and pure in comparison with lower class people. So the high class Hindus always hate the low class people.

Ananda in *Untouchable* perfectly sketches the scene when Bakha happens to touch Hindu in the market place:

'Keep to the side of the road. You, low caste Vermin ?' he suddenly heard someone shouting at him. 'Why don't you call, you swine, and announce your approach! Do you know you have touched me and defiled me, you cooked son of low-legged scorpion ! Now I will have to and take a bath to purify myself. And it was a new dhoti and shirt I put

on this morning !' [. . .]. 'You swine, you dog, why don't you shout and warn me of your approach !' He shouted as he met. (38)

The low class people have the routine to endure such rebukes but when there is excess of oppression, there will be sudden blow of volcano to defend that oppression.

In the backdrop of history there is the domination to the minority by the high class people. The narrator in *Untouchable* opines:

The temple seemed to advance towards like a monster and to envelope him. He hesitated for a while. Then his will strengthened. With a sudden onslaught had captured five steps of the fifteen that lead to the door of temple, his heart drumming fiercely in the chest [. . .]. The force of another impulse take a step or two further up. Here, he was almost thrown out of equilibrium by an accidental knock in his knee and stood threatened with a fall. But he climbed the steps herd and recovering his balance, rushed headlong to the top step. From here, as he lay, he could peer through with his head raised above the marble threshold, lowered by the rubbings of the heads of the devout, and affording a glimpse, just a glimpse, of the sanctuary which had so far been a secret a hidden mystery to him. (45)

Hence, the hero, Bakha has revolted the system of higher class people. Actually the lower class people are not allowed to visit the temple but hero has challenged to go there, this shows that he has the rebellious tendency toward the so-called higher class people.

Bakkha is filled with anger by the suppression done by higher class people. He challenges the men who misbehave his sister. He says 'I could show you what that



Brahmin dog has done !' (54). The feeling of anger is mounting up towards the superior class Brahmins. The narrator says:

He felt he could kill them all. He looked ruthless, a deadly pale and livid with anger and rage. [. . .] A young rustic had teased a friend's sister as she was coming home through the fields after collecting fuel. Her brother had gone straight to the fields with an axe in his hand and murdered the fellow. 'Such an insult !' he thought. 'That he should attack a young and innocent girl. And then the hypocrist of it ! This man, a Brahmin, he lies and accuses me of polluting him, after-father of fathers, I hope he didn't violate my sister.' (54)

There has been the tendency of discrimination from his ancestors. This type of neglecting behaviour of the higher class has not been endured by the hero, Bakha. He has shown the revolutionary attitude towards the bourgeois tendency. The bourgeoisie tendency of discrimination is not bearable so he wants to kill the man because of the cruelest behaviour by the higher class.

In the novel, Bakha wants to change his profession because there is no freedom; wherever he goes he finds hatred. There must be the emancipation to the human beings but the hero is entangled with the chain of hatred. To be free from the chain of entangle, he wants to change the profession, "He came of peasant stock, his ancestors having come down in the social scale by their change of profession. The blood of his peasant ancestors, free to live their own life even though they may have been slaves" (49).

The more the workers work, the more powerful becomes the object which he creates. In opposition, the worker becomes poorer in his life and less he belongs to himself/herself because the worker puts his life in the object but the object no longer

belongs to himself/herself. So, is happening in the novel. The more the peasant works for the master, the more pitiable condition prevails in the society. When Bakha works for his masters, he falls in more pitiable condition towards his life. The living condition of the lower class people is very pitiable. They have mud houses termed as outcastes' colony. Houses are clustered together in two rows and their boundary is separated. They live with the leather workers, the washermen, the barbers, the water carriers, the grass-cutters and the outcastes from the Hindu society. The situation is full of misery and ugliness. This shows that the living life of lower class people is very pitiable. They have been separated from the light of development.

Bakha is very much shocked by the idea of discrimination by the upper class. So, this discrimination makes him feel hatred towards himself and the society. The narrator says:

His feelings would rise like spurts of smoke of a half-smothered fire, in fitful, unbalanced jerk when the recollection of some abuse or rebuke he had suffered kindled a spark in the ashes of remorse inside him. And in the smoky atmosphere of his mind arose dim ghosts of forms peopling the scene he had been through. [. . .] 'Why was all this?' He asked himself in the soundless speech of cells receiving and transmitting emotions, which was his usual way of communicating with himself. 'Why was all this fuss? Why was I so humble? I could have struck him.' Rebuck and abuse has been the routine for the people like Bakha. Because of the lower class, he has been suppressed by the untouchability. (42)

There is always struggle in the society between the oppressors and the oppressed minority. The oppressed always try to cross the boundaries imposed on them and the oppressors punish them for breaking the rules and laws.

Adorno and Horkheimer's view is that the culture industry and enlightenment lead towards mass deception. The people are condemned to choose whatever culture industry provides for them. Here the people of lower class have been victimized by the oppression of the higher class people. They deceive the people in the name of religion and there is the disintegration between the higher class people and lower class people. The novel reads:

Oh ! you eater of your masters ?. What have you done? You have killed my son. 'She waited, flinging her hands across her breasts and red with fear, give him to me? Give me my child ! You have defiled my house, besides wounding my son? (106).

Bakha shows humanity because the child is injured. He wants to help the injured boy . This is the great humanity to help the injured man but he has been scolded even if he helps the people in the injured time. Helping hands have been defiled in the name of lower class. In this way we can say that Indian society is divided in high class and low class. Because of this division, low class people do not get equal opportunity. They are always exploited by high class people. There is no equal distribution of natural resources. They cannot get equal opportunity as high class people in the society. Shishir Kumar Das states:

These shows the life and the humiliating conditions, under which they crushed these low down trodden victims of the exorable social, economic and political order that existed in the Indian society. Anand is angry going man who cannot tolerate exploitation of one man by

another man, or on one class by another class. He is a sworn enemy to all kinds of exploitation, whether it's social and political. Thus the main evil Anand attack in his various novels is the evil of exploitations of one man, by another man, and of one class by another class. (*A History of English Literature* 49)

Bakha is a child of modern India. The clear-cut styles of European dress had impressed his naïve mind. He sometimes goes to British regimental barracks. He has copied everything done by Tommies. The narrator in the novel observes:

[. . .] when he first went to live at the British regimental barracks with his uncle. He had had glimpses, of the life the Tommies lived, sleeping on strange, low canvas beds covered tightly with blankets, eating eggs, drinking tea and wine in tin mugs, going to parade and their walking down to the bazaar with cigarettes in their mouths and small silver-mounted canes in their hands. And he had soon become possessed with an overwhelming desire to live their life. He had been told they were sahibs, superior people. He had felt that to put on their clothes made one a sahib too. (5)

This shows that he has copied everything but the problem is he could not be a Sahib. This is the imagination to be like Sahib or upper class people. This happens because he could not reach the height of upper class people.

Bakha is humiliated by class discrimination because the upper class always oppressed the lower class people and he nurtures the ambition of living like upper class people by wearing the dress of cap, boots, jackets, but he could not reach the height of upper class because there is the oppressive tendency of upper class people.

Mulk Raj Anand opines:

The white skinned English people belong to a separate class of exploiters. By virtue of their being the member of the ruling class, white men and women had the liberty and the power to exploit Indians, whom they regarded as the subject race. (*Is There a Contemporary Indian Civilization*, 48)

Describing the supposed superiority of the white skinned Britishers, Mulk Raj Ananda writes:

The strange colour of their skins made them more remote giving them the aura of beings of another world, frightening in their policies. And the inhuman steel frame of officialdom which they evolved made them more like the tyrannical demons of hell. (*Is There a Contemporary Indian Civilization*, 49)

Most of the Anand's novels study struggle against injustice and sacrifice. The atmosphere is bound to become dark, gloomy and oppressed. The atmosphere is naturally dark and oppressive to these victims of exploitation. The hero of the novel is quest for identity and meaning in life. Bakha is tortured by the so-called upper class, their main aim is to oppress when they deal with the low class people. Searching for identity, Bakha goes everywhere but he is disillusioned by the rhetoric solution given by different people and institutions.

The Christian missionary, Mahatma Gandhi and the poet Iqbal Nath Sarshar fail to present a prescription for freedom accessible to the untouchable community. Everywhere Bakha goes for the solution of freedom but he never gets freedom because of the ideologies of bourgeois tendency like Christian missionary and Mahatma Gandhi etc. The main purpose of them is to dominate low class people in the society.

Christian Missionary seems to advocate in favor of the untouchable but when we analyze in the heart of the novel, it is just advocating only on behalf of the

bourgeois society or just to illuminate the people of outcaste to influence the Christianity in the name of religion but the solution is not admirable for the lower class like Bakha.

Colonel Hutchinson, chief of the local Salvation Army, wants to influence the people of outcastes. Narrator observes:

But he was mistaken. Colonel Hutchinson, chief of the local salvation army, was never very far from the outcastes colony. To this rather religious wife he always made the excuse that he was going out for a walk in the hill where the kingdom of heaven was waiting to be found, though, actually he went out wallowing in the mire for the sake of Jesus Christ, talking to some untouchable among the rubbish-heaps about divinity and trinity. [. . .] she was barmaid in Cambridge and had developed an aesthetic taste for the gem-like, glistening drops of wine that adorned the hair of Hutchinson's moustache when he had had a drink. She had married him for that India, however, had embittered her for not only did she hate the 'nigger' servants in her house, but she discovered that her husband was too studious for her gay cord-playing, drinking and love making tastes. (111-112)

Hutchinson wants to influence the lower class through his manner but his manner is not good enough. He tries to console Bakha by speaking broken Hindi language and the people like Bakha are easily influenced by such consolation. The narrator says:

Hutchinson, although he remembered that the colonel often visited his father when he (Bakha) was a child. His father, he recalled, also talked of Sahib, sometimes if he saw him in the distance, saying that the old Sahib had wanted to convert them to the religion of Yessuh Messih and

to make them Sahibs like himself. But that he had refused to leave the Hindu fold, saying that the religion which was good enough for his forefathers was good enough for him. (114)

Colonel Hutchinson seems like Sahib but being a Sahib he wants to change the religion of Bakha's family to adopt the Christian religion and make them Sahibs like himself. This is only the snobbery of Hutchinson of change the religion of Bakha's family. Actually Hutchinson has not the great deal of mastery over the Christian religion.

Bakha is very much enthusiastic to colonel Hutchinson because he talks about the mystic god. He sings the song of Jesus Christ. He says:

Life is found in Jesus,  
 Only there 'tis offered thee;  
 Offered without price or money  
 'Tis the gift of God sent free'

Bakha was dumb with amazement, carried away by the confusion, feeling flattered honoured by the invitation which had come from the Sahib. (116)

In the beginning, Bakha is very much eager to know about the Christian religion because he has already faded up with the religion of Hindu which creates the division to the people. He thinks that Christian religion will help him to avoid all the injustices and discriminations. This makes Bakha curious. Colonel Hutchinson advocates the Christian religion which is offered without price. He says that his religion is a gift which is given by the God is pure to diminish all the sorrows and suffering for the sake of human beings. He asked 'who is Jesus?' Colonel says:

He died that we might be forgiven.  
 He died to make us good,  
 That we might go at last to heaven,  
 Saved by His precious blood. (117)

Bakha, therefore, is again inquisitive for questioning about the Jesus Christ. Hutchinson says that he is the son of God. Bakha is not agree with his view, he says that God lives in the sky. How could be a son of God. Colonel says that he died for us we're the sinner. in the earth, we can be purify by his precious blood. He dies for our sake.

All the way of answering by the colonel is very much vague to the hero Bakha. He does not confess his sin towards Hutchinson because he had committed no sins that he remembers. Again he is scolded by colonel's wife. She says, 'I can't keep waiting for you all day while you go messing about with all those dirty bhangis and Chamars' (123).

Bakha is unable to grasps the concept of original sin and he is disillusioned by the idea of Hutchinson wife. He does not like the idea of being called sinner too. Why could he confess his sins that he hadn't committed any sins. He does not want to go to heaven. Talking all the way of heaven is a kind of suppression to the minority people. The only point that peaks his interest is the fact that God regards all people as equal but this is only a response to comfort him from the inequality that he has encountered throughout the day. Therefore, the solution given by the religion is liked bourgeois tendency to solve the problem of Bakha. The dress of colonel as a key symbol of otherness. His caste and national loyalty is also a problematic issue. Hindu religion divided man into two classes. One is high class and other is low. By dividing the man into two groups, it couldn't be able to harmonize the people into one group.



So, the religion either Hindu or Christian religion is not be able to addressing the actual plight of untouchability.

Gandhi's view is also like that of religion. Gandhi never address the actual plight of untouchability. In the beginning, he seems to advocate on behalf of the untouchables. He wants to reborn in the low class family that will help him to know the suffering of them. He says:

I shall not refer to that matter. I shall only speak about the so-called "Untouchables" whom the government tried to alienable from Hinduism by giving them? reponate legal and political states'. [. . . ] I do not want to be reborn. But if I have to be re-born, I should wish to be labour as an untouchable, so I may share their sorrows, sufferings and the affronts leveled at them. (132)

His views to reborn as an untoucbaillity is the snobbery to solve the problem of untouchables. He says:

He loves scavenging in his ashram an eighteen-year old Brahmin is doing scavenger's work in order to teach the ashram scavenger cleanliness [. . .]. He is a regular reader of the Gita and faithfully says his prayers." He felt that he wanted the ashram sweeper to do his work well he must do it himself and set an example. (138)

Whatever Gandhi says is only the bourgeois idea. He does not talk in the good way but it is just the way of handling the untouchables. For him, they should realize that they are cleaning Hindu society. This creates confusion to Bakha on the word of 'cleaning Hindu society' (138). Bakha kfinds no freedom for Gandhi's idea of cleaning Hindu society. Bakha finds oppression for his words. He means to say that lower class will go on scavenging.

Gandhi says that "Untouchable have to purify their lives. They should cultivate the habits of cleanliness so that no one shall point his finger at them. Some of them are addicted to habits of drinking and gambling of which they must get rid" (138).

Gandhi is just blaming to the untouchable. He also says, "Untouchability as the greatest blot on Hinduism" (146) and asserts that it is 'satanic' to assume anyone in Hinduism is born polluted. He says that sweeper in his ashram attempts to show understanding for the sweeper: he feels that if the Brahmin wanted the ashram sweeper to do his work well he must do it himself and set an example. It only undermines the very existence of an untouchable because it assumes that the untouchable is incapable of doing such mental work well. This too confirms an existing hierarchy of power between the untouchable and other high class Hindus because it suggests that the untouchable must be taught. Which is only the cycle of oppression in the society.

Gandhi says that 'dirt' in the untouchables and not their job. It means emancipation by purification but he also says that "May God give you the strength to work out your soul's salvation to the end." He means to, say that the people of low class go on scavenging. So, Gandhi's idea becomes bourgeois idea because it does not address the actual plight of low class people.

Gandhi again proceeds to criticize the untouchables by saying that they have to 'cultivate habits of cleanliness' that they must get rid of their evil habits such as drinking liquor, gambling and eating carrion. This shows that he advocates emancipation by purification. There is also the sense of suppression because the existing system does not allow for the untouchables to become purified primarily because their fundamental existence is rooted in the profession of filth. Bakha says his

father that the high class which thinks that they are mere dirt because they clean their dirt. So, Bakha questions Gandhi's speech. In his speech there is the elements of oppression.

This is how the politician Gandhi cannot address the untouchable outcaste for their unalienable rights. The speech which is delivered is only the glass without tea. So, he could not address the actual plight of untouchability. His speech is only on behalf of the bourgeoisie not to the oppressed people like Bakha.

The last solution given by the poet Iqbal Nath Sarshar is somehow good in comparison to Christian religion and the politician Gandhi but it he focuses and destroying the inequalities in the Indian society. He says:

Well, we must destroy caste, we must destroy the inequalities of birth and unalterable vocations. We must recognize an equality of rights, privileges and opportunities for everyone. The Mahatma didn't say so, but the legal and sociological basis of caste having been broken down by the British-Indian penal code, which recognizes the rights of every man before court, caste is now mainly governed by profession. When the sweepers change their profession, they will no longer remain untouchables. And they can do that soon, for the first thing we will do when we accept the machine which clears dung without anyone having to handle it- the flush system. Then the sweepers can be free from the stigma of untouchability and assume the dignity of status that is their right as useful members of a casteless and classless society. (145-46)

Ananda takes the chance to expressing his own Marxist inclination. The suggestions of destroying caste, inequalities, change profession, using flush system. These solutions prove to be inadequate primarily because they remove the option for

untouchables to take action against their own profession. Somehow his view is of the option of destroying all the things for the sake of untouchable is quite favoured by Ananda. Ananda only skims the surface of its possibilities; introducing the concept in the very last pages of his novel only weakness the poet's arguments because neither the main protagonist nor the reader has enough time to fully conceptualize its implication.

Viewing all the incidents the hero of the novel who is searching for the identity never gets success for achieving the goal of his life. He wants the equality among all the human beings. This novel shows that the oppressed class for it fails to raise the sense of outrage against the existing social system which is responsible for their oppression. All the way of giving solution either by religion or Gandhi looks bourgeoisie in tendency because the Christian religion fails to give the solution. Rather it compels Bakha to confess his sin which in fact he has not committed at all. By the same religion, Hutchinson says God regards all the people as equal but Bakha confronts inequality that throughout the day. In this way, Bakha sees the tendency of perpetual deferral in religion since it makes no attempt to remove the social hierarchy where higher class people were enjoying but the oppressed minority were treated as untouchable in the society. It advocates only inequality but Bakha wants freedom not in heaven but he wants freedom in the earth. So, changing religion is not the permanent solution for the oppressed minority like Bakha. Hence, Hindu religion does not advocat on behalf of the minority.

The solution given by Gandhi seems to be bourgeoisie in tendency because he only emphasizes that untouchables are incapable of doing works well. He advocates emancipation by purification but Hindu society does not allow for the untouchable to become purified. In this sense, it is the oppression towards the minority people. So

his speech is quite oppressive. The solution given by Gandhi senses the smell of oppression. He is not addressing the society's existing norms and values. Rather he blames untouchable groups and, therefore, Bakha faces the perpetual deferral of his problem.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In *Untouchable*, Anand reflects the contemporary Indian society vividly. Every society is a platform where there exists variety of socio-economic classes. All the members of the society do not yield the same nature of their property, structure, earning and opportunities. Sometimes there is conflict regarding the cultural and religious issues. These types of conflicts exist in the society and these form the foundation for class variation.

Bakha, the protagonist of the novel, has been victimized by the so-called higher class people. The class system has become a great challenge in the sense of brotherhood among the people. It has brought the unnecessary division among the people. The lower class people have to face untold suffering in their life. He/she has to face the severe punishment if they break the law made by upper class people.

The discrimination is done due to the religion or the existing class which is prevailing in the society that made the people divided into two parts: one is higher and lower class class. The hero, Bakha, very much undermined by the so-called Brahmin pundit, Kali Nath. When Bakha goes to temple, so-called higher class blames that the temple is polluted by the step of Bakha. It is a kind of oppression towards the people like Bakha.

Class discrimination is the important thing in this novel. When Bakha wants to take cigarettes from the shop, the shopkeeper in angry and flings a packet of 'Red-lamp' cigarettes to him. Same is the case in sweet shop, Bakha wants to take jalebis in the shop but the shopkeeper 'threw the jalebis like cricket ball' because he belongs to the low class.

Lallaji abuses Bakha very much. His sister is subject to discrimination. Pundit Kali Nath molests Sohini and to avoid that discrimination he blames Sohini for

polluting him and most of the people blame Sohini not the pundit, even her father. The untouchables are not allowed to read in the schools and campuses because so-called higher class think that they are superior to lower class people. There is no good distribution of means of production because of the higher class always oppresses to the lower class people. In the name of religion, people of higher class always suppressed the down-trodden people. Because of the discrimination Bakha wants to be like Sahib He feels the lack from all the spheres. So he copied everything from Tommies. He wears cap, jacket, boot, and everything from the Tommies. All happens this because of the class discrimination and there is not the good distribution of means of production to the people.

Gandhi, Christian Missionary and Iqbal Nath Sarshar try to solve the problem of the lower class people. According to Christian religion we are all born sinner we must confess our sin to the God. But Bakha is surprised by the matter of sinner. Bakha never believes that he had committed the sin. Again, Hutchinson compels Bakha to confess sin to him and convert him as Christian but Bakha is puzzled by these ideas. Gandhi, too, wants to solve the problem of untouchability but he blames untouchables that they are Hindu society. This idea of cleaning Hindu society makes confusion to Bakha. Gandhi says that Brahmins do the work for the example to the lower class. He suggests untouchables to get rid of their bad habits like gambling, drinking and other bad things. He gives emphasis on 'emancipation by purification' but this is only to suppressed idea towards untouchables. The solution given by Gandhi is bourgeoisie in tendency which is not useful in the practical life. The poet Iqbal Nath Sarshar's idea of destroying inequalities, caste system and other discrimination are the root cause for the oppression to the low class people. He advocates that a change in profession will free from the untouchable and the way to

achieve this change through the implementation of a flush system. His idea is quite better than Gandhian idea and the orthodox Christian religion.

Marx says that literature is a product of society, its different colours represent various social phenomenon. Literature should reflect the social, economic and political situation of contemporary society. Marxist critics like George Lukacs, Theodor Adorno, Leon Trotsky, Raymond Williams focus upon a close relation between literature and society. Class, status, gender, ideology, economics, etc. are the contents of literature. So literature has to do with society in which different norms, values, customs exist. Furthermore, the study will prove that Mulk Raj Anand analyzes Indian society and provides a critique of it with *Untouchable*.



### Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Noida: Harcourt, 1999.
- Adorno, Theodor. *Cultural Criticism and Society*. England: James Press, 1958.
- Ananda, Mulk Raj. *Is There a Contemporary Indian Civilization?* Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1963.
- - -. *Untouchable*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Bender, John. "Eighteenth-Century Studies." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1992. 79-99.
- Cowasjee, Saroj. *So Many Freedoms: A Study of the Major Fiction of Mulk Raj Ananda*. New Delhi: Oxford, 1977.
- Das, Sisir Kumar. *A History of Indian Literature*: Sahitya Academy, 1995.
- Diaches, David A. *Critical History of English Literature*. Vol. 4. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Limited, 1969.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London and New York: Routledge Classics, 1976.
- Forgacs, David. *Marxist Literary Theory*. Eds. Ann Jefferson and David Robey. London: Bastford Ltd., 1986.
- Forster, E.M. Preface. *Untouchable*. By Mulk Raj Anand. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 201. v-viii.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie's World*. Trans. Paulette Moller. New York: Berkley, 1996.
- Gautam, Shreedhar. *Essays on Nepali, Indian and American Literature*. Lalitpur: Gautam, 2001.
- Held, David. *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. London: Hutchinson, 1980.

- Iyenger, K.R. Srinivas. *Mulk Raj Ananda Indian Writing in English*. Delhi: Asia Publishing House 1973.
- Lukacs, George. "The ideology of Modernism." Ed. Adams, Hazards, and Leony Searle. *Critical Theories Since 1965*. Tallahassee: Florida State UP, 1986.
- Marx, Karl. "The Communist Manifesto." *Creation of Knowledge*. Eds. SPL, RPA and ANS. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar, 1996.
- . "The German Ideology." Ed. Hazard Adams. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. New York: Hartcourt, 1972. 624-28.
- Naik, M.K. *A History of Indian English Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademy, 1997.
- Sastry, Shri M.V.R. "Kancha Illaiah's 'Why I am Not a Hindu?' A Critical Review." 12 March 2007. <<http://voi.org/indology/Ilaiah.html>>
- Sharma, Ambuj Kumar. *The Theme of Exploitation*. Ghaziabad: Vimal Prakashan, 1992.
- Walter, Benjamin. "The Work of an Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." Ed. Adams, Hazards, and Leony Searle. *Critical Theories Since 1965*. Tallahassee: Florida State UP, 1986.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. London: Penguin Book, 1958.
- . "The Country and the City." London; Chatto and Windus 1961. *Marxism and Literature*. Walton Street Oxford-26 DP: Oxford University Press, 1977.