

TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Normalcy as a Social Construct: A Study of Human Relations in Doris Lessing's
The Fifth Child

A Thesis

Submitted to the Central Department of English

In partial fulfillment of the requirement

For the degree of Master of Arts in English

By

Rajendra Prasad Sedain

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

March, 2010

Tribhuvun University
Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences
Central Department of English

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION

This thesis entitled “**Normalcy as a Social Construct: A Study of Human Relation in Doris Lessing’s *The Fifth Child***” by Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sedain has been completed under my supervision. I recommended it for acceptance and examination.

Shankar Subedi

Lecturer

Central Department of English

Kritipur, Kathmandu.

Tribhuvun University

Faculties of Humanities and Social Sciences

Central Department of English

Letter of Approval

This thesis entitled “**Normalcy as a Social Construct: A Study of Human Relations in Doris Lessing’s *The Fifth Child***” submitted to the central Department of English Tribhuvan University by Mr. Rajandra Prashad Sedain has been approved by the under designed members’ of the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

.....

Internal Examiner

.....

.....

.....

External Examiner

.....

.....

.....

Head

Central Department of English

.....

.....

Date:.....

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my respected supervisor Mr. Shankar Subedi who provided me scholarly guidance to develop this thesis. I am very grateful to him who corrected my innumerable mistakes and made possible to develop the thesis into this form.

I express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Krishana Chandra Sharma, Head of the Department, Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, for giving me permission to write this thesis. I am extremely obliged to him for his suggestions.

I would like to thank my father Yogendra Prasad Sedain, my mother and other family members for their notable help.

Lastly, my gratitude goes to those authors and researchers whose works have been consulted in preparation of this thesis. I would thank the staffs of English Department of English T.U., Kirtipur.

Date: March, 2010

Rajendra Prashad Sedain

Abstract

The Fifth Child, a novel by Doris Lessing raises a host of questions about human relation and its societal treatment. The tyranny of the visual in the establishment of normalcy and social power; constructedness of the normal and the deviant, defective, or abnormal; and the gap between professional diagnoses and family realities. This research is concentrated on the attitude of Ben's family and relative's behavior towards him. Ben's activities are always observed through the eyes which are shaped by traditional assumption of normalcy. Harriet behaves with Ben differently, because of the societal norms of normalcy. The brutality of the concept of normalcy and its psychological effect has been presented in this research with reference of Lessing' novel *The Fifth Child*.

The research has been divided into four different chapters. The first chapter is introduction of the thesis and methodology is mentioned in the second chapter. The third chapter is textual analysis in the sub topic normalcy as a social construct: of human relation in novel and forth chapter is conclusion.

Table of Contents

Chapter: I Introduction	1
Chapter: II Constructedness of Normalcy and Disability	9
Chapter: III Constructedness of Normalcy in Doris Lessing <i>The Fifth Child</i>	24
Chapter: IV Conclusion	45
Works Cited	48

I. Introduction

The Fifth Child one of the interesting novels written by Doris Lessing, published in 1988 at the first time in the United Kingdom. From the time of its publication, the novel has come out in discussion of its subject matter which is new and different from the traditional writings. The novel carried out the theme of 19th century assumption of normalcy. In this research, it is tried to analyze how and why Lessing raised the issue of normalcy in her novel, *The Fifth Child*. The novel starts from the event of David and Harriet meeting and ends with the descriptions of Ben's miserable situation. The plot of the novel encircles in the in the Ben's physical and mental condition which is different from ordinary children. Lessing present pitiful condition of Ben and inhuman behavior of David family and relatives behavior toward Ben and justify the whole consequences of the event with reference of the 19th century assumption of the normalcy.

Doris Lessing was born in Persia (now Iran) on October 22, 1919. Both of her parents were British migrant. Her father had been made crippled in World War I, was a clerk in the Imperial Bank of Persia. Her mother had been a nurse. In 1925, her family moved to the British colony in Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) for cultivation corns. At that time Doris's mother adapted to the rough life in the settlement, energetically trying to reproduce what was, in her view, a civilized, Edwardian life among savages; but her father did not, and the thousand-odd acres of bush he had bought failed to yield the promised wealth.

Lessing wrote many novels and stories including *The Fifth Child*. Her fictions are deeply autobiographical, emerging out of her experiences in Africa, drawing upon her childhood memories and her serious engagement with politics and social concerns. Lessing has written about the clash of cultures, the gross injustices of

racial inequality, the struggle among opposing elements within an individual's own personality, and the conflict between the individual conscience and the collective welfare. Her stories and novellas set in Africa, published during the fifties and early sixties, decry the dispossession of black Africans by white colonials, and expose the sterility of the white culture in southern Africa. In 1956, in response to Lessing's courageous outspokenness, she was declared a prohibited alien in both Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.

The novel, *The Fifth Child* describes the changes in the happy life of a married couple, Harriet and David Lovatt, which occur as consequence of the birth of Ben, their fifth child. In this research it is tried to seek the state of abnormality of Ben and the dream construct and reconstruct the assumption of the society which assert in the name of normalcy. The demarcation of able and disable, normality or abnormality and its socio, religious and clinical assumption and discourse are wisely presented in the novel through the character of Ben, the fifth child of Harriet.

In the novel, *The Fifth Child* there found the overtone of feeling of stigmatized identity of Lessing. Lessing's life has been a challenge to her belief that people cannot resist the currents of their time, as she fought against the biological and cultural imperatives that doom her to sink without a murmur into marriage and motherhood.

During the postwar years, Lessing became increasingly disillusioned with the Communist movement, which she left altogether in 1954. By 1949, Lessing had moved to London with her young son. That year, she also published her novel, *The Grass is Singing* (1954), and began her career as a professional writer. In the 1970s and 1980s, Lessing began to explore the quasi-mystical insight through new techniques of writing which helps readers to understand the changing assumption of

the society. *The Golden Notebook* (1980), is her famous novel, help to understand her life and her views toward the changing world.

After publishing the novel, it has generated strong reactions from readers. Matthew C. Roudane is one of them writes, "I have always been fascinated by the legend of little people, gnomes and goblins. And then I read an essay by Loarn which is similar with the Lessing's writing"(2). Some claim that the novel is a political commentary on twentieth-century England. Among them Giles Jeffery is one who clears about the novel and says:

The Fifth Child is never anything more than political document which shows the arrogance of the time which locate the child Ben's behavior in the facts that his mother took during and was tense during an unwanted pregnancy and his father, along with the rest of the family, rejected him from the time he born, exacerbating his drug-induced genetic problems. (33)

The above lines clear the political motives of selecting subject matter of writing novel which always creates a kind of mystic vision toward the society. She presents the life of Ben and satires so called humidity and charity of the European society. The novel directly satire the concept of welfare sates of Britain and primitive brutality of the European people In the same way Kirkus argues:

Ever unpredictable, Lessing now offers a rather cryptic yet uncommonly accessible tale of psycho-social horror: a variation on the classic "'changeling'" formula--here marbled, subtly and disturbingly, with such Lessing themes as apocalyptic doom, the rough dignity of society's outcasts, and the dark underside of human nature. (The five-

novel ""Martha Quest"" series, Lessing readers will remember, is called children of violence. (x)

Regarding this novel fifth child, different critics have different perspective. The one Micheal Pye has expressed his views, “And Ben’s arrival in the family does have terrible consequences. His proper grandparents are ready to put him in an institution, where the death of such freaks is never deliberate or much delayed” (11). Another critic, Trudy Budh has viewed as follow, “Ben receives kindness- even affection from a number of people themselves marginalized by age, poverty or social position, people who recognize his good intension, pity and his loneliness”(1). Except that Lessing herself has announced about her novel *The Fifth Child* is:

I read an essay by Loren Eiseley where he talked of walking up from sea shore in Maine at dusk. He had been walking up from the sea shore somewhere in Maine at dusk. He had been thinking about the ice age, and he looked up and saw a girl. He said he had to himself; there is an ice age girl. He speculated that the gene could have come down through the century. (1)

Similarly another significant writer Sue Tait, has expressed his opinion about novel and says, “Then Harriet becomes pregnant for the fifth time and the dream to crumble [...] He is monster child and the Lovett family becomes his victims (1).

With the above expression, it can be understood that that the family of Lovett has become the victim of monster child. The dream about big family and big house crumbled due to the birth of such child. The traditional thought of Lovett family has led them trouble condition.

Similarly, Linda Simon writes, “In interview after publishing *The Fifth Child* Lessing explained that she never intended Ben to be evil, only misplaced, if he is in

landed up in our somewhat complicated society (2). Lessing's message made it further clear:

There is an invisible line between blessed happiness and self-indulgent over-happiness, and this line is all too easy to cross. There's also the slightest suggestion that the fifth child is not actually intrinsically different from the rest, but rather that the perfect family found itself unable to extend its love to yet another newcomer. (ii)

By analyzing the above criticism upon the novel we can say that the novel is strange, new and mystic in itself which raises the marginalized issue of the European society.

It is clear that the presence of fifth child, Ben brought the disastrous consequence in the family so the family members are not positive towards him and behaves as different creature. They become ready to put him in an institution for death. It is comprehended that marginalized people have portrayed their affection towards him. The people, who have been suffering from financial crisis and social position, have been able to understand his intention, pity and loneliness.

The above extract s clarify that the fifth child, Ben is not evil character, just he has been misplaced. He is not well behaved as he expected in the society. He is known in the society as evil character from another planet.

This critical perspective of male Rubin about Lessing's *The Fifth Child* is any case Ben was seen only through other people's say Even his own mother who rescued him from an institution in defiance of the family wishes, saw him as a, ' throw back' to a more primitive life form"(1). The tendencies of family members towards the fifth child is not seemed very positive according to wish of him. Due to the construction of normalcy in the society, *The Fifth Child* is a fable about a happy family. They have one child and everything is great. They have another and everything is great. Now

they have four wonderful children, but as they prepare to welcome a fifth, several members of the family begin to suffer from unexpected feelings of dread. Indeed, the new baby arrives looking strangely primitive, almost monstrous, and he doesn't seem to be tuned in to the same sense of joy and togetherness that the rest of the family thrives on.

In the "free love" context of the nineteen-sixties, Harriet and David Lovatt are throwbacks to a more conservative, traditional, and family-oriented decade. Their life dream is to have a big house in the country filled with children, and it seems that they will succeed. After bearing four young children, however, Harriet is feeling the strain of years of childbearing, sleeplessness, money trouble, and her parents' and in-laws' disapproval of her fecundity.

Her fifth pregnancy is not only unplanned, but also unusually painful and disruptive. Harriet's doctor prescribes sedatives but finds nothing abnormal in her situation. When Ben is born, Harriet jokes that he is like "a troll or a goblin," but no one responds well to this unusually hairy and physically vigorous baby, who in turn does not respond to anything but his own desires and fears.

As he grows older, family pets and other children seem to be in physical danger. Health care professionals do not confirm the couple's conviction that Ben is not normal, but neither do they obstruct the decision to send Ben to a private institution, a removal that leaves the family temporarily happy until Harriet visits Ben and recognizes the institution for what it is, a place where all manner of "different" children are sent to live heavily medicated, physically restrained, and foreshortened lives away from families who do not want them.

Harriet brings Ben home, where he grows up amid what remains of the Lovatts' domestic fantasy, and finds community in a gang of boys whom Harriet

suspects are involved in various criminal acts. As the story closes, Ben has left home and Harriet imagines him in another country searching the faces in the crowd for another of his own kind.

It is argued that who is most at fault, Harriet, David, or Ben himself, and such debates are highly illuminating not only about how we conceive parental and especially maternal responsibility but also how we conceive the rationing of family and social happiness and whether it should be decided on a Utilitarian or other model. Lessing makes it impossible to establish the objective nature of Ben's difference, and whether we are meant to read him as an archetype, a figure of science fiction an atavism or a product of maternal impressions, a metaphor for the construction of racial, ethnic, or class difference, or a figure of social realism (a mentally disabled, physically atypical, or autistic child; a child with disabilities produced by maternal drug use).

The novel is in some senses a traditional gothic novel, but it tackles a variety of themes encompassing childhood development, the nuclear family, the difficulties of pregnancy, and the treatment of disabled children. The novel's most significant passages play upon universal human fears of the unknown, in the vein of much great horror fiction. Students argue passionately over who is most at fault, Harriet, David, or Ben himself, and such debates are highly illuminating not only about how we conceive parental (and especially maternal) responsibility but also how we conceive the family and social happiness and whether it should be decided on a Utilitarian or other model. Lessing makes it impossible to establish the objective nature of Ben's difference, and whether we are meant to read him as an archetype, a figure of science fiction (an atavism or a product of maternal impressions), a metaphor for the construction of racial, ethnic, or class difference, or a figure of social realism a

mentally disabled, physically atypical, or autistic child; a child with disabilities produced by maternal drug use. Lessing presents the mystic discourse about human behavior about the normalcy and disability.

Finally, Lessing presents the ongoing debate of the normalcy and disability on the perspective of religion, socio cultural, clinical as well as psychological overview which find in the narratives of the novel through the character of Harriet.

II: Constructedness of Normalcy and Disability

Normalcy is a form of life which seems to be normal or common. Common people live in a world of norms which endeavors to be normal or else deliberately tries to avoid that state. It considers what the average person does, thinks, earns, or consumes. Rank, our intelligence, the cholesterol level, our weight, height, sex drive, bodily dimensions among some conceptual line from subnormal to above average. It consumes a minimum daily balance of vitamins and nutrients based on what an average human should consume. Children are ranked in school and tested to determine where they fit into a normal curve of learning, of intelligence. Doctors measure and weight them to see if they are above or below average on the height and weight curves. There is probably no area of contemporary life in which some idea of a norm, mean, or average has not been calculated. In this regard, Lennard J. Devis states:

To understand the disabled body, one must return to the concept of the norm, the normal body. So much of writing about disability has focused on the disabled person as the object of study, just as the study of race has focused on the person of color. But as with recent scholarship on race, which has turned its attention to whiteness, I would like to focus not so much on the construction of disability as on the construction of normalcy. I do this because the “problem” is not the person with disabilities; the problem is the way that normalcy is constructed to create the “problem” of the disabled person. (5)

Normalcy, like pathology, consists of a summation of various parts, that when viewed as a whole indicates that all is as it should be with no exceptions. Normal therefore is often defined as the complete absence of abnormal. In dealing with pathological

process on across- sectional imaging, often encounter cases in which the anatomic imagine appears normal, but the underlying function or metabolism is needed abnormal. Thus normal becomes far more difficult not truly normal, all of its parts must be normal in form, metabolism and function.

To complicated matters even more it is often asked in pediatric imagining research to compare a pathologic population to that is proven to be normal. The normal population is no often referred to as the normal control population and used to assess just how far the pathologic groups have strayed from the fold. The problem in pediatric imagine research, as all that it caught on doubled aged sward.

Normal for an imaging study must take into consideration both minimal clinical as well as imaging criteria. Clinical issues must be resolved for each subject to assure they fit a profile of clinical normalcy that is acceptable based on observation and examination, perhaps by more than one observer. In the case of children, this must include an adequate assessment of childhood development and achievement. In this regard, William S, Bell argues her views in the following manner:

The first assumption recognizes by imaging is to be considered normal if the child is clinically determined to be normal. The second is to accept minimal criteria for normalcy based on imaging corroborated by normal clinical assessment. While these two approaches at first sound similar, there outcome and the way subjects are recruited may be quite different. In the first approach, minor abnormalities revealed by imaging often may be found even if the child is considered clinically normal. (21)

A common assumption would be that some concept of the norm must have always existed. After all, people seem to have an inherent desire to compare themselves to

others. But the ideas of a norm are less a condition of human nature than that it is a feature of a certain kind of society. Recent work on the ancient Greeks, on preindustrial Europe, and on tribal peoples, for example, shows that disability was once regarded very differently from the way it is now. The social process of disabling arrived with industrialization and with the set of practices and discourses that are linked to late eighteenth and nineteenth century notions of nationality, race, gender, criminality, sexual orientation, and so on.

It is one of the first devoted disability studies. But will not be the last. A disability study is a field of study whose time has come. For centuries, people with disabilities have been as oppressed and repressed group. People with disabilities have been isolated, incarcerated, observed, written about, operated on, instructed, implanted, regulated, treated, institutionalized, and controlled to a degree probably unequal to that experienced by any other minority group. As fifteen percent of the population, people with disabilities make up the largest physical minority within the United States. One would never know this to be the case by looking at the literature on minorities and discrimination.

Now impute to recognize the level of oppression both overt and by marginalization, is being organized the by the people with disabilities and other interested parties. The exciting thing about disability studies is that it is both an academic field of inquiry and an area of political activities. The act of assembling a body of knowledge owned by the disability community as opposed to one written about that community by “normal” is part of an ongoing process that includes political actions involving the classroom, the workplace, the courts, the legislature, the media, and so on.

So, this reader appears at the moment that disability, always an actively repressed memento for the fate of the normal body, gains a new, nonmedicalized, and positive legitimacy both as an academic discipline and as an area of political struggle. As with any new discourse, disability studies must claim space in a contested area, trace its continuities and discontinuities, argue for its existence, and justify its assertions.

To do this, the case must be made clear that studies about disability have not had historically the visibility of studies about race, class, or gender for complex as well as simple reasons. The simple reason is the general pervasiveness of discrimination and prejudice against people with disabilities leading to their marginalization as well as the marginalization of the study of disability. Progressives in and out of academia may pride themselves on being sensitive to race or gender, but they have been “ableist” in dealing with the issue of disability. While race, for example, has become in the past twenty years a more than acceptable modality from which to theorize in the classroom and in print, a discourse, a critique, and a political struggle, disability has continued to be relegated to hospital hallways, physical therapy table, and remedial classrooms. The civil rights movement, a long history of discussion of the issues around slavery, the attention demanded by the “problem” of inner cities, and governmental discrimination has created a consciousness among progressives that legitimacies ethnicity as a topic for cultural study. It is possible to have a Henry Louis Gates or a bell hooks in a literature faculty, but it has been virtually impossible to have a person teaching about disability within the humanities. No announcements of jobs in the area of disability studies yet appear in the professional journal of English, history, or philosophy.

The ideology of normalcy is clearly dominant in the law and bioethics of postmodern society. Even among the liberal academics, clinicians, and ethicists associates the assumption is that ethical issue are to be resolved individual and rationality, rather than communality and socially. There is a nod and shrug when it makes the argument offered about the normalcy. It is assumed it must endorse the individual right's to choose for his or her spouse or child, the right of women to abort to maintain her fetus and the right of the person limited by injury or illness to choose his or her own continuance or rapid termination. This requires not simply acknowledging the status of existing law but also endorsing on individuality and right of individual choice. Most of the people shock when he/she seems different from others. In this regard Drosser Mercer states:

No of course I don't endorse that to argue from an ideology of difference that rejects defining a natural, and thus desired, state on the basis of set of physical and cognitive characteristics is to reject choices, I must reject those who argue for the termination of this that life. (3)

The ideology of normalcy is not new in American medical and legal ethics. It is least 100 years old and has been applied across the past century to persons of difference at every stage of development. Here the person of persons with Down syndrome is instructive. In this regard, Chicago physician Dr. Harry J. Haiserlden states, "This perspective cumulated in the famous U.S. supreme court case book of Buck V. Bell (1927) , which legalize the force sterilization of women to prevent the procreation of failure generations of defective"(2).

In the 1980s, medical infanticide of infants born with observable difference, especially Down syndrome, continued as an accepted, if often undisguised, practice. Pineshel (1989) noted that in the 1970s, many children born with typically Down syndrome. Contemporary medicine and mainline bioethics hold the view that any divergence resulting in negative cognitive, physical, or sensory abilities when compared to those of a mundane population norm results in a person who will be necessarily disadvantaged. Such deviations from the norm result in a disability. The medical model of disability refers to the assumption that any such deviation is pathological and any serious deviation is or may be a rationale for medical intervention. The greater the deviation, the more justified is that intervention. That model is itself an outcome, however, of an ideology defining the limited variations permitted in the construction of difference in contemporary society. In this regard, Singer states:

If the difference is sufficiently severe, the person is assumed to be diminished, lessened both existentially and as a member of the social constituency that we share. Deviations from the norm are, therefore, by definition, a harm resulting in suffering to be avoided where possible. In the extreme, severe deviations from the norm result in a life unworthy of continuance, one so devalued as to be disqualified from society's protected "life interest" and its once principled value, the "sanctity of [human] life. (Singer, 1995, p. 1).

This argument results upon an ideological definition of the individual as a discrete, self-reliant, self-conscious person with a store of good at least equal to others' in society. To be disabled is to have a lesser endowment; to be unable to experience the world in a way similar to that of other, similarly discrete individuals.

The concept of norm unlike that of an ideal implies that the majority of the population must or should somehow be part of the norm. The norm pins down the majority of the population that falls under the arch of the standard bell shaped curve. This curve, the graph of an exponential function that was known variously as the astronomer's error law, the normal distribution the Gaussian destiny function or simply the bell curve become in its own way a symbol of the tyranny of the norm. In this regard, Lenard J. Davis says:

Any bell curve will always have as its extremities those characteristics those deviations or extremes. When we think of bodies, in a society where the concept of the norm is operative, then people contrast to societies with the concept of which all people have a non ideal status.(2)

In England, there was an official and unofficial burst of interest in statistics during the 1830s. A statistical office was set up the board of trade in 1832, and the General register office created in 1837 to collect vital statistics. All of this interest in numbers concerning the state was a consequence of the Reform Act of 1832, the Factory Act of 1833, and the poor Law of 1834. The country was being monitored and the poor were being surveiled. Private groups followed, and in 1833 a statistical section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was formed in which Querelet as well as Malthus participated. In the following year Malthus, Charles Babbage, and others funded the Statistical Society of London. The Royal London Statistical Society was funded in 1835.

The use of statistical began an important movement, and there is a telling connection for the purposes of this book between the funders of statistics and their larger intentions. The rather amazing fact is that almost all the early statisticians had

one thing in common: they were eugenicists. The same is true of key figures in the movement: Sir Francis Galton, Karl Pearson, and R.A. Fisher. While this coincidence seems almost too striking to be true. In this regard, R.A. Fisher further clarifies:

An important consequence of the idea of the norm is that it divided the total population into standard and non standard sub-populations. The next step in conceiving of the population as norm and non norm is for the state to attempt to norm the non standard the aim of eugenics; of course such an activity is profoundly paradoxical since the inviolable rule of statistics is that all phenomena will always conform to bell curve. So norming the non normal is an activity as problematic as untying the Gordian knot. (4)

In related discourse, Galton created the modern system of fingerprinting for personal identification. Galton's interest came out of a desire to show that certain physical traits could be inherited. As he wrote:

One of the inducements to making inquiries into personal identification has been to discover independent features suitable for hereditary investigation it is not improbable, and worth taking pains to inquire where each person may not carry visible about his body undeniable evidence of his parentage and kinships. (65)

The body has an identity that coincides with its essence and cannot be altered by normal, artistic, or human will. This indelibility of corporal identity only further the mark place on the body by other physical qualities intelligence, height, reaction time. By this logic, the person enters into an identical relationship with the body, the forms the identity and the identity is unchangeable and indelible as one's place on the normal curve.

Finally, Galton is linked to that major figure concerned with the discourse of disability in the nineteenth century Alexander Graham Bell. In 1883, the same year that the term "eugenics" was coined by Galton. According to him:

Nothing how the various interests come together in Galton, we can see evolution, fingerprinting, and the attempt to control the reproductive rights of the deaf as all pointing to a conception of the body as perfectible but only when subject to the necessary control of the eugenicists. The identity of the people becomes defined by irrepressible identificatory physical qualities that can be measured.

(23)

Galton made significant change in statistical theory that created the concept of the norm. He took what had been called error theory, a technique by which astronomers attempted to show that one could locate a star by taking into account the variety of significant. The significance of these changes relates directly to Galton's eugenic interest. In an error curve the extremes of the curve are the most mistaken in accuracy. But if one is looking at human traits, then the extremes, particularly what Galton saw as positive extremes tallness, high intelligence, ambitiousness, strength fertility would have to be seen as errors. Rather than errors Galton wanted to think of the extremes as distributions of a trait. As Macken notes, "There was a gradual tradition from use of the term probable error to the term standard deviation" (23).

This term included low intelligence, mental incompetence; sexual licensees and so on established a legacy that people with disabilities are still having trouble living down. This question was so strong that an American journalist writing in the early twentieth century could celebrate the inspiring, the wonderful, message of the twentieth century could celebrate the inspiring the wonderful, message of the new

heredity as opposed to the sorrow of bearing children who were diseased or crippled or depraved. The confession of disability with depravity expressed itself in the formulation defectives class. As the president of the University of Wisconsin declare after the world war first. In this regard Bell argues:

In the matter of state must assert itself as the trustee of a millennial future [...] in order to fulfill his duty in a practical manner, the State will to avail itself of modern medical discoveries. It must proclaim as unfit for proclamation all those who are affected with some visible hereditary disease or are the carries of it and practical measure must be adopted to have such people rendered sterile. (10)

An ideological definition of the individual as discrete, self reliant, self conscious person with a store of goods at least equal to other's in society. To be disabled is to have a lesser endowment to be unable to experience the world in a way similar to that of other, similarly discrete individual that harm accrues because the limited person lacking normal capacities will be disadvantaged and thus less able to contribute to his or her family and community through successful completion in society and the life. Implicit the whole as a Darwinian assumption that non-competitive variations are unproductive and it is to be avoided. The person of difference by definition is limited, his and her status unnatural. The effect of a disabling, uncompetitive condition is assumed to diminish that person existentially and practically. In this way, termination becomes a rational response to chronologically limited ability, logical action ending or reversing the suffering that accompanies the harm that necessarily accrues to the person whose competitive abilities and social postures are severely limited by restriction. Opposed to this ideology of difference in which all discrete individuals are by definition assumption to incomplete and un able, gaining full personhood only

interpersonal and socially competitiveness is a society may reject the person on the basis of negative deviations from a cognitive or physical norm. in this construction, disability is not an inherent limit but an outcome resulting from society's rejection of a person on the basis of his or her difference-its devaluing of his or her status, which endangers both social function and existential worth. Difference is thus not necessarily disabling; disability is not an outcome based on inherent limits but not discriminatory social reaction to the effects of this or that difference (Reindal, 200; Newell, 1999).

In contrast to an understanding of disability solely in terms of deficits located these new way discourses acknowledge that disability may be experienced. In this regard, Harris states, "Located within the individual Deafness is a paradigmatic disability, "a condition that someone has a strong rational preference not to be in and one that is in some sense a harmed condition" (Harris, 2001.p.384). It thus stands as a litmus test for difference and normalcy and society's view of the degree to which persons of difference are to be born. One level of the debate is described in a recent discussion of a non-peer-reviewed article on inherited deafness. In it Nance and Kearsey (2004) described a computer simulation demonstrating how intermarriage of persons with hereditary deafness might result in a society with a greater number of deaf persons. Involved is a gene that regulates the production of connexin proteins that in the fetus form channels between adjacent cells. Recessive mutations are expressed in the cochlea and account for many, if not most, cases of genetic deafness. Intermarriage by deaf carriers of the recessive gene will result almost certainly in a deaf offspring.

Disability is not intrinsic, but rather extrinsic. Disability is situated not in an individual pathology, but in society's failure to embrace diverse ways of being in the

world. Disability is not a variant of human physiology, psychology or genotype, but instead the manifested outcome of social barriers and deeply entrenched patterns of discrimination. The problem is not that I cannot walk – the problem is that I find myself living in a social order premised in the most fundamental ways upon the assumption that everyone-or everyone who counts- does walk in that quaint (if somewhat laborious) biped way. The ideas upon which meaning number 2 is premised are not simple- but they can be stated quite simply.

It is being with the rather remarkable fact that the constellation of words describing this concept “normal”, “normalcy”, “normality”, “norm”, and “average”, “abnormal”-all entered the European languages rather late in human history. The word “normal” as “constituting, conforming to, not deviating or different from the common type or standard, regular, usual” only enters the English language around 1840. (Previously, the word had meant “perpendicular”, that carpenter’s square, called a “norm” provided the root meaning.) Likewise, the word “norm” , in the modern sense, has only been in use since around 1855, and “normality” and “normalcy” appeared in 1857, respectively. If the lexicographical information is relevant, it is possible to date the coming into consciousness in English of an idea of “the norm” over the period 1840-1860.

The assumption about the universality is one of the concept of norm what it might arrive at the concept that of the ideal a word that is drafting from the seventeenth century. Without making two simplistic divisions in the historical chronoscope, one can nevertheless try to imagine a world in which the hegemony of normalcy does not exist. Rather, what we have is the ideal body as exemplified in the tradition of nude Venuses, for example. This idea presents a myth poetic body that is linked that is linked to the gods. In this regard, Lennard Davis state:

The divine body, then this ideal body is not attainable by human. The notion of ideal implies that in this case the human body as visualized imagination must be composed from the ideal parts of living models. These model individualities can never embodied the ideal since an ideal, by definition, can never be found in this world. When ideal human body occur, they do so in mythology. So Venus or Helen of Troy, for example, would be the embodiment of female physical beauty” (10)

By the contrast, the grotesque as a visual form was inversely related to the concept of the ideal and its corollary that all bodies are in some sense disabled. In that mode, the grotesque is a signifier of the people, common life. As Bakhtin states, grotesque had a life affirming transgressive quality in its inversions of the political hierarchy. In this regards, Bakhtin states:

It is possible to think people with disabilities now being used as architectural decorations as the grotesque were on the facades of cathedrals through Europe. The grotesque permeated culture and signified common humanity, whereas the disabled, body, after concept, was formulated as by definition excluded from culture, society the norm. (11)

The concept of norm average enters European culture, or least the European language, only in the nineteenth century; one has to ask what the cause of this conceptualization is. One of the logical places to turn in trying to understand concepts like norm and average is that branch of knowledge known as statistics. In the sense Potter says:

In France statistics were mainly used in the area of public health in the early nineteenth century. The connection between the body and industry

is tellingly revealed in the fact that the leading members of the first British statistical societies formed in the 1830s 1840s were industrialist or had close ties to industry. (12)

It was the French statistician Adolphe Quetelet(1796-1847)contributed the most to a generalized notion of normal as an imperative. He noticed that the law of error, used by average error. In this regard he says, “For the average man, all things will occur in conformity with the mean results obtained for a society. If one seeks to establish in some way, the basis of a social physics, it he whom one should consider as normal. (53)

One might to add here a set of speculations about Sigmund Freud. His work was made especially possible by the idea of the normal. It shows us that sexuality, long relegated to the trash heap of human instincts, was in fact normal and that preservation was simply a displacement of normal sexual interest dream, which behave in a manner of known or only permissibly in normal mental life. In this regard he says:

The dreams of neurotics do not differ in any important respect from those of normal people. In fact, it is hard to imagine the existence of psychoanalysis without the concept of normalcy. Indeed, one of the core principles behind psychoanalysis was that was we each start out with normal psychosexual development and neurotics became normal through problem in the normal development.(33)

Normalcy is constructed by the society in the name of culture, religion and values.

From primitive age to modern time human civilization is always becomes the victim

because it is constructed time and again under the interest of powerful person or groups.

In the novel *The Fifth Child*, abnormality appears as a form of psychological disorder which made Ben differ from others ordinary child. From the infant age Ben shows abnormal behavior and cross the curve of normalcy.

III: Constructedness of normalcy in Doris Lessing's *The Fifth child*

The novel raises a host of questions about human variation and its societal treatment; the tyranny of the visual in the establishment of normalcy and social power; the constructedness of the normal and the deviant, defective, or abnormal; and the gap between professional diagnoses and family realities. The chapters on Ben's institutionalization are riveting, distressing, and handled in a complex fashion. Neither the institution nor its staff are demonized, nor is Harriet's rescue portrayed as a unilaterally heroic act. In this regard, the following lines relevant to quote:

To Harriet he did not have the look of someone solidly planted: he seemed almost to hover, balancing on the balls of his feet. A slight young man he looked younger than he-was had a round, can did face and soft down hair girls longed to run their fingers through, but then that contemplative gaze of his made itself felt and they desisted. Harriet was in the sales department of a firm that designed and supplied building materials; David was an architect. So that was it about these two that made them freaks and oddballs? It was their attitude to sex! This was the sixties! David. (4)

David and his wife misbehave the child, Ben who behaves different from the normal child. Harriet feels difficulties and expresses her idea about the physical condition of the new born babies:

The new baby had of course been offered to everyone to hold, when they asked, but it was painful to see how their faces changed do informing this phenomenon. Ben was always quickly handed back. Harriet came into the kitchen one day and heard her sister Sarah say to a cousin, "that Ben gives me creeps.(56)

The question of normality and abnormality is an ongoing debate in the modern society. It always becomes a matter of discussion both in public and private areas.

In this regard, Kirkush states:

Students argue passionately over who is most at fault, Harriet, David, or Ben himself, and such debates are highly illuminating not only about how we conceive parental (and especially maternal) responsibility but also how we conceive the rationing of family and social happiness and whether it should be decided on a Utilitarian or other model. Lessing makes it impossible to establish the objective nature of Ben's difference, and whether we are meant to read him as an archetype, a figure of science fiction (an atavism or a product of maternal impressions), a metaphor for the construction of racial, ethnic, or class difference, or a figure of society.(2)

From the beginning of the human civilization human society has been run by the majority of the assumption of the power. Who is powerful or in majority that is normal, one who is powerless or minority and weak he/she is abnormal but in the novel Ben is stronger than the others ordinary child so he compares with monsters or some abnormal creature. In this regard, the following lines of the novel are relevant to quote, "She cut off monster, afraid of antagonism him, "Look she said trying to sound, calm, but her voice was angry and accusing, would you say I was an unreasonable woman? Hysterical difficult just a pathetic hysterical woman?" (47).

There are many causes of abnormality which Lessing's character Ben and his family have been faced. Ben's situation is seemed to be poor. In this regard, David says, "Poor! Ben poor she crooned stroking him. He clutched her shirt with both hands, pulled himself up, and stood on her thigh. The hard little feet hurt her" (56). Ben's

condition is painful because the assumption of society defines Ben as an abnormal. In this context, Harriet asserts, “Not as an ordinary baby will, in the sucking bite that relieves the pain of teething, or explores the possibilities of a mouth, tongue she felt her, she felt her bone bend, and saw his old triumphant grin” (56). Harriet further clears and the Situation of Ben and the opinion, “There was horror, too which is what Harriet felt, more and more. Soon she was shutting Ben up in his room away from everyone. He had not seemed to mind, or even to notice. It was hard to make out what he did think of other people (57). Before Harriet gave birth to the Ben, she felt humiliation. The case of humiliation is assumption of the society because Ben is different from the ordinary child. In this regard, she says, “The baby was not six months old yet [...] he was going to destroy it. They would have to make sure that he was in his room at mealtimes and when the children were downstairs with the adults. Family times, in short” (59).

Harriet family is one of the perfect families of the city but the family is unable to respond the new babies because of the boy's abnormality. In this regard, the following lines of the novel are relevant to quote: “He 's a hyperactive child that's how they are described these days, I believed, said old fashioned Dr. Brett. She went to him because he was old fashioned” (63). about the physical and mental condition of the child doctor and Ben talk, “You say he's not talking? But that's not unusual. Wasn't Helen a late talker? I believe she was?”(64). In the same line, Dorothy and David discusses, “David said, “What is the point of thinking you, Dorothy? It seems everything has gone a long way beyond thank yous” (64).

Lessing focuses the problems of Harriet's family which directly indicate with the assumption of normality. In this regard, she says, “Neither Harriet nor David would normally have wanted to go anywhere, for they loved their home. And what

about the family coming for the Summer? (64). Border lines of normality and abnormality indicates Grimes problems. In this context, Doctors, argues, you two are going to have to face it. Ben has to go into an institution.

But he's normal said Harriet, grim, "The doctor says he is" (65).

In the novel, Lessing presents the Nineteenth century assumption of normality which make disturb in family life of Harriet:

For a moment it was the meeting of two alien forms of life: the children had been part of some old savagery and their blood still pounded with it; but now they had to let their wild selves go away they rejoined their family. Harriet and David shared this with them, were with them in imagination. (75)

In 19th century, the assumption of normality and abnormality were compared with criminality. A person does criminal activity because of his mental abnormality which might have been occurred in the life of Ben. Abnormality is compared with criminality which creates fear in the Harriet's family. In this regard, Doctor, says, "All right, I am a criminal. But they were murdering him. He did not move. She had her back to him. She did not want to see his face" (87).

At the beginning of the novel both couple of David are happy because they have already four children. With the birth of Ben, the happiness has gone from the David's family. In this regard, Harriet states:

Most people were dancing, packed close because of lack of space, couples bobbing up and down or revolving in one spot as if they were on invisible turntables. The women were dressed up, dramatic, bizarre, and full of color: *Look at me! Look at me!* Some of the men demanded as much attention. (3)

The above lines focus the highlights the dressing of the Ben which is different from other ordinary child. His activities are seemed like dramatic act. There was a set of assumption of normalcy. In this regard, the following lines of the novel are relevant to mention:

From this concoction her head startlingly emerged. It was pure nineteen-twenties, for her black hair was sleeked down into a spoke on her neck at the back, with two glossy black spikes over her ears, and a black lock on her forehead. She sent frantic waves and kisses to David from across the room where she circled with her partner, and he smiled mainly back: no hard feelings. As for Harriet, she was a virgin. "A *virgin now*", her girl friends might shriek; "are you crazy?"(4)

The concept of normalcy creates problems in Harriet's family which she had faced the problem as the time of her youth. She was a normal girl and make love affair with David which is a normal action in the eye of the society. Now she has some psychological problems which is related with her on coming child. In this regard, David says:

She had not thought of herself as a virgin, if this meant a physiological condition to be defended, but rather as something like a present wrapped up in layers of deliciously pretty paper, to be given, with discretion, to the right person. Her own sisters laughed at her. The girls working in the office looked studiedly humorous when she insisted, "I am sorry, I don't like all this sleeping around, it's not for me." (5)

The above lines reflect the mental condition of the Harriet which is related with the problems of her psychic.

When David and Harriet were conscious about the family and interested in family, they accept the concept of European love and family life. In this regard, Harriet says, "Two eccentrics, Harriet and David, set off from their respective corners towards each other at the same movement: this was to be important to them as the famous office party became part of their story" (6). In the same way, Harriet further clears his family background and focuses on the assumption of normalcy. In the sense, he himself clears his dream and action which is related with the 19th century assumption of normalcy:

He joked, far too often, that he had two sets of parents: he had been one of the children with a room in two homes, and everybody considerate about psychological problems. There had been no nastiness or spite, if plenty of discomfort, even unhappiness-that is, for the children. His real father married one of his kind: she was a noisy, kind, competent woman, with the cynical good humor of the rich James Lovatt was a boat builder, and when David did consent to visit his place could easily be a bunk on a yacht, or a room in a villa in the South of France or the West Indies. But he preferred his old room in Oxford. He knew what he wanted, and the kind of woman he needed. If Harriet had seen her future in the old way, that a man would hand her the keys of her kingdom. (7/8)

In the Victorian England normal middle class family lived in Victorian house which is as same as the house of Harriet. In the novel the scenes of normalness of the house is defined in this way, "Perfect! But for a young couple it was absurd, a three-storeyed house, with an attic, full of rooms, corridors, landings [...] Full of space for children,

in fact" (8). The situation of David family is not so abnormal. The following lines show the normal condition of the house of Harriet and David:

David to Harriet, "Six children at least, "They could not say this to anyone else. Even with David's quite decent salary, and Harriet's, the mortgage of this house would be beyond them. But they would manage somehow. She would work for two years, commute with David daily to London, and then. (9)

Having six healthy children is the dream of the David which is relevant for the society. David has dream of making big and strong family. Both husband and wife's relationship is not so abnormal till Ben was born. The house is open for the forthcoming child. In the sense these lines are relevant to quote, "They unlocked their front door, their hearts thudding with happiness, and stood in a very large room, facing capacious stairs. Some previous owner had seen a home as they did (9).

Writer reflects the normalcy of the David's family and compares it with the abnormal situation of the present and clears through the memory of the past which is constructed by the contemporary European socio religion and cultural values both couple were stood as the travelers of the journey.

David and Harriet stood together, feeling themselves even more preposterously eccentric, and much too young, faced with these two elderly people who judged them. Molly and Frederick were large and untidy, with a great deal of grey hair wearing comfortable clothes that complacently despised fashion. They looked like benevolent haystacks, but were not looking at each other in a way David knew well. (12)

David and his friend both talk about the estimate of the family and its normal condition. The concept of mental disorder is also defined as situation of abnormality.

In the sense, David says, “They separated in the dark car-park of the hotel, Frederick said, “As far as I am concerned, you are both rather mad. Well, wrong-headed, then” (12). The concept is made further clear by the following lines:

Yes, “said Molly. “ You haven’t really thought it out. Children [.....] no one who hasn’t had them know what work they make.” This conversation ended with “I think you should come and see for yourself.” “Very well,” said he, agreeing as much to what had not been said as to what had: his difficulty in keeping up with his wife’s unspoken languages was the main reason he had been pleased to leave her. (13)

The environment of the family has been spoiled by the concept of abnormality and the situation of the Ben because physical shape is dangerous. In this regard, Harriet says, “Harriet said fiercely, “Perhaps we ought to have been born into another country. Do you realize that having six children in another part of the world, it would be normal, nothing shocking about it-they aren’t made to feel criminals?”(16).

In the novel, Lessing presents the various example of the Victorian family assumption which determines the principle of Victorian values of normalcy for children and women. In this context, David sister Deborah states:

They did this pregnancy, like the other, was normal, but Harriet was uncomfortable and sick, and though to herself that while she had not changed her mind at all about six (eight or ten) children, she would be jolly sure there was a good interval between this one and the next.(19)

When Ben was born with grotesque body, whole family feel worried, “David wept. Dorothy wept. Harriet laughed and wept. The midwife and the doctor had a little is of festivity and triumph. They all drank champagne and poured some on

Luke's head. It was 1966" (17). After finishing the evening drink they remember the different events which are related with same case. In this regard, Harriet tells one story about the Jessica's daughter:

The girl could easily have been Jessica's daughter and not Molly's. She was not married, though she had had what she described as near misses. In general style she was so far removed from them relative to her that these differences become a running joke. She she had always the life of rich, had found the shabby high mindless of her mother, but house irritating hated people being crammed tighter, but conceded that she found this party interesting.(19)

In the same lines she also focuses on the Sahara and her husband condition. In this regard, she argues, "Sahara and her husband, William were unhappily married, and quarreled, and made but she was pregnant her fourth and a divorce not possible" (21). In the context of nineteenth century, a concept of normal and stigma or abnormal is highly applied in the family. In the novel Harriet and David talk about the changing age and its effect on normalcy of life, "It had been hard preserving their belief in themselves when the spirit of the times, the greed y and selfish sixties, had been so ready, to condemn them, to isolate, to diminish their best selves" (21).

The cause of unhappiness of the society is the birth of Ben who disturbed the happy life of the David family. In this regard, David says:

The cause of unhappiness creates by the child. In the life of Sahara also the same thing happen, Sahara and William's unhappiness, their quarreling, had probably attracted the Mongol child yes, of course they knew one shouldn't call them Mongol. But the little girl did look a bit like Genghis Khan, did not she?(22)

Government of England had determined the normalcy of children and their fortress. In this regard the following lines are relevant to quote, "At least they ought to know what went on outside their fortress, their kingdom, in which three precious children were nurtured, and where so many people came to immerse in safety, comfort kindness"(22). In the same line, William and Sahara talk about the normalcy of the children and wife. In this regard, Sahara states, "He sat opposite former wife and her husband, and as usual both kinds of people were observed examine each other and marveling that they could ever have come together (24).

The status of Victorian society has been broken out with the changing phenomena of the society and the concept and meaning of normalcy also change. In this novel Lessing shows normal condition of David house by referring the relationship of children and parent:

The father of four children speaks; said Sarah, passionately cobbling her poor Amy, defying them to say aloud what they must be thinking that she was going out of her way to support him, her unsatisfactory husband in front of them all. He gave her a grateful look while his eyes avoid the pathetic bundle she protected. (26)

In the marriage time both, couple David and Harriet had dream of big family with great numbers of children. At least six number, David hopes six number of children, In this regard, David says, "When I get married , this is what I am going to do I'm going to be Harriet and David, and have a big house and a lot of children [...] and you all be welcome. "She was fifteen; a plain dark plumping girl who they knew would shortly blossom and become beautiful" (28). Dorothy is one of the characters of the novel who is poor and works in David house. She expresses her anguish toward the David in abnormal way:

I am your servant; I do the work of a servant in this house. Or “you are very selfish, both of you. You are irresponsible. These words were in the air but were not spoken: they that if she allowed herself to herself to begin she could not stop with this. (33)

Above lines reflect the situation of middle class people and their assumption of normalcy. In this regard, David states:

He looked dubious; however, He had a harassed, no longer young man, who she had heard. , had a difficult marriage . She had always felt rather superior to him now she felt at his mercy, and was looking up into that professionally reticent face as she lay there, under his hands, ongoing for him to say something else. (36)

The assumption of normal life has been presented by the measurement of the of power wealth and cultural situation of the person. In this regard, Dorothy further clears:

Alice was quick, fussy, nervous, like a little guy terrier. She had three grown up children, and grandchildren, but said she did not want to be a nuisance to them, a remark that caused Dorothy to make dry remarks, which Harriet felt like accusations. Dorothy was not pleased to have a woman of her own age sharing authority, but it could not be helped. (38)

Male dominated society has been marked the norms of on behalf of their success which has been applied in the sense of socio-religious background of the people. In this regard, the following lines are relevant to quote:

But theme Easter come, Harriet was proved right it was not a success. Her strained, abstracted face as she sat there at her table, upright

braced for the next jolt, or jab, stopped conversation, spoiled the fun, the good times. What have you got in there? (40)

The above lines reflect the religious background of the character which helps to identify the religious values of the society which is one of the important markers of the normalcy. The family is normal like ordinary Christian family which certain access of economy. In this regard the following; lines are relevant to quote:

She took David to the station, and the two older children to school, then parked the car somewhere and walked. She almost ran through streets she hardly saw, hour after hour, until she understood she was causing comment. Then she took to driving a short way out of the town, where she walked along the country lanes, fast, something running. People in passing cars would turn amazed, to see this painting [...] white faced hair flying, open mouthed, panting, arm clenched across her front. If they stopped to offer help, she shook her head and ran on” (41).

Harriet works in a kitchen as cook. At that time, she remembers the events of her family which relates with the economic condition of her family. Economically her family is normal because there is not sign of abnormality. The following lines clear the economic normalcy of her family:

Harriet was spooning in soup, and broke hunks of bread into it. Her appetite was enormous, insatiable so bad she was ashamed and raided the fridge when no one could see her. She could in find to eat. She even had secret catches like an alcoholic’s hoards, only it was food: chocolate, bread, pies. (43)

The descriptions of the novel highlight the certain, strange and horrific condition of the novel. In this regard Harriet states, “This strange girl was smiling but it was a nasty smile, not friendly, and the little girl thought this other girl was going to reach up cut of the water and pull her down into it”(45). David's family doctor suggests him about the abnormality of the child and say:

But there was none of the doctor; her husband stood watching, with the smiles that this moment imposed. But there was none; on the country, there was a strain in everyone, apprehension. A strong, sucking reflex, and then heard gums clamped down on her nipple and she winced. The child looked at her and bit, hard. (49)

Above lines show the fundamental changes of the David's family which is psychologically depressed after having children. At the same time Ben comes into David's family as the abnormal child. In the context, David quotation is relevant to quote, “He had not cried since he was born, except for a first roar protest poorest, or perhaps surprise” (49). In the same line he further clarifies the abnormal situation of the family and states, “Jane, the four year old took one of his feet in her hand in her two hands, but vigorously kicked her away“(50). Ben's abnormality made David family unhappy. The following lines further clear that:

It looked as if she was unkindly depriving him of the breast, and she heard Davies breathing change. Ben roared with rage, fastened like a leech to another nipple, and sucked so hard she felt that however whole breast was disappearing down his throat. This time, she felt he was on the nipple, him away. (51)

In the same line Harriet further clears physical abnormality of Ben and states:

But what, that's the point, said Harriet, what is he? The other three said nothing or rather, said by their silence that they would rather not face the implications of it. All right said Harriett, lets say he has a healthy appetite if that makes everyone happy. (53)

Dorothy one of the character of the novel criticizes the situation of Ben and states, "Dorothy's face changed as she felt shifted her position so that Ben's pistoning legs could not reach her"(54).In the nineteenth century, the question of normalcy and stigma was highly used in the context of child which related with the physical situation of Ben. In this regard, David asserts:

They say "Is little Paul still is longing to see the new baby. They arrived bringing wine and summer produce from all over the country, and all kinds of people stood bottling fruit and making jams and chutneys with Alice and Dorothy. A crowd of children played in the garden or were taken off the woods for picnics. (55)

When Ben played with his friend he shows a little bit abnormal condition which is related with his physiological condition. Ben's behavior is not relevant with the 19th century, middle class Christian father born child. So people talk Ben and normalcy. In this regard the following lines are relevant to quote:

Ben that he had willed himself to be born, had invaded their ordinariness, which had no defenses against him. But not making love was not only a strain for them both, it was a barrier, because they had to be remained continually of what threatened them... so they felt. (58)

The condition of adult children marks leads the path of new child but in the case of Ben that assumption is not applied. Ben fights with adult children and some time hardly beaten so most of the women blamed him as the rude or abnormal child. In this

regard, David states, “This told the adults that the children’s attitudes to Ben were already formed: they had discussed Ben and knew what to think about him. Luke Helen, and Jane went away upstairs silently, and it was a bad moment for the parent” (58). All other children humiliate Ben and laugh at him which create psychological problem upon him. In this regard, the line further clarify the fact, “All the other children had laughed, chuckled, and wanted to be loved, admired, and praised on reaching this moment of achievement. This one did not. It was cold triumph, and he staged about, eyes gleaming with hard pleasure while “(59).

Ben was badly treated by the society which was no different from the Primitive society. In this regard David argues, “I suppose in the old times, in primitive societies, this was how they treated a women who’d given birth to a freak. As if it was her fault. But we are supposed to be civilized” (60). The question of liberality and humanism has not worked at all. In the name of normalcy, society constructs the norm and that used to humiliate different one. Such value judgment creates psychological problem in the life of Ben. In this regard the following lines are relevant to quote, “Children playing in the garden heard his him in his thick angry cries, and saw him up on the still trying to push aside his bars” (61). In the same line, Harriet narrative further clears the Ben psychological problem:

One morning when Harriet came down to start breakfast for the children; the dog was lying dead on the kitchen floor. It had had a heart attack? Suddenly sick with suspicion, she rushed up to see if Ben was in his room, he was squatting on his bed, and when she cane in looked up and laughed but soundlessly in his way which was like a baring of teeth.(62)

Ben's physical condition made him frustrated and behaves as different from the normal one. In this regard the following lines are relevant to quote:

Ben was always on his feet, and had to be watched every second. He slept very little. He spent most of the night standing on his windows sill, staring into the garden and if Harriet looked in on him, he would turn and give her a long stare, alien chilling; in the half dark of the room. (63)

Above lines highlight the Ben's physical as well as mental condition which challenge the ethic of society and highlights the pitiful condition of Ben. Ben became psychologically isolated from the world and says, "After a day with Ben I feel as if nothing exists but him. As if nothing has ever existed. I forgot their supper yesterday. Dorothy went to the pictures and I came down and found Helen cooking their supper" (65). Harriet was deeply rooted with the conscious of constructed philosophy of normalcy. In this regard, Dorothy speaks "Harriet was determined not to let it all go. She found she was again silently addressing Ben: I'm not going to let you destroy us, you won't destroy me [...]" (65). Sahara and Harriet talk about the philosophy of normalcy and the marital proms faced by those children in the future. In this regard Sahara puts her arguments in this way:

It is all right if we are careful never be Amy alone with Ben, said Harriet and Sarah after a long silence, said .My god, Harriet but she was rejecting this submission to bring a victim of fate. Sarah, yes with her marital problems and her Mongol child yes. But she, Harriet, in the same boat? (66).

Above lines show the problem of David family which is related with the question of normalcy and Ben physical and mental condition. In this regard, David further clears:

It was the strain of it all, watching Ben watching Amy who was the centre of everything. Her head was too big her body too squat, but she was full of love and kisses and everyone adored her. Helen who had longed to make a pet of Ben was now able to love Amy".(66)

In the novel, Lessing presents the idea of normality which has been created multiple problems in a family and raised the question of all socialization processes of the human civilization. David family is one expel which became the victim of the normalcy which was constructed by some power factor. Ben behaves in abnormally both in speech and work. In this regard, the following lines are relevant to quote:

Go for walk now." His voice was heavy and uncertain each word separate, as if his brain were a lumber house of ideas and objects and he had to identify each one. No sense of self preservation , no sense of danger, they hurl themselves off beds and shares, lunch themselves into space, run into roads, have to be watched every second... and they are also she added at their most charming, delightful, heartbreakingly sweet and funny. And then they gradually become sensible and life is easier. (69)

The overall activities of Ben show that he physically crippled by birth but more than that so called modern, morality based society made him abnormal. In this regard, Harriet states, "Ben again banged the tray with his stone, in a frenzy of exulting accomplishment. It looked as if he believed he was hammering metal, forging something; one could easily imagine him, in the mines deep under the earth, with his kind [.....]"(70). about the physically and mental conditions of the Ben, his parents and relatives asked to the doctor and again harasses him and separates him from this

society. In this regard, David speak, "Then we have to find to doctor who says he's abnormal" said Harriet, doctor Brett certainly won't."

"Get another doctor, said Molly."These things can be arranged. The two large haystack people, with their red well fed faces were united in determination" (72)

In the novel, Lessing satires so called morality based value of the modern society and the normalcy which has been constructed by some powerful factors of the society. Ben and his whole family is the victim of such bad tradition. At last Ben was separated from the society because of the lack of normalcy. In this regard, the following lines are relevant to quote:

It's either him or us, said David to Harriet. He added, his voice full of cold dislike for Ben, He probably just dropped in form Mrs. He's going back to report on what he's found down here. "He found down here, "He laughed- cruelly, it which of course she had half known already that Ben was not expected to live long in this institution whatever it was.(74)

In the same line the following lines highlight the abnormal condition of Ben:

At supper they were overnight, giggling, and hysterical. But in a quiet moment Jane asked a shrilly "Are you going to send us away too? She was a stolid quiet girl. Dorothy in miniature, never saying anything unnecessary. But now her large blue eyes were fixed in terror on her mother's face. (76)

Harriet dislikes Ben because of the assumption of normalcy. She was traditional woman she could not go beyond the values of society which was fixed and guided by certain socio religion and cultural values of the society. She herself criticizes the helpless Ben and says, "It was not with love or even affection, that she thought of

him, and she disliked herself for not being able to find one little speck of normal feeling: it was guilt and horror that kept her awake through the nights”(77).

Ben was treated as the criminal and nobody go near to him. His psychological condition is going worse than bad. The following lines further clear the Harriet behavior toward Ben;

Again Harriet was wondering why she was always treated like a criminal. Even since Ben was born it's been like this, she thought. Now it seemed to her the truth, that everyone had silently condoned her. I have suffered a misfortune; she told herself I haven't committed a crime. (78)

Harriet is in dual condition she does not like the social value and assumption of normalcy which was in practices. In this regard she says, "Harriet heard herself explode with "I m sick of being told I don't understand this and that. I'm the child's mother. I'm Ben Lovatt's mother. Do you understand that?" (80) Psychologically, Harriet was in confusing state and further she speaks, "A child seemed at first glance normal but then Harriet saw there was no back to its head it was all face, which seemed to scream at her. Rows of freaks, nearly all sleep and silent. They were literally drugged out of their minds."(81) In the condition of Ben she is conscious but she could not come up from the demarcation of the society. She further states about the Ben and says:

He lay like a drowned fish on the slab, was turned over several times by the girl, when the young man interrupted the hosing process for the purpose, and was finally carried by them both to another slab, where they dried him and then took a clean strait Jacked from a pile and it on him. (83)

Ben's abnormal condition and the ethical question of normalcy both are interrelated in the plot of the novel through various examples which create a kind of confusion of the theme in Lessing's writing. In this regard one, Harriet states about Ben's condition and says, "John crouched low over bars and behind him, clutching tight, a dwarf child, she was her son Ben, his mouth open in what seemed to be chant or yell of exultation. Ecstatic, She had never seen him like this happy? Was that word?"(94). David's family doctor justifies the psychological problem of Ben's which affected the whole Lovatt family and suggested, "Dr. Gilly said, I'm going to come straight to the point, Mrs Lovatt. The problem is not with Ben, but with you. You don't like him very much" (103). In the same lines he further states:

"Dr. Gilly enquired, after a pause for analysis of what Harriet had said, "You resent the fact that Ben isn't clever is that it? Oh, my God" Harriet violently, "What is the point The two women eyed each other. Harriet sighed letting her violence subside; the doctor was angry, but not showing it."(104)

Above lines highlight religious ideology about normalcy and Harriet consoles her remembering the god.

In the last part of the novel, Lessing further clears modern human condition which was not yet determined by the destiny and god. Many wars and riots made human beings abnormal or physically unable what for that and how can work the definition of normalcy or physical disability in that condition. In this regard, David states:

War was riots killings hijacking murders and thefts and kidnappings... the eights, the barbarous eights were getting into their stride and Paul lay sprawled in front of the set or wandered about the room, eating and watching being nourished. So it seemed. "Yet certain films he would

watch over and over again and never tired of them. They had hired a video. He loved musicals: The Sound Music, West Side Story Oklahoma! Cat. (115)

Above lines show the present condition of people who are physically unable but the cause is not by birth. So it is needed to change the definition of normalcy which was constructed by the society for undermine the weak people. In this regard, He says:

Come the revolution, we'll [...] "We we'll kill all the rich shits and then "There's one law for the rich, and one for the poor everybody knows that" They would say these things amiably, with that air of repletion people use when copying what other do when they are part of a popular mood or movement.(124)

In short, Lessing tries to analyze the normalcy and its negative impacts which have been fallen in the life of Ben and his family, his mother, Harriet. At last, the novel challenges the traditional definition of normalcy and suggests searching the new foundation of normalcy with certain morality and civilization. Lessing presents the picture of the modern middleclass white family where abnormal child faced various problems. Ben's family and relatives could not come out from the traditional values and practice which was determined by the powerful person as the tools to undermine the weak

IV. Conclusion

In *The Fifth Child*, writer tries to capture the socio economic, religious and cultural attitudes of the normalcy which is based on the power position of the contemporary society. David and his wife Harriet, one of the middle class couple are worried about the problem of their newly born child, Ben who is physically abnormal. David and Harriet both are the couple of middle class. At the beginning, the family was happy they have already been four children. After the arrival of Ben, the couple worried because the fifth child is physically abnormal. David's relatives and neighbor started to talk about the physical situation of the boy which is the cause of mental problem of the family. Normalcy is constructed by religion, socio-economic and cultural factors of the society and practices in the life of individual. In this novel, same thing happened in David's family.

Nineteenth century European assumption of normalcy was deeply rooted in the power structure of a particular group or intellectuals. They construct certain values which help to identify a person he or she is normal or abnormal. In the case of Ben, David relatives' and neighbors' criticism made Harriet and David be more thoughtful about Ben. From the time David loses passion towards the fifth child. And then Ben and his parents both are stigmatized and depressed. So normalcy is a mark that is defined by a particular society. In 19th century Victorian values of society undermined Ben's normalcy which made him leave the family and society.

Lessing tried to focus the issues of love and normalcy as the interrelated form which creates problem in the David's family. In nature, David loves children because he has a dream of a big house with many children. But after the birth of Ben, he was afraid with the comment of society about the Ben's abnormality. Psychologically he and his wife Harriet became depressed and change their dream. The whole story of

the novel only focuses the problem of the family which was not only related with clinical problem but also connected with the constructing value of the normalcy.

There are two primary factors to examine the normalcy which help to establish human relationship in this world. The first one is clinical report which is more scientific and reliable than the second one which is constructed in the certain societal background and use as the controlling factor of society. Constructing normalcy is measured value that helps to control a person from being unique. David's family doctor advises him not to be horrified with Ben's condition but that not enough to control his family problem. The family is deeply rooted with the assumption that formed by socio – cultural and religion and demarked the lines of normalcy.

In the novel, Ben, standing rather apart from the crowd, staring at the camera with his goblin eyes, or searching the faces in the crowd for another of his own kind. As a symbolic summing-up of the past three decades, from Sixties cataclysm to Eighties terrorism, this short novel is vaguely provocative at best; the even broader, socio-anthropological subtext--civilized, familial mankind forced to confront the primitive animal within is only slightly more persuasive. But, despite echoes of pop-fiction the assumption of normalcy and human relation is highly provoked in the novel.

In short, the research tries to seek normalcy was constructed in a particular foundation of the society and it plays an important role in a person's individual performances which is deeply rooted in the psychic of a person. In the novel, Ben himself physically as well as mentally feels different from other and tries to construct separate identity by showing strange behavior. In the same way, David and Harriet, both are socially and psychosocially worried of being the parents of abnormal child.

David's family tries to break the assumption of traditional values of constructing normalcy but they are not succeeding to challenge the view which has been established in the society since long time on the basis of socio cultural and religious foundation. So Lessing tried to pick out the issues of normalcy with the reference of David's family but not conclude it with proper solution that is why the research tries to assert the problem of normalcy and its psychological effect in family.

Works Cited

- Baron, Robert. *A Psychology*. New Delhi, prentice hall of India, 1999.
- Davis L .J. *The Disability Studies Reader*. New York, Rout ledge, 1997.
- Davis, Lenard, J. “Constructing Normalcy”. *Disability Studies*. Ed. Learned J. Davis. New York: Rutledge, 1997
- Ditches, David. *A critical history of English Literature*.4th ed. Vol.4. New York Delhi, allied 1995, 4, vols.
- Erving, Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice Hall, 1963.
- Ferrate, J. and Brown J.P. *Social Construction of Race and Ethnicity of United States*. New York. Longman, 1998.
- From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
- Heatherton, T. F., Kleck, R. E., Hebl, M. R., & Hull, J. G. (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Stigma*, Guilford Press, 2000, ISBN 1-572-30573-8.
- Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)
- Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary Origins of Stigmatization: The Functions of Social Exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin* **127**: 187-208.
- Lessing, Doris . *The Fifth Child*. Great Britain, Jonathan Cape Ltd.1988.
- Linton, S. *Claiming Disability*. New York, New York University press, 1998.
- Mervin, Rothstein. “The Painful Nurturing of Doris Lessing’s The Fifth Child”, *NewYork Times*, June 14, 1988.
- Pye, Michael. “Creature Walks among US.” *New York times Book Review*; Aug, 6,200 11-13.

Rubin Marle. "An Exile from society". *The spectator* Dec. 12:1988.

See also the sequel Ben, in the World

Simon, Linda. "The Alien". *The world and I*. 16.2(Feb.2001).

Stiker, H.J. *A History of Disability*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan press, 1997.

Winze, Merger. A. "Disability and society before the 18th century". *Disability*

Studies. Ed. Lenard. J. Davis., New York, Rutledge, 1997.

