Both the writers, V.S. Naipaul and Salman Rushdie can be considered as writers in exile for more than one reason. Both have travelled across the sea and come to a new land, i.e. “foreign” land, and both communicate with the English language as “a home” for their words and sentences and an alien tongue. In addition, we can clearly see the operations of exile within the works of these writers. These diasporic writers deal with exile not simply as a condition of the post-colonial world, but they treat it as a central means to understand the self.

Naipaul’s Experience with India:

Naipaul first came to India in 1962. Touring India, living in Srinagar, writing and completing his first novel on English life Mr. Stone and the Knights Companion, Naipaul discovered affinities in patterns of response and behavior, with Indians. But he had been controlling precipitate reaction to other aspects of India—the dirt, the defecation, the blind adherence to two worlds, the failure to pay heed to history, and neglect of their own past. Visiting his ancestral village in U.P., the village of the Dubes-Naipaul recoiled from what must have appeared a hell-in terms of what he feels about dependence and “mini-men”. The stifling lack of opportunity seen in the cringing postures of his relatives—was horrifying to a man who had distinct memories of the impoverishment of such a world. Naipaul angrily, silences the pleas of this world, but not without fear. He exits on a plane to London, but arriving there, he finds the image of man, here too, equally distasteful.

Naipaul’s year’s initial visit to India had made him, despite his empathy and attraction towards the Hindu philosophical world-view; discover a strong antipathy to other Indian attitudes, making the journey by ship had found “another idea of main…a new type of authority and subservience”. Naipaul found as he approached India not “whole men”, admirable in physique and bearing, but a new category of men “diminished and deformed”, men who “begged and whined”. The end is in the beginning: Naipaul resolves to preserve himself in India. Naipaul had grown up with India in an amazing and special type of way. Coming to India he was wonderstruck at the transference which he made from Uttar Pradesh to Trinidad in his grandfather’s time. Indian “artefacts” were well known to him. The attitudes were alien. “Those ways of thinking and seeing”, existing in his grandfather, who “denied Trinidad”, were impossible to Naipaul.

In Trinidad, Naipaul had been Indian in attitudes to food and pollution, heeding the strictures of his Brahmin family with regard to strangers, especially, especially Muslims. But he is an outsider to his family being “born an unbeliever’. It is this fact which cuts him off from the joys of the pilgrim to Amarnath, and a huge segment of India.

His reverence for old India expresses itself, as we find, in the desire, that his Indian friend Ramon killed in an accident in England should receive proper cremation. Ramon is without allegiance to home or country like Naipaul himself. One sees this reverence in Naipaul’s horror at electric lights being used
instead of “the clay lamps of immemorial design” at Divali in Bombay. Naipaul had built up a childhood fantasy about the beauty of India embodied in the Himalayas. India could be what Trinidad was not. But coming to India he found “caste was unpleasant” unlike Trinidad where it did not count in “day-to-day life”. Fantasy had kept the two worlds-Indian and the New World-“juxtaposed and mutually exclusive” in Trinidad. But India showed them confused, violated and ridiculous, because London had penetrated deep, but not deep enough to create a new order. “The area of the imagination” which Indian was to Naipaul in childhood gave way before the India “smugness…the imperviousness to criticism, the refusal to see, the double-talk and double-think…” These aspects of Indian life destroy, for Naipaul, his land of childhood myth.

Naipaul faults Indian for they find poverty “an inexhaustible source of tears, an exercise of the poorest sensibility”. This attitude maintains the status quo of the “degrees of degradation” he is confronted with. Indians whether clerks or officials or the swank new business class, like Bunty, cling to their origins. Naipaul concludes that “few Indian are outsiders”. He finds the society static with only a change in its surface “mimicry”, yesterday Mugul and possible tomorrow, Russian or American. “The inner world” of Indians he finds unchanged and this is where he is forced to Part Company with them. Naipaul, the transformation of the colonial self must be in term of change in values and attitudes. He cannot condone the “schizophrenia” of “the scientist who before taking up his appointment consults the astrologer for an auspicious day”. Naipaul does not mince words in condemning the Indian “withdrawal, denial, confusion of values”, finding the same in Manohar Malgaonkar’s novel The Princes, where the public school product Abhayraj, son of a prince, finally reacts to his childhood …which their servant serves them food, time dissolves for Naipaul and he is linked with them through a forgotten Hindu self:

And now…in Kashmir, this encounter with the tourist family answered…the three generations which separated me from them shrank to one. The encounter had done more than dislodge a childhood memory; it awakened a superseded consciousness. (AD.p.144)

Another such occasion when he visits his grandfather's ancestral village and recognizes the shrines in the temple is similar to the ones in his parental home, back in Trinidad. Childhood connects India with Trinidad. Adulthood with its burden of reality (“seeing”) and reason, divides from India. Naipaul has “contracted out” of the medieval world-view through temperament and disposition. His year in India teaches him only his ‘separateness’.

In a year I had not learned acceptance. (AD.p.252)

Naipaul's relationship with India, it is clear is unresolved expect at the level of paradox. “Close” to India by birth, he is “far” because he lacks those “religious attitudes” which make India bearable. “To come to term with the strangeness of India’, Naipaul has unraveled every conscious and unconscious layer of memory: “phantasmal memories of old India which for me outline a whole vanished world”. (AWC.p.9) Here, for the first time Naipaul acknowledge that these memories “are like trapdoors into a bottomless past”.

Moving through India, Naipaul now demolishes the Indian view that “India absorbs and outlasts its conquerors”, feeling rather that India has steadily depleted intellectually over the last thousand years. He disagrees with R.K. Narayan’s view (expressed in 1961); “that India would go on”. Narayan is an Indian in seeing “order and continuity” where Naipaul with his “sense of history and even the simplest ideas of human possibility”, can see only “dereliction”. Rushdie’s Experience with India:

Of the two expatriates under study, it is only Salman Rushdie whose engagement with India includes a childhood directly experienced there. The younger of the two novelists, he resists through the modes of his imaginative response to India in his fiction, the predictable nodes of analysis of the expatriate connection in terms of a loss-guilt-alienation syndrome. His response in life and in fiction does not contain the latent, neurotic fear of being re-implicated and trapped by the spirit of India. The strongest reason behind this appears to be a happy childhood in the security of a close-knit family in Bombay:

His [Saleem Sinai’s] childhood is extremely full of Events and, by and large, anxious and unhappy, Whereas I remember my childhood as a time when Nothing much happened. It was just a very good Feeling.

Unhappy experiences began as a schoolboy at Rugby; “I remember bad moments when I felt very depressed…I never had any friends at school…” But from such an experience Rushdie moved on to a better period at Cambridge, where he read history. And it is the truth of a nation's history that Rushdie concentrates upon in Midnight's Children and ShameIndia’s and Pakistan's respectively.

Questioned whether the narrative voice in Shame was not his own, Rushdie agreed to it and said, being the unnamed narrator of Shame is a good deal than the named narrator of Midnight's Children.” But he cautioned against “too literally” reading the novel in relation to himself:

…One of the things that the supposedly non-fictional passages discuss is the business of write- ing from outside a country and the kind of knowledge you gain of a country when you don’t live there. In order to discuss the relationship of the narrator to that material I have somewhat exaggerated his detachment from Pakistan.

Rushdie’s own relative detachment from India separates
him tonally from Naipaul's trauma-ridden response. He appears to have taken stock of the gains and losses of exile in a businesslike manner. Consequently, his visits to India bring no radical shock to the perception.

India is not alien to Rushdie, neither is England where he belongs to the stream of young expatriate writers. Living here, he finds that exile dictates its special angle, its unique perspective on the world. As expatriate he is “obliged to see the world in slices...” and, like his narrator he is “a migrant from one country... and a new comer in the other…” (S.p.85)

Rushdie’s relationship with India is one of continuous “dialectic” where one view of reality is cross examined simultaneously by a Rushdie born of India, and a Rushdie altered by England’s intellectual traditions and other European ones. The terms of enquiry, as Jaidev points out, are drawn simultaneously from two traditions. Rushdie is emphatic about his right to belong to both the traditions. As an Indian writer in England Rushdie has tackled and answered positively the question of whether “distance opens any other doors?”

Examining the psychological dilemma of Indian expatriates, Rushdie confesses to look back at India. “His ambivalence towards the rejection of India emerges when he says: “We are Hindus who have crossed the black water; we are Muslim who eat pork”. With allegiance to India and the west, Rushdie feels his identity to be “at once plural and partial. Sometime we feel that we straddle two cultures; at other times that we fall between two stools.”

Analysis his liking for India, Rushdie attributes it to India's secularism: “that it is based on a non-sectarian philosophy”. Another factor of attraction is “the Indian talent and the endless possibilities of it.” Yet, always, there is the hint of the expatriate fear, boarding on terror, of being reclaimed by India. The expatriate looks back, “even at the risk of being mutated into pillars of salt”. Rushdie too, would like to stay out of the physical reality of India, recreating another India: “imaginary homelands, Indias of the minds”

Examining side by side, the critical theories of Naipaul and Rushdie, one concludes that it is the double-shuffle between the poles of fantasy and reality which is the characteristic mark of the expatriate sensibility in its response to India. The penetration of a fantasy-experience of India by a painful reality accounts for their ambivalence of response. The fantasy of a pure India itself is based on a childhood involvement with the country. While Rushdie easily accommodates the grim and painful aspects of Indian life, and Naipaul recoils in a deep horror from the poles of attraction and repugnance which they have experienced. The greater negation and despair of Naipaul is seen to spring from his insecure childhood, as well as a true absorption in the expatriate condition. Rushdie's response is a pointer in the direction of an expatriate group, politically oriented and positive in emotion and attitude. Yet freed from the sadness and gloom that is invariably a counterpart of exile his theories and response run the risk of being regarded as an intellectually stance, rather than a full and deeply experienced condition. Again, Naipaul and Rushdie are linked in a preoccupation with memory as witness/falsifier/creator and explore in different ways the form and aesthetics relevant to writer-expatriates with an India connection and foundation. Compared amongst one another, it is clear both the writers experience a sense of loss in “abandoning” India.
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Introduction:

Dalit writing in English is one of the fast growing territories of present day time. It has become distinct and new stream of Indian Literature. There has been translation of several autobiographies written in different regional languages of India throughout India. The revolutionary thought of Dr. Ambedkar has altered the life of the Dalits in India. Every dalit writer has his/her root in the thinking of Dr. Ambedkar in the sense; he is responsible for their education and so the changed situation. The word 'Dalit' means masses exploited and oppressed economically, socially, culturally, in the name of religion and other factors. Dalit autobiographers expose the fact that their condition has been changed only due to Dr. Ambedkar's 'Be educated, be agitated and be organized' message. Omprakash Valmiki is no exception to this, for he highlights the importance of teachings of Dr. Ambedkar. As Arjun Dangle in his edited book reveals “Dr. Ambedkar is the enabling factor in Dalit literature because of his ideas, outlook towards life and his struggle to achieve what he felt just”(P. xxiii). In his autobiography 'Joothan: A Dalit's Life' Omprakash Valmik states that how education played significant role in his life. Growing up in caste- based society is a very bad experience for him. He undergoes a life of humiliation and man-made discrimination. He couldn't change his adverse situation at that time because of education but later on.

The principal objective of the paper is to discuss 'education' in Omprakash Valmiki's autobiography i.e. 'Joothan: A Dalit's Life'. It also aims at focusing education as a means of progress for the untouchables. Again, it is also an attempt to discuss education system in relation to teacher's attitude, educational atmosphere in the then schools and schools attending subaltern in the autobiography of Valmiki.

Key words: Joothan: A Dalit's Life, Education, subaltern's experience in school etc.
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uncivilized human beings in the autobiography. They treat the writer badly in school. They treated him worse than animals. They heaped piles of indignities on the writer. The writer recalls his past memories to tell how his teacher used to call him 'abey chhure ka'. The label given to the writer by his teacher shows the caste and class biased mentality of the teachers. Without his faults he was beaten ruthlessly by his teachers in the school. He was compelled to sweep and clean all the verandas during his learning time. The other boys used to learn and he has to sweep and clean the rooms along with the veranda. The writer says when he used to do these all works in the school instead paying attention on the learning while the headmaster of the school used to see him without asking him to attend the school. He states that they had to sit in a separate corner or outside the threshold of the classroom. Dealing with Valmiki's this experience in 'Joothan' Dr. Rajesh Kumar in his research paper focuses the reality and raises a question regarding to this situation of the subalterns when he writes “Arrangement were made for them to have separate settlements, separate river banks, and separate cremation grounds. Since Sudras were denied any right to education by the Hindu caste system, the question of separate educational institutions didn't arise. Later, during the British days, when they did begin to receive education (p.123&124) they had to sit out of the class. Apart from this Valmiki goes on stating his bitter experiences regarding to school education. Even during working for school he was not allowed to get a drink of water. This is what one of the shocking faces of the school we come across in his autobiography. Schools are treated as the institutions to mould the citizens of tomorrow. These are the training centers where humans are trained to live like human but ironically in the autobiography of Valmiki we find such descriptions regarding to schools where we lose the belief that the schools are no more centers where real humans are shaped. The school institution doesn't accept Valmiki as a legitimate participant in its activities of learning. He humiliated not only by the students but also by the teachers which was worst thing for him. Talking about his school experience Valmiki writes “All sorts of stratagems were tried so that I would run away from the school and take up the kind of a work for which I was born. According to these perpetrators, my attempts to get schooling were unwarranted.”(Page no. 56). Dr. Ambedkar had also gone through such experiences during his schooling but knowing the importance of education he advised his followers to pursue education. The autobiographer has particular place for his teachers in his mind. He recalls his memories in relation to his teachers as his “ideal teachers” whose “kicks and fists were not of a teacher but of a goonda”, who “would, first of all make me aware of my being a Bhangi”, who were not teachers but “illiterate feudal lords”, and for whom “I had not an iota of respect..... in my heart” Interface difference can be noted out between Valmiki's ideals of schools and his teachers' ideals about school. The incident of teaching the lesson on Dronacharya, the guru of the Pandavas and the Kauravas raises many questions in Valmiki's mind. The same question is raised in the mind of the speaker in the poem “Prohibited History” by Challapalli Swaroopa Rani when she composes the following lines

“In which canto of your country's famed history
Will you write it down, my story? ” (Page no. 165)

Valmiki had a question in his mind that 'why did not an epic poet ever write a word on our lives'? The pangs of Valmiki are similar to the pangs of the speaker in the poem mentioned above. According to an opinion by Ambedkar and Mahatma Phule about the denial of human rights. Later on in his life he has been inspired by both the iconoclasts and their ideologies. Today he is known as one of the most outstanding writers of dalit writing. The root of his success lies in his education. He could overcome all the odds of his life only because of his education. Education offered him a reason to think about good and bad. Though the place where he took his education was not good for him, he remained there and continued his education. Ignoring all the evils on his path, he went on climbing the ladders of success and fought against social inequalities and evils. Even after revolutions of Dr. Ambedkar, the highly educated dalits suffering from identity crisis. As a keen observer of the society, in his one of such observations he writes “the dalits who have become educated face a terrible crisis the crisis of identity- and they are trying to find an easy and instantaneous way to get out of this crisis. They have started to use their family gotra as their surname after just a little bit of fine tuning. (Page 70)”

Conclusion:

Education has proved fruitful for Valmiki though the teachers were not so good towards him. He has got his education in very adverse condition but today he is one of the most outstanding dalit writers. Thus, education played crucial role in his life and shaped his life properly.
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A Study on Changing Perspectives on Marginalisation in Mulk Raj Anand

The problem of class is a universal phenomenon; but Anand’s interest lies in exploring the stresses and strains generated in Indian society as a result of basic economic transformation brought about by various acts of the British government, the penetration into Indian society by commercial and other forces from the alien world of the capitalists, and the establishment of modern industries in India which necessarily demanded new class arrangements in society. Even caste counts nothing in the comparison of class in modern capitalist India.

DEEPTI SHARMA

A social process of being made insignificant or unimportant in terms of material gains and through this, excluding the individuals or the masses from services, programs, and policies run by the various government agencies, is normally known as Marginalisation (Young, 2000). It also refers to being separated from the rest of the society, forced to occupy the periphery and edges and not to be at the centre of things. These deprived are such underprivileged people who could not be considered as a constituent of the mainstream society. Indian Literature is replete with quite a few narratives of protest against discrimination of these socially and economically disadvantaged sections pushed away to the fringes. In a traditional society like ours, caste has played a fundamental role in determining such power relations among various groups. However, as we are moving towards a ‘modernist’ culture characterized by massive machines and heavy industries, we are yet to come to terms with the new forms of resultant marginalization. New centers of power with their predatory agents and modes of exploitation have taken over the erstwhile dominance based on caste. The discourse of ‘caste’ is fast getting replaced by ‘class’. Further, the Western models of development have only aggravated the suffering of these new sections of the marginalized in our society. Mulk Raj Anand was one such visionary who had a glimpse of the impending crisis. Being closely influenced by Marxist views and Gandhian ideals, his novels offer an insight into the process of marginalization and deprivation.

On the other hand, modern economics willfully dedicated to promote an economy based on industrialization brings in more trade, and thereby higher GDP which is believed to generate the ultimate happiness. But will this modern civilization built on the principles of growth and development through big machines help the humanity in a plausible way? People like Gandhi have always been apprehensive about success of such designs of development. According to Gandhi, the industrialization and urbanization have created multiple problems and miseries for the modern man. Critical of modern civilization, he correctly realized that rapid industrialization and galloping urbanization cannot be the panacea to all ills. Increasing industrialization in today’s world has not reduced social inequalities, but has rather resulted in further differentiations. Increasing use of technology has led to greater heterogeneity, greater inequalities and greater un-altruistically oriented behaviour. Gandhi regarded industrialization detrimental growth of a non-violent and eco-friendly society. The end of one misery could well be followed by another pathetic one. The recent ate of killings of innocent farmers (including the clashes atNandigram in West Bengal and Mathura in UP only to name a few) and the case of dispossessed tribals in various parts The country, is only an indicator of the approaching doom.

With this backdrop, I intend to discuss the novels, first, untouchable (1935) and then, Coolie (1936) in order to trace a remarkable evolution in his perspective on the downtrodden. A champion of the marginalized and the underdogs, intolerant to injustice and inequality, Anand has always been a crusader against social distinctions and man-made barriers. A novelist with an inherent social purpose his main aim is to expose the follies and affectations of the privileged classes—priests, money-lenders, businessmen, tea- planters and British rulers. Each one of his novels deals with some social problem mostly related with the lives of the
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marginalized community. The Untouchable deals with the problem of caste whereas the later-published Coolie grapples with a more recent occurrence of exploitation of the poor at the hands of the richer class of humans - the privileged owners of inhuman industries. Bakha, the protagonist of Untouchable is exploited on account of his low birth, whereas Munoo, the Dickensian hero of Coolie meets his tragic end in a social system where there are no castes there are only two classes: the haves and the have-nots. The novel Untouchable portrays the predicament of the lowly people under oppression by the caste Hindus. In his discussion of miserabilisme or dirty realism Fredric Jameson refers to the sociopolitical process of creating the "social other" and consequently of ghettoization the systematic attempt to create "forbidden spaces" for the contemptible sections of the proletariat (Jameson, 1994). The untouchables in ancient Indian society were not only ghettoized but also were expected to perform menial tasks for the upper-class gentry. Bakha, the hero of the novel is forced to live a life of humiliation amidst dehumanizing conditions prevailing in the society. It must be noted that the poignant irony in his case is that he is a slave of slaves. However, forced with a heartfelt urge to improve his plight, he rebels against his situation. While Bakha's complicated existence as an untouchable is situated in the varnashramstructure of Hinduism, Munoo's fate as a rickshaw-puller is tied to his dehumanising work as a coolie. The fact remains that both Bakha and Munoo are helpless labourers whose work has been permanently devalued and misappropriated. However, Anand stretches the metaphors of untouchable and coolie to suggest that we all are untouchables and coolies (Verma, 2008). At the very beginning Anand gives us a bleak but vivid picture of the outcaste's dark and uncongenial colony thus providing a background for the concept of untouchability. The thatched mud-houses clustered together in two rows are utterly ill-fitted for human habitation. It looks as though the scavengers, leather-workers, washermen, barbers, and water-carriers - all these inhabitants of the colony are subhuman non-entities huddled up together. They should be content to live in gutter like worms only to be crushed by the superior caste people.

In this sensitive portrayal of an individual Muluk Raj Anand displays his penetrating thoughts and humane attitude in understanding the grim realities of social life in India. For the privileged people, the ghettoized slum of the untouchables is a forbidden place, aptly termed 'out-castes colony' which reveals the callous and even inimical attitude of the privileged people towards an integral section of the same society. The marginalization of the unfortunate people was obviously caused by some misconceived designs of certain upper caste people who treated the outcastes as their moveable, yet untouchable property. Commenting on the theme of the novel, E M Forster writes in the Preface to the book: "Untouchable could only have been written by an Indian who observed from the outside. No European, however sympathetic, could have created the character of Bakha, because he would not have known enough about his troubles. And no Untouchable could have written the book, because he would have been involved in indignation and self-pity." Regarding the source of this protest in his writings, Anand himself admits: "...From that time onwards my protest about the human predicament, under the empire and in the atmosphere of our own decay, often resulting from blind acceptance of bad habits and the taboos of the sage Manu and the Hadith tradition of Islam, became self-conscious. In this way, I sensed the pain of life, which the more privileged took out of the weaker members of the flock." (Anand, 1999)

The Untouchable ends with the novelist proposing that the advent of modern technology and machinery could be a plausible solution to the problem of age-old untouchability. However, this vision of the abolition of this sin and the formation of civil society is dependent on industrialization and hence on the full application of modernity which can be heralded only by the British rule in India. But it is only an instance of a hasty generalization, to pass a final verdict on Anand's vision favouring a society based on the values of modern world order based on the values of Modernity.

Coolie presents the class distinction between the rich and the poor and by way of depicting the sad and pathetic life of Munoo, a young boy from a village in the Kangra hills of Himachal Pradesh. It is a human tragedy caused by poverty, exploitation, cruelty, greed and selfishness. It is not fate or the Almighty, but the society in which he is brought up, responsible for the tragedy of this Dickensian character Munoo. Like the tragic heroes of the great novelist and playwright, John Galsworthy, Munoo is the victim of social forces that work against him. He is a universal figure who represents the miseries of the poor and marginalized section of society. Social forces of exploitation and poverty determine the life of Munoo in the novel. The novel depicts the yawning gap between the haves and have-nots, the exploiters and the exploited, the rulers and the ruled, the powerful and the powerless. It is a veritable saga of unending pain, suffering and prolonged struggle punctuated only occasionally by brief moments of relief and hope. In a cruel act of destiny, Munoo loses his father at a tender age of fourteen. The tragic death was forced because the poor man could not pay the debt of his landlord. The helpless boy could not forget the way in which his father suffered and his mother toiled every day to earn a livelihood. He had also heard how the landlord had seized his father's five acres of land. Munoo's happy idyllic life comes to an abrupt end when he is forced to work as a domestic servant and is badly treated in the city. His fate takes him to the civilized world of city-dwellers, more refined in their customs, where the miserable boy is strained to work in a pickle factory. Not much later, with the fall of his master, he has to look for another employment but finds it very hard to get one and starts working as a coolie. His experiences as a coolie in the grain market, in the vegetable market and in the streets and lanes of the town are most disappointing and depressing. The picture of coolies lying huddled at night because they don't have enough and adequate accommodation, and their scrambling for work during day time, reveals the sufferings which the multitudes
of the unemployed people had to undergo during those days. When again forced to leave for Bombay in search for a livelihood, Munoo realizes "The bigger a city is, the crueler it is to the sons of Adam...You have to pay even for the breath you breathe."

Munoo's fate does not change for better in Bombay either. He feels surprised to find that even in this city, which was reported to be grand and glorious one, thousands and thousands of people sleep on the pavements for want of a proper dwelling. Furthermore, employment here is too difficult to find as no industrial society can provide for all the needs of its people. Munoo finds Hariappealing to the head foreman of a cotton mill, Jimmie Thomas for a job as if Hari were a beggar asking for alms. Jimmie gives Hari, his wife and Munoo employment not out of any sympathy for them in their distress but because he expects to get his commission and also to charge interest on the loan which he offers to Hari. This state of affairs shows how the poor and unprivileged are exploited.

It is again remarkable that Bakha is a victim or exploitation by the people of upper castes whereas in the case of Munoo his exploiters include his own peers. The level of deterioration of human values sinks down to the lowest in this 'modern' urban society. The homogeneity commonly found in a rustic society disappears here. It is not only the head foreman of the mill who exploits the needy workers but also the gate-keeper. There is also a shopkeeper who sells the daily-needs of life to the penniless workers on credit and charges high interests which aggravate their misery. Munoo, Hari and other coolies continue to work in the mill and bear patiently all the exploitations and atrocities committed to them by their employers and other persons. But the crowded dwellings, dirty and insufficient toilets, regular deductions made from their low pay on one pretext or the other, dismissal of Ratan who has been a member of the trade union, etc. are the chief causes that compel the Trade Union leaders to be active for the cause of the labourers. Munoo hears the speeches made by the leaders of Red Flag Union. He is impressed particularly by Sudha's speech: "There are only two kinds of people in the world: the rich and the poor, and between the two there is no connection."

The callous and inhuman face of this modern society is further reflected when Munoo runs up the Malabar Hills to escape the hectic police action and gets knocked down by the motor-car of an Anglo-Indian lady, Mrs. Mainwaring, a lady of vast pretensions and no morals, who takes him to Shimla as she is in need of a servant. Unmindful of the boy's sufferings, she keeps munoo as her domestic servant and often exploits him sexually while at the same time, Munoo pulls the rickshaw like a beast whenever she wants to go out for shopping or for some social visit.

The task of pulling the rickshaw puts a severe strain on his lungs and gets infected by T.B and is moved to a hospital on the slopes Chotta Simla where, in the early hours of one unreal, white night he passes away, but surely not before being exploited and despised by society, rejected by his relatives and oppressed by his masters. As a victim of social forces, Munoo's tragic denial of life is caused by poverty which proves to be the greatest misfortune for him. He belongs to the marginalized class of the poor, if not to the Dalits and Untouchables. Not caste but class to which Munoo belongs is responsible for the treatment he receives from society. Thus, in the coolie, Mulk Raj Anand draws our attention to the class-discrimination and centers the novel on the theme of class-consciousness. The main concern of the novelist is the problem of the newly formed class system. This power can corrupt a man so much so that he may even purchase a fellow human being and totally subjugate him. Munoo certainly serves as a symbol of Anand's dissatisfaction with a society whose utilitarian concern unscrupulously massacres social morality. He is the representative of those thousands of the poor and oppressed classes of India who are severely crushed to dust under the all-powerful foot of the industrialized society. Anand focuses on the inhuman attitude of the capitalist system which ignores the human element in the labourers and treats them as mere 'hands' of the machine that functions only for their profit and man is treated only as a tool, notas a living human being of flesh and blood with a conscience and a soul. (Dickens, Hard Times)

The problem of class is a universal phenomenon; but Anand's interest lies in exploring the stresses and strains generated in Indian society as a result of basic economic transformation brought about by various acts of the British government, the penetration into Indian society by commercial and other forces from the alien world of the capitalists, and the establishment of modern industries in India which necessarily demanded new class arrangements in society. Even caste counts nothing in the comparison of class in modern capitalist India.
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The Fall of All Passions in Milton's Life and Art

Milton (1608-74) has been read as an epic poet and within it as a writer of a Christian epic, for its sublimity, its Homeric similes, the grandeur of Satan, raising thus the controversy whether he invested the Devil with his own passion for revolt, but rarely has he been studied as to, how having learnt a lesson not to pursue things passionately in the narrow compass, albeit negatively and suffering as himself in his body in the form of blindness, could he envision the fall of Satan and Adam, ignoring rational understanding of things. The present paper purports to underline the fall of passions and emotions in Milton’s art and life. It puts in perspective how passions blind us to reason, enabling us, as they did Milton, Satan and Adam. Milton has no tragic view to propound in either, not even in Samson Agonistes as he said in the last mentioned, that there is no tragedy when the mind is Calm in the consequence, when all passions are spent.

Suman Kumari

Milton's tragic view of life is that mankind live by passions and not by reason. He sums up the way to salvation from all kinds of passion-hatred, envy, jealousy, even hope and love through, "Calm of mind all passion spent", a phrase in his Samson Agonistes (L. 1758). All his personages, (including his own self) are fallible. Milton himself lived a passionate life charging others, as being charged in return, in the thick of political debates that he raised against the censorship of press as for example in Areopagitica and "on Divorce", vehemently pleading for easy divorce laws. All his prose writings are polemical in nature.

His pamphlet on poem, called "The Passion" is written on crucifixion, but this theme was not congenial to him, as it involved pain. Milton believed that sorrow is bad, joy good, because the former diminishes the power of body or mind. Passion is not power, but weakness, slavery, as Milton believed. This is the ethical part of Milton's poetry, but he came to this understanding by the hard way till his passions for writing, his polemical pamphlets resulted in the loss of his eyesight. He came to learn that though there is nothing more useful to man than his own perfection, even as in case of his own affirmation, of his might, but he also came to know that virtuous action is rational action, and not merely one's egoism. Thus, his blindness was a turning point in his life, a change as against the general belief attested by E.M.W. Tillyard in his introduction to Milton in Fifteen Poets that :

"Milton never changed from first to last, that his nature was excessively rigid and austere, (107)

Milton put his past life in the higher scheme of things, in knowing the true causes of things or saw them in their necessary relation to God. This becomes evident in his sonnet "On His Blindness", written around at the age of 42. The sonnet is a dividing line between his earlier and later self, the former marked by passions and the latter by knowledge. His passions charged his mind when he looked at issues most often personal, as for example his mismarriage with Mary Powell, prompting him to write on making easy divorce laws, which subsequently led him to further angry outburst against censor. Similarly his First Defence is written on behalf of Oliver Cromwell with whom he sided and against Charles I. It was equally virulent. His Second Defense was more of a quarrel against Alexander and in favour of the cause of the commonwealth to which he was personally committed. Of course, he argued that government should not be narrowly formed for one person or persons who rule not by reason but by their whims and desires. There are passages in this book which speak of Milton's sense of freedom. However, he ignored larger perspective that even his conception of commonwealth as that of Oliver Cromwell could be distortional. Such contradictions in his early writings virtually blinded him to see things in larger contexts.

It is in this context that his sonnet is significant, that it widens his perspective. Milton comes to know that absolute freedom is an illusion. There is no such thing as free will everything in nature is determined, only when we do not know adequate knowledge we assert our will. The decision of the will and the causal indetermination are one and the same thing: considered under the attribute of thought we call it determination, man thinks that he is free because he is ignorant of causes. The falling stone, as Benedict Spinoza
says, would regard itself as free it were conscious. Because he thinks itself free, it forms the idea of praise and blame, sin and guilt. Milton identifies human freedom with inderminism. This is what he comes to realize that seen in relation to clear knowledge, there is no point in feeling guilty about not returning God's gift or questioning:

**Doth God exact day-labour, light denied?**

However, he soon realizes that it was a foolish question. Milton's God, as he himself said, does not need either man's work or his own gifts. Milton's God is the rational part of manthe better part, the more he understands the universe in all its relations, the freer will he be from hate and fear, anger and envy, love and hope, pity and repentance. He who knows the true causes of things will love God. This intellectual love of God is the love of God for himself, for man is a mode of God, a mode of knowledge of true causes of things. This God loves himself, i.e. knowledge is godly when one is free from passions which are confused states and inadequate ideas—the passive side of human mind. Milton at the end of the sonnet announces that all that he has to do, indeed, all men, is to suffer the mild yoke, for they also serve who stand and wait. This is no surrender but a submission. This is made possible by Milton's ethical stance, that mind's highest good is knowledge of God and that mind's highest virtue is to know God, i.e. to know the necessary causes, as in his own case i.e., his blindness was caused by passions in losing his eye sight in irrational response to multiple issues; he could not preserve his real being; he could not seek his own true utility, his own true good, nor could he act under the guidance of reason; men who are governed by reason desire nothing for themselves which they do not also desire for the rest of mankind. On the contrary, Milton's earlier life was marred by conflicts. Hence, this sonnet underlines the necessity that he should relinquish his wish, his natural right in order that he may live in peace with others, to quote Walt Whitman:

"One'self I sing, a simple separate person
Yet utter the word democratic, the word Enmasse.
(From "One'self I sing."")

While Milton recovered himself from his inadequate and confused ideas caused by his passion or pride, that he was not right in his opinions when his blindness overtook him and made him feel that he is determined, Satan on whom most of Paradise Lost is centered, could not. It is not that he did not suffer his fall in the worst of dungeon but his indomitable pride will not let him. Satan is all negative emotions which blind him to reason. Before coming to write Paradise Lost, Milton deliberated over the choice of his subject. The theme of the fall of man was not initially in his mind, though he wanted to write on some lofty subject comparable to Iliad or the Odyssey. Nevertheless, he wanted to write an epic, a Christian epic in it. His passion for individual perfection, his struggle for commonwealth provided him with a new material, his sufferings at the hands of his enemies but his blindness changed the course of his life. Except for a little murmur, Milton submitted to rational understanding that the service to God is not what God requires; he is above all these things, and indeed, unlike human beings, is not swayed by passions. It is the lesser beings, may they be archangels and even God's chosen creatures, who are stirred up with envy and love, akin to mental blindness. Milton seems to think that lesser mortals do not realize the force of emotions. In his description and speeches of Satan, Milton does not blame the archrebel so much as he focuses on his slavery to passions. It is not that Satan's mind was in anyway defective, it was only not equal to his blinding passion of envy, particularly against God's chosen creatures Adam and Eve.

Milton does not dismiss passions and emotions from human life; rather what he seems to say is that they should be understood in their origin and nature. They are natural like other things, follow as they do, the same necessity as virtue and other things. What Milton suggests in the fall of Satan is that he in preserving his egotistical self, ignores that he should seek his own true good or act under the guidance of reason, and that he should have desired nothing for himself which he did not desire for the rest of mankind. Adam and Eve were not his rivals, but even if he thought them so, love of enemy is good; hatred and envy are evil; this understanding would have helped him to achieve unity of purpose with Adam and Eve. Indeed, nothing helps a man to preserve his real being more than another rational being; hence, while seeking our own good and being good to one another, we would create a commonwealth which Milton desired.

Satan's fall from heaven to Hell was brought about by his obdurate pride, more specifically what he called his "injured merit" in relation to the creation of Adam and Eve whom God not only created and placed them in the Garden of Eden but were also very dear to him. Had Satan thought that nothing exists in isolation and that man who seeks his own true utility will be useful in loving others, he would not have gone to tempt Eve. He did not understand that the new creatures were also not free, as they were also not allowed to eat the fruit of forbidden tree, as he also was not free to hate other creatures and thereby weaken his strength. Both Adam-Eve and Satan disobeyed eternal order by their respective emotional responses.

There is something of both Satan and Adam-Eve in Milton of his earlier life when he charged others even the state passionately. William Blake was not very off the mark when he said that Milton was of Devil's party, without knowing it. However, he purged himself through the fall of Satan. Paradise Lost is an attempt on Milton's part, though it required a great deal of effort, to understand that we are determined both by our nature and the force of emotions. All passions and emotions are, however not negative. The difference between positive and negative emotions and passions is that while the former increase our power of acting, the latter decrease our comprehension and grasp of the whole of things. What promotes our comprehension is good. Joy,
for example, is good, sorrow bad. Sorrow is the transition from greater to less. This is reflected in the defeat of Satan and his subsequent failure to take on God. He rather chooses a devious path of injuring the Almighty i.e. knowledge with ignorance by bringing down the fall of his loved creatures.

In the first book itself, Satan expresses his sense of loss, though he still nurses grievance against God. The cause of his sorrow, his pain, his injury, is his hope to take revenge and thus rehabilitate himself in heaven

Milton's companion pieces "L'Allegro" "Il Penseroso" represent two attitudes of joy and sorrow. "L'Allegro" is a happy man. He dismisses melancholy, the child of blackest midnight when darkness spreads its jealous wings and invokes the goddess of joy, Empysony, so called in heaven by men of heart-easing mirth. On the other, Il Penseroso bids farewell to joys. Such is Milton's muse. The fallen Angels in Paradise Lost Book I also bewail that they must change for heaven, this mournful gloom of hell but do not make any effort to redeem themselves. Milton feels that striving for joy is the very essence of every living thing; we feel joy when we are able to pass to a higher state of being; we feel sorrow though passivity and suffering when we pass to a lower state. Satan's action are mechanical; they are in the nature of his reactions, there is no love, no joy in what he does; on the contrary, he passes on to a lower existence and becomes a sneaking snake to tempt Eve. In his invocation to the Muse, Milton himself urges the Deity to:

What in me is dark
Illumine, what is low raise and support,
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal providence,
And justify the ways of God to man (PL. BK I, 23-26)
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