

Human Relations: In Shadows of Casteism

Rupali Purkaystha, Dr. Pawan Kumar

Research Supervisor, Shri Khushal Das University, Hanumangarh

Department of English

Article Info

Page Number: 5125 - 5133

Publication Issue:

Vol 71 No. 4 (2022)

Article History

Article Received: 15 September 2022

Revised: 25 October 2022

Accepted: 14 November 2022

Publication: 21 December 2022

Abstract

will concentrate on the ways in which casteism manifests itself in Indian society. Arundhati Roy is a novelist and activist, and her book, "The God in Little Things," is considered by many to be her "magnum opus." The God of Small Things provides an honest representation of the modern challenges that are confronted by the typical type of Indian civilisation. In this work, author Arundhati Roy has made a concerted effort to provide the reader with nearly all of the relevant social and historical information. She has done this so that the readers would be able to become acquainted with the manner of living, the daily routine, the ceremonies, the customs, and the rituals that are practiced, as well as the habits. This book analyzes how apparently unimportant circumstances may have a huge impact on people's lives and the activities they engage in. For the entirety of India's history, social class was and still is a major worry in many parts of the country, as it is in many of India's regions today.

Keywords: Human Relations, Arundathi Roy, Shadows of Casteism

INTRODUCTION

SOCIETAL CONTEXTS IN THE WRITINGS OF ARUNDHATI ROY

Suzzana Arundhati Roy became the first Indian woman to win the Booker Prize after she was selected as the recipient of the prestigious award. It was in the year 1997 when she first started working in the field of literature. But, she spent her early infancy in the hamlet of Ayemenem (Aymanam), which is located just a few kilometers from Kottayam in the central part of Kerala. Her father worked as a tea farmer in Shilong, which is where she was born; however, she spent her early childhood in Ayemenem (Aymanam). The author's first book, which was nominated for the Man Booker Prize and was published under the title *The God of Small Things*, centers on this town as its primary setting. The path that Arundhati took through life was littered with challenges and agony at every step. Arundhati and her mother were compelled to relocate back to Ayemenem since her father had gotten a divorce from his wife a few years after Arundhati was born. This meant that they had to be with Arundhati's mother. When her mother, Mary Roy, married a Bengali guy and then divorced him, she was the first person in her family to do anything that was considered unconventional. Also, she played a key part in the progression of history by campaigning for the adoption of the Christian Succession Act and even argued her case in front of the Supreme Court of the United States. Following the successful conclusion of the trial, she and her siblings were each awarded an equal share of the property that had previously

belonged to their father. Hence, Arundhati was the product of growing up in a home that was not functioning properly.

Inside the Ayemenem home, the customary patriarchal clutches were responsible for exerting a significant amount of control. Traditional worldviews were held by the males who lived there and were otherwise affiliated with the home in any other way. This phenomenon is shown in a stunningly beautiful way in the book by the character Ammu, who stands in for her mother, Mary, and who was forced to go through a lot of ordeals and struggles because of the oppressive patriarchal environment in which she lived. Mary was forced to go through a lot of ordeals and struggles because of the patriarchal environment in which she lived. We do not find in Roy's work either a commitment to a bygone era or even a humorous depiction of the struggles faced by those in the middle class. Instead, Roy makes an effort to write about the post-traditional worldview in conjunction with the rapidly developing reality of modern India, yet none of these things can be found in his work. As a direct result of Roy's work, the boundaries of the English language have been expanded in every conceivable way. She has been praised by the Booker committee for the remarkable linguistic inventiveness that she exhibits across her body of work. She is a writer whose work has given the tradition of Indian literature in English a new meaning as a result of her contributions.

She has published a large number of essays and articles on a wide range of subjects, in addition to her novel; however, the one thing that links all of her works together is the fact that the problems that are discussed in each one are for the people of India, of the people of India, and to the people of India. Her novel is the only work of hers that has been translated into English. The narrative, the plot, the theme, and the characters all work together to reveal a complex web of Indian feelings, events, incidents, conflicts, psychological investigation, societal laws, political perspectives, history, caste differentiation, gender determination and manipulation of love laws (who should be loved and how and how much), suffering, and hypocrisy. *The God of Little Things* embodies many of the fundamental principles that underpin the Hindu way of life. In a word, what Ms. Roy is trying to convey is that this depiction of Indian culture in relation to this topic features three dimensions:

The atmosphere of "*The God of Small Things*" was influenced in large part by my own personal experiences of what it was like to grow up in the Indian state of Kerala [...] As a result of the fact that my mother had a divorce when I was a little child, my upbringing was quite similar to that of the children in the book..

Through the use of her characters, she has brought to light ostentation and hypocrisy, Marxism, patriarchal domination, and callous police administration; the problem of love laws; a relationship that is forbidden between an untouchable and a touchable; and most importantly, a highly debated theme of incestuous relation between the thug class and the upper castes. With the employment of her characters, she has done all in her power to illustrate the socioeconomic situations that face men and women who come from a variety of social strata. A private story gradually develops into a bigger conflict in which the identities of people are engaged for the purpose of establishing supremacy and satisfying the requirements of society. This occurs when the author decides to show the subject matter as a three-sided affair in his or her handling of the issue in his or her presentation of the subject matter.

An examination of the many dimensions of India's quickly changing social scene might use the individual's experience as a springboard to get started. The concept of untouchability, which is still widely practiced in India, is mentioned, albeit in an oblique manner.

It is crucial to highlight that the tabooed relationship of Ammu with Velutha, an untouchable, may not seem surprising to a westernized urban sensibility; yet, a traditional caste mindset, especially in India, is likely to be startled by such a breach. It is important to underline that this. The reason for this is that in Indian society, the concept of caste functions as a social construct that is firmly embedded. Ammu rejects the 'love rules' and embarks on an illegal relationship with Velutha, an untouchable who is also a victim of the system. Both of them have been victimized by the system. It is probable that Mammachi employs him at her factory to carry out the responsibilities of a carpenter due to his skills in the fields of craftsmanship and mechanics.

THE SHADOW OF SOCIAL ACTIVISM

Arundhati is a brilliant post-colonial writer who is also extremely well-known as an activist in India and abroad. She has garnered acclaim from people all over the world. Her body of work has attracted a lot of attention from people all around the world. The power structures of imaginary civilizations are the subject of both of her works, *The God of Small Things* and *The Ministry of Utmost Joy*, which she has written. Her non-fiction work is nothing more than a continuation of the storyline of the novel on a more realistic level, which is the only difference between the two types of writing that she has produced. Her objective is to raise the condition of people who are oppressed from a position of weakness and insignificance to one that is substantial and significant in order to achieve her aim.

As this is a fight to determine whether or not humanity will continue to exist, everyone involved in the struggle must throw their disguises and identities to the side and engage in the combat as themselves. Should the current state of affairs not change, it will be the end of not just our dreams but also the dreams of our children's children and so on. Her struggle is against those who are strong, including communists, fascists, and governments that are armed with nuclear weapons, as well as their hegemony and supremacy over countries that are economically developing. In addition, she is fighting those who have power over those who do not have it, such as the rulers of helpless non-citizens like the Adivasis and the untouchables, as well as those who have been slaughtered and those who have been uprooted in Gujarat, Narmada, Iraq, and Palestine.

The author Arundhati Roy suggests that there is a third reality, which she calls the "world of mirrors." This region is situated in the middle, between the powerful and the powerless. It is a world in which both men and women take up a confident attitude, but neither men nor women define themselves as belonging to any of the other two worlds. The people who live in this planet obey all of the social laws, in spite of the fact that these regulations are illogical and senseless. The majority of people who have been displaced do not have a voice, and they are not regarded to be citizens of the nation in which they presently dwell. According to her, the people whose lives would be made more difficult as a result of decisions are not included in the process by which these decisions are made.

The caste system has been around for a very long time in India, and it is largely responsible for the horizontal separation that exists throughout Indian culture. The most defenseless elements of society are now going through difficult times, and the continuous structural degeneration constitutes a threat to the very existence of every member of the community as a whole. Her goal in writing non-fiction is to free people from the shackles of tradition, and she hopes to accomplish this via her writing. Noncitizens are forced to suffer as a direct result of actions made by powerful individuals who either have a profound insight of the human condition or who seek to give the appearance of having such an understanding in order to further their own self-serving agendas. She is a fervent opponent of globalization in the corporate sector because she believes that it widens the distance between the people who make decisions and the people who have to suffer as a result of those decisions.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LITERATURE AND SOCIETY

The Term “Society” means relationships of social beings, men, express their nature by creating and re-creating an organization which controls their behavior in myriad ways. Society liberates and limits the activities of men and it is necessary condition of every human beings and need to fulfillment of life. Society is a system of usages and procedures of authority and mutual aid many divisions of controls of human behavior and of liberties. This changing system, we call society and it is always changing. Society exists only where social beings “behave’ toward one another.

Society is an abstract term that connotes the complex of inter-relations that exist between and among the members of the group. Society exists wherever there are good or bad, proper or improper relationships between human beings. These social relationships are not evident, they do not have any concrete form, and hence society is abstract. Society is not a group of people; it means in essence a state or condition, a relationship and therefore necessarily an abstraction. Society is organization of Relationships. It is the total complex of human relationships. It includes whole range of human relations. Social Relationships invariably possess a physical element, which takes form of awareness of another’s presence, common objective or common interest. We can say that society is the union itself, the organisation, the sum total of formal relations which associating individuals are bound together. Societies consist in mutual interaction and inter relation of individuals and of the structure formed by the relations.

Literature and Society are in their nature two interesting aspects that intertwines each other, Yet to understand their relationship, it would like to put some statements from Rene Wellek and Austin Warren in their book Theory of Literature as follows

The relationship between Literature and Society as usually discussed by starting with the phrase, derived from the De Bonald, that literature is an expression of society, but what does this axiom mean? It is assumed that literature at any given time mirrors the current social institution ‘correctly’, it is false; it is commonplace, trite and vague if it means only that literature depicts some aspects of social reality.

Therefore, they offer a specific evaluative criterion that the relation between literature and Society is that literature mirrors or expresses life because an artist is supposed to express or mirrors the whole life of a given time but means his or her time correctly completely; the artist is aware of the specific social, economic, political, and religious condition in his or her era, and he or she should be representative of his or her age and society; it is the artist's duty to convey historical as well as social truths as a symbol of artistic values in literature. Thus literature can also be viewed as the essence, the abridgement and summary all history. Therefore the relation between literature and Society is very close in which the reader can catch literature as the mirror reflects the society as well as in the author's era .

OBJECTIVES

1. To analyse how Casteism and politics destroys the harmony of a place, community or even families which affects their relationship?
2. To understand how the innocence of individuals can be destroyed by the evils of Caste system and Politics.

CASTE IS CLASS, COMRADES

My hypothesis, which states that caste is the most important factor in determining subaltern status in *The God of Small Things*, requires that I make a distinction between class and caste in order to demonstrate that my hypothesis, which states that class is the least important factor in determining subaltern status, is accurate. The vast majority of readings, including those that focus on the Dalit (untouchable) elements of the text, do not immediately differentiate between the two issues. This is true for both of these types of readings. The majority of the interpretations support this interpretation.

The analogy of "jam-jelly," which Roy used to characterise Mammachi's product, is the most effective method to explain the dichotomy because it combines two seemingly incompatible concepts. Roy stated that the sanctioning authority never gives the product a favourable review because the product's consistency poses a challenge to any form of classification due to its thickness. My position is that the singularity of caste neither enables Roy to fully align herself with the subaltern group that has its ideological sympathy for the Naxalite Movement nor compels her to wholeheartedly subscribe to Eurocentric feminism, which does not take contextual history and politics into consideration. Rather, my position is that the singularity of caste neither enables nor compels Roy to fully align herself with the subaltern group that has its ideological sympathy for the Naxalite Movement. Instead, it provides Roy with the opportunity to completely identify herself with the subaltern group that shares ideological sympathies with the Naxalite Movement. The tangled nature of the subject is reflected in the contradictory opinions that Comrade Pillai holds on class, both in public and in private settings.

To get his message across to others that "Caste is Class, Comrades," he presents himself in public with a perspective on caste that is all-encompassing. (TGST 281). Chacko is privy to the following confession, which he makes to him in private: "You see, Comrade, from the viewpoint of the locals, these caste difficulties are very profoundly ingrained.... They were pre-programmed from the minute

they were born until they reached adulthood. It has been brought to their attention by me that this is not accurate. But if we're going to be totally forthright about this, Comrade, Change is a whole different ballgame. Acceptance is a further point to consider. (TGST 278-9). The "deeprooted" separation that exists within the community as a result of the existence of four varnas (castes) is what, in the end, makes it impossible to realise the Marxist ideal of transforming society into a state in which there are no classes.

THE FLUID CLASS CATEGORIES IN TGST

The story "The God of Small Things" is set against the background of the ascent to power of the Communist Party in Kerala, which serves as the framework for the political events that are portrayed in the novel. It is imperative that we address the class problem using Marxist nomenclature because of Roy's analysis of the flaws in the political structure. This analysis shows that there are flaws in the political structure. Karl Marx was of the opinion that class was a social phenomenon and that possession of the means of production was the determining factor in the economic underpinning that served as the basis for social stratification. Marx, through his material \ dialectics, identifies different stages in the course of history in which the dominant group acquires supremacy over other groups by controlling the means of production of food and commodities. Marx's analysis is based on the idea that the dominant group is able to do this because it controls the means of production. His thesis is outlined in the novel "Das Kapital," which Marx wrote.

The unequal access that different societal classes have to different resources is inevitably going to result in conflicts between those classes. Marx was of the opinion that the end of class struggles would usher in the ultimate change, and that this change would come about as a result of revolutions. Lenin, who worked alongside Marx, offers the following explanation for this phenomenon: The term "class" refers to large groups of individuals who are differentiated from one another in terms of the position they hold within a social production system that has been historically determined, their relation (which is typically predetermined and codified by law) to the means of production, the part they play in the social organisation of labor, and, as a result, the size of the portion of the social wealth of which they are in possession as well as the means by which they have acquired it. This is known as the "class structure." (qtd. in Utomo 421) These justifications are flawed in a number of different ways, some of which are not noticeable until the broader context of the novel is taken into consideration.

Due to the reality that Pappachi the Imperial Entomologist works for the government, for instance, it is possible that he does not automatically meet the requirements for aristocracy or a superior social class. One of the perspectives that can be derived from an orthodox Marxist analysis is this one. On the other hand, due to the fact that he is a respected member of the community, there is a possibility that he will be a part of the Upper Class. In a similar manner, Mammachi and Chacko are regarded as members of the aristocracy due to the fact that they own the pickle business and, as a result, have access to the means of production. In the meantime, it is not difficult to identify the members of the proletariat working class among the personnel in the workplace, including the leaders of the trade organisations. Despite this, Comrade Pillai is considered to be a member of the middle class because he is the owner of a printing press and because of the authority he has in the community. The fact that

Chacko is so close to state organisations and wields such power over his fellow employees is fueling the notion that he should be demoted or removed from his position of authority within the company he works for. Permit me to illustrate how fluid the class classifications are throughout the text by referring to some of the more prominent characters.

CAN THE SUBALTERN BE STORIED

Is writing Arundhati Roy's primary occupation, or does she also engage in activism? Is she more of a feminist or a Marxist? Without falling into the nomenclature error, it is fair to say that Roy has remained an anti-capitalist and has maintained his opposition to powerful people or big things. This holds true for both her works of fiction and her works of non-fiction alike. Her viewpoints are consistent with the historiographical programme that the subaltern group is working on. The Oxford University Press in India was responsible for the dissemination of a number of publications that gave the organisation its first public profile. The first edition, which Ranajit Guha was responsible for editing and publishing, came out in 1982. Guha and his colleagues who received their education in the west offered a rebuttal to the aristocratic method of historical documentation employed by the Cambridge School, which upheld its imperial heritage. They were interested in researching the uprisings of the subalterns, a group that has been largely overlooked by the standard narrative of Indian history.

The Naxalite Movement is the source of inspiration for the members of the subaltern group who are the exponents. After almost twenty years had passed since the rebellion, a group of Indian historians whose formative years were connected to the experience of Naxalbari attempted to rewrite "history from below." They published The Subaltern Studies Collective, which went on to become a significant postcolonial body of scholarship with an Indian flavour. Ranajit Guha served as the group's leader. There is not a singular description of the subaltern that is provided by the collective. I'd like to take a page from Indrajit Roy's article in the Oxford data stream and present three definitions of the word that illustrate how the members of the group view it differently:

According to Ranajit Guha (1982), the "mass of the labouring population and the intermediate strata in town and country" are what he means when he talks about the "subaltern." Spivak (1992) provided further elaboration on this concept, stating that "everything that has limited or no access to the cultural imperialism is subaltern." These realisations served as the foundation for Chakrabarty's (2002) description of the ideal figure of the subaltern. He defined this figure as "the person who survives actively, even joyously, on the assumption that the statist instruments of domination will always belong to somebody else and never aspires to them."

CONCLUSION

It is reasonable to suppose that in order for Roy to produce a piece of art in the same vein as R.K. Jeter, she has combined real events from her own life with a vivid fictional invention. In the book "In My Days," Narayan makes the observation that "fiction outlasts facts"³. Graham Greene is another author who has highlighted the importance of a writer's creative unity in the organizing of life's seemingly

random occurrences in a fictional work. Arundhati Roy is aware of the mingling of realistic autobiographical experiences and the power of the shaping imagination, which can create life size images out of the facts with chimerical nature. According to him, writing out of a provocative personal life the writer tries "to reduce a chaos of experience to some sort of order and a hungry curiosity."⁴ Arundhati Roy is conscious of this mingling of realistic autobiographical experiences and the power of the shaping imagination. While she is aware that the story of *The God of Small Things* is "my story," she is equally emphatic about this unique linguistic tool, stating, "My language is mine; it's the way I think and the way I write." In this process, her unusual life with no less unusual upbringing contributes a lot in developing a formula of artistic creation which happily unfolds through the tool of her 177 language which by its capacity for indignation makes it just an inseparable part of her personality You are aware that I do not fumble around and attempt, that I do not stress over the phrase, and that I do not rewrite. It was merely a matter of doing a lot of rearranging.⁵ It is through this harmonization of truth with fiction that Roy makes her work more than "metro novels of the 1980s," and she scores t relatively higher than what S'.

REFERENCES

1. Spivak. G. C. (1988). *Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography*. in R. Guha & G. Spivak (ed.). *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p.no.89-92
2. Spivak. G.C. (1988). "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg(ed.). Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press. p.no.156-160
3. Spivak. G.C. (1991). "Theory in the Margin: Coetzee's *Foe* Reading Defoe's *Crusoe/Roxana*". in Jonathan Arac and Barbara Johnson (ed.) *Consequences of Theory: Selected Papers of the English Institute. 1987-1988*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. p.no.145-148
4. Spivak. G.C. (1995). *Supplementing Marxism*. Bernd Magnus & Cullenberg (ed.). *Whither Marxism? Global Crises in the International Context*. London: p.no.189-192
5. Routledge. Europe Spivak. G.C. (1996). *Subaltern Talk: Interview with the Editors*. Donna L. & Gerald M. (ed.). *The Spivak Reader*. London: Routledge. p.no.135-137
6. Spivak. G. C. (2000). *The New Subaltern: A Silent Interview*. Vinayak Chaturvedi (ed.). *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*. London: Verse. 2000. 234-327 p.no.178-180
7. The Holy Bible: New International Version. Grand Rapids. MI: Zondervan. 1984. Print. Visvanathan. Susan. *The Christians of Kerala: History. Belief and Rituals among the Yakoba*. New Delhi: Oxford UP. 1993. p.no.165-169
8. Print. Woolf. Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. New Delhi: Cambridge UP. 1998. Print. Zaidi. Nishat. "Strategies of Voicing the Devoiced: A Feminist Reading of *The God of Small Things*." *Indian English Literature*. Vol. V.. Ed. Basavaraj Naikar. New Delhi: Atlantic. 2004.137- 47. Print. P.no.160-174.
9. *The God of Small Things*. New Delhi. India Ink Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd.. 1997. *The End of Imagination*. Kottayam. Kerala. D.C. Books. 1998. *The Greater Common Good*. A long article published in *Frontline*. May 22-June 4.1999. p.no.175-179
10. *The Algebra of Infinite Justice*. New Delhi: Penguin Books Pvt. Ltd.. 2002. (B) *Critical Studies*:

A.N. Prasad. Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things: p.no.180-184

11. A Critical Appraisal. New Delhi. Sarup & Sons. 2004. Indira Bhatt. *Arundhati Roy's The God of Small Things*. (ed.). New Delhi: Creative Books. 1999. Jaydip Singh Dodiya. Joya Chakravarty (Ed.). *The Critical Studies of Arundhati Roy's* p.no.185-189
12. The God of Small Things. New Delhi. Atlantic Pub..1999. K.V. Surendran. *The God of Small Things: A Saga of Lost Dreams*. New Delhi. p.no.190-195