

Chapter-1

Introduction

Literature has been seen as a representational paradigm of life since antiquity. From the times of Plato and Aristotle, it has been a moot point for academic discussions, whether literature should be for moralistic purpose or for the purpose of pleasure. In nineteenth century it has been a point of conflict between the two streams of thoughts. B. Prasad in his *An Introduction to English Criticism* defines both streams, one is:

‘Art for Life’s Sake’ advocated by Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin. For them, art and morals are interdependent. . . . Another stream is ‘Art for Art’s Sake’. The cry was taken up in America by the poet-critic Edgar Allan Poe who declared that art had no other purpose than ‘an elevating excitement of the soul. (199-200)

But some critics feel the impossibility to ignore either of these two streams of thought since each seems incomplete when neglecting the other. So many critics have defined the idea that literature can fulfill both the purposes. In nineteenth century, Mathew Arnold recognizes the wholeness of literature which has many dimensions at the same time. According to B. Prasad, “Arnold may be said to stand midway between the two” (*An Introduction to English Criticism* 200). Accepting this middle stage we can say that neither is an author completely detached from social circumstances nor is she/ he a camera representing everything as it is. (S)He has some cultural baggage which modifies his/her perception about life, society, and individuals which reflects in his works but at the same time he has to modify them with words and situation for the sake of reader’s entertainment and to justify his own ideas. In his works, characterization, and representation, his perception and interest matter. Sometimes his own knowledge (unconscious) and acquired knowledge (conscious) both work together and he finds himself caught between the two.

This creates clashes in his ideas which lead to an absurd kind of existence. In contemporary modern period with cultural baggage, wealth, social and political standards have also impact on the ideology of the writer.

In general, clashes are the integral part of life which can be internal or external. To external clashes, we can add the clashes based on class, caste, gender, and economy whereas internal clashes or psychological clashes can be aroused between two individual psyches about one idea, or they can be aroused as inconsistencies in one's own psyche. Different people have different ideas about life, world, and people and somehow, these differences create clashes. Because of these clashes, life has variations but at the same time, these clashes make life difficult. The differences between ideas, persons and cultures vary with time, space and situation. India is a land of differences and these differences are in the form of culture, language, caste, religion etc. Many Indian writers like Raja Rammohan Roy, Bankimchandra Chattopadhyaya, Rabindranath Tagore and Shri Aurobindo, had tried to resolve the clashes of language and caste by using them in their writings. As it was a controversial issue for the writers of that time to write in the language of colonizer as it was considered the language of dominant to dominate. Indian English writers have accepted English language as it is a language of the world but at the same they consider it alien language. According to Sunil Khilnani, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru were central figures in the long, uneasy, and interminable task of making English an Indian language. He says:

Often ambivalent about the function of English in India, they kept a political commitment to English as a language of public communication. English may have been the language of enemy yet both wished to accommodate it alongside other Indian languages, recognizing it as a vital link not just to the

wider world but also between Indians themselves. (*A Concise History of Indian Literature in English* 152)

Indian writers in English realized the fact that through this language they can mobilize their ideas to a big population so they started to write in English language. But the problem started with the concept of Indian sensibility. The Indian writers of English made an artificial solution to solve the clash between English and Indian sensibility. Because Indian sensibility can't be represent in English language. To resolve the conflict between English and Indianness they made 'Indian English language' by using Indian words in English without translation. As Raja Rao defines the use of Indian English language in the preface of *Kanthapura*; "One has to convey in a language that is not one's own the spirit that is one's own . . ." (Rao 5-6). English, for the postcolonial writers in India, is the inevitable choice for historical reasons as their acceptance of modernity. They tried to achieve a unified self, where emotionally they are Indians and intellectually they are English. These writers tried to make a bridge between the traditional Indianness at the sentimental level and freedom oriented liberalism which in practice is West-oriented. Bilingualism also can be an in between way to the conflict of language, as a positive aspect in India where many languages are demanding to become national language. N. Manu Chakravarthy writes, "Bilingualism has always been one of the central features of modern Karnatka literature, and, in our own times, Ananthamurthy has been the most vehement spokesperson for those advocating the cause of bilingualism in India" (Chakarvarthy xx).

Along with the differences of language the differences of caste, gender and culture are prevalent in India in different forms. In Indian freedom struggle slogans like 'unity in diversity' were used to cover these differences. So, it is a tendency to become ambivalent when there is no solution or choice between binary opposites; where taking one stand is not possible then there is a need for 'artificial solution'. It is contradictory for Indians because

they have to choose a middle path. The emergent requirement to be free from the rule of British compelled many writers and politicians to hide this heterogeneity in the period of national turmoil. They played a very important part in imagining and embodying the radical vision of anti colonialism. However this concept of showing artificial sameness has not been always for humanistic purposes. Here, the example of partition suits very well, when Hindus and Muslims were showing artificial homogeneity to achieve separate nations while ignoring the real sameness i.e. 'Humanity'. Hindu religion has many castes and sub castes, which separate people among lower and upper strata. It has many degenerating forces at humanistic level. But at the time of freedom struggle, people had to compromise with the heterogeneity of other religions against the British rule. Both the Hindu and Muslims equally contributed in the freedom struggle. But at the time of partition, only the homogeneity of their religion was remembered. Even now in the so called post modern period where science has developed so far, India is caught in the nexus of religion, caste and gender. People like Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Azad, Rabindranath Tagore were aware of these opposite forces prevailing in Indian scenario at that time and they tried to resolve them to some extent but created other divisions unintentionally. In India caste has been a very sensitive issue to the revolutionary peoples like Mahatma Gandhi, Bhimrao Ambedkar and Jyotiba Fule. Gandhi gave the term Harijan to dalits to equate them with others as all are 'Jan of Hari', (people of God). But now Harijan identifies Dalits only and the people of upper castes are people of God but not Harijans. An article in The Times of India explains the dilemma of the word Harijan:

A Parliamentary committee took serious note of the widespread use of the word 'Harijan' across the country and asked the government to strictly ensure its non-use, underlining that it was depreciating the status of the under-privileged sections of society. (*Times of India* 19 Aug, 2010)

So the resolution of Gandhi to the caste system to bring the equality to the lower caste people is failing in present scenario. It requires enormous intellectual courage and integrity not to align with any of the hegemonising socio-cultural and political institutions in dealing with acute conflicts either based on caste or gender. These binary forces of the opposites compel individuals and communities to make a choice between a decaying traditional past and so called progressive, rational and secular modern present. U.R. Ananthamurthy's works are the representation of how the sharp division among opposite forces as tradition and modernity, religion and secularism, and rational and unscientific, generates a schizophrenia in societies. *Samskara* and *Bharathipura* are particularly about the degeneration of particular locales which are fundamentally brahminic oriented. On the surface level, these novels attempt to work out a number of traditional themes in a contemporary setting which are related to metaphysical, religious, psychological and social dimensions of life. But one can assert that in its essentials it is "The conflict between brahminism and a flouting of orthodox brahminic tradition acquires protean dimensions and becomes a conflict between faith and heresy, between the spiritual and the materialist, idea and experience, asceticism and eroticism" (Sharma 104). Ananthamurthy is the one, who dares to defy these categorizations even if he is characterized as essentialist, anti-progress, and revivalist and so on.

U. R. Ananthamurthy is one of India's most prominent writers and he is a part of the Navya Movement, the influential innovative movement in Kannada literature, manifested after India attained independence. Before 1947, modern Indian literature was largely characterized by the patriotism of the independence struggle or escapism into romantic dream worlds. After Pargativada that began in the 1940's, Navya Movement comes into being. Its main characteristics are its emphasis on existentialism and psychoanalysis, with the regarding of individual on humanistic level as it has been inspired

by European models. In 1952, the publication of two poems by Gopalkrishna Adiga ‘Karsnana Kolalu’ and ‘Himagiriya Kandara’ heralded the beginning of the Navya Movement in Kannada literature. The Navya novel begins with Shanthinath Desai’s *Mukti* (1961). L. S. Seshagiri Rao observes in this context:

The Navya novel is the embodiment of the experience of alienation in a vast and bewildering universe. . . . The pre-Navya novelist started with the assumption that life is meaningful and worth living. . . . The Navya novelist started with the question: ‘Is life worth living?’ . . . The Navya novelist, sick of the hypocrisy of the professed apparent apostles of service and morality, was suspicious of their own enthusiasm and the panaceas of others. . . . Navya literature was influenced by T.S.Eliot, the Absurdist and the Existentialist, and Kafka and Camus. (*Contemporary Indian literature* 644)

The Navya novelists hold an ambivalent position in their full and fearless negotiations dealing with binary oppositions which can be destructive in extreme sense. T. Avinash rightly observed the ambiguous position of Kannada writers of contemporary period:

Kannada prose narratives and the novel form has always negotiated with modernity, colonialism nationalism, caste discrimination and issues related to women. From Marali Mannige (Shivarama Karantha) to Suryana Kudure (U.R. Ananthamurthy) various writers like Kuvempu, Karantha, and Tejaswi etc have negotiated with the complex issues of Modernity and colonialism. There is neither a complete rejection nor a total acceptance of modernity. Ambivalent attitude marks our negotiation with modernity. Our attitude to modernity therefore, cannot but be deeply ambiguous. In a plural and hybrid socio-cultural scenario, there is no simple, final answer to above

mentioned problems. Thus, this ambivalence is a result of a historical process rather than of an individual writing. The recent Kannada narratives continue such debates in different proportions. Different writers take different positions and their concerns and negotiations are extremely amorphous. There is no single mega narrative as such to describe these writers. (Avinash 127-128)

U. R. Ananthamurthy, both as a creative writer and a thinker, has firmly refused to embrace reductionism of any kind. His understanding of Indian tradition which has many decaying values, when the humanity is on the brink of modernity, has compelled him to become ambivalent. His works are the exposures of his personal dilemmas when he wants to accept modernity but he fails to overcome from traditional values. Ananthamurthy has consistently looked for alternatives to the dominant paradigm of our times. He is very conscious of the fact that no society can ever produce an ideology or a solution capable of resolving all problems. One of the great features of Ananthamurthy's presence in the Kannada tradition has been his strong ability to offer unconventional explanations to controversial social and cultural issues. This has led many to see in him reactionary and revivalist attitude. As an intellectual, Ananthamurthy has, with great intellectual clarity, gone beyond dichotomies and succeed in fortifying binary opposites.

Winner of Jnana Peeth Award in 1994, for his novel *Samskara* (1965), Udipi Raja Gopalacharya Ananthamurthy was born on 21 December 1932, in a remote village, Milige, in Shimoga district, Karnataka. U.R. Ananthamurthy is the product of a mixed education because he was born into a traditional Brahmin family and was educated in Sanskrit and Kannada as well as in English. After completion of his early education in a traditional Sanskrit School, he had his later education in Thirthalli and Mysore. He completed his graduation and post-graduation from the University of Mysore. After doing his post-

graduation in English Literature, he went to England for higher studies. Although he teaches English literature at the University of Mysore, he writes in Kannada, the language of Karnataka in south India. Anantha Murthy has also written poetry, criticism, and short stories, but he is primarily known as a writer of novels like *Samskara*(1965), *Bhava* (1998), *Bharathipura* (1974), *Avasthe*(1978) and *Divya* (2001), which have been translated into English, Russian, French, Hungarian, German, Swedish, Hindi, Bengali, Malayalam, Urdu, Tamil, Telugu and Gujarathi. Ananthamurthy has travelled widely around the world and delivered many lectures. He has undertaken innumerable tours, attended several National and International Conferences and has given a number of lectures on various topics since 1974. Ananthamurthy has won number of awards both from the Government and Academies for his invaluable contribution in different fields.

There has been done enormous research on Ananthamurthy's works especially on *Samskara*. His *Samskara* has acquired the status of a minor classic and several articles have appeared that seek to examine the novel in its various aspects e.g. Nirja Misra, in his article "A Journey Beyond Brahmanism" 1985, Virender Pal in his "Religion, Caste and Modernity: A Study of U.R. Ananthamurthy's *Samskara*".

Meenakshi Mukherjee in her book *Realism and Reality: the Novel and Society in India* comments on the critical response to *Samskara*. She de-contextualizes the narrative from its indisputable discursive contexts of Brahmanism and patriarchy. She focuses on it as an allegory of a 'casteless wanderer' which gives it a universal appeal. She asserts, "The question need not be connected to Hinduism, it is a universal problem of a man who has equated himself with a particular role" and to read it the other way is "to limit it" (*Realism and Reality* 166).

V. S Naipaul in his *India: a Wounded Civilization* has dwelt on the theme of the traditional versus the modern. Ramesh Rao in his article "Hinduism and Post - Modernism:

How close is the Connection?” deals with a serious discussion of the underlying crosscurrents in Hindu philosophy and how such a philosophy casts a shadow over the lives of the characters in the novel.

Most of the critics have dwelt on the sociological aspects of the novel and given short shrift to the philosophical aspects. Nirja Misra criticizes the limited area of *Samskara* in dealing with Hinduism. He says, “Hence the Brahmin is assigned a role, this depersonalising character of Hinduism cannot be reconciled with the individuality that the Acharya has acquired by making a choice outside the code” (Misra 102). Another critic classifies the novel as a representation of two opposite ideologies fighting with each other and studies the nature of this conflict and sees whether the novel suggests any way out of this dissonance:

Broadly speaking, *Samskara* is a representation of the conflict between orthodox brahminism and anti-brahminism. . . . The conflict between brahminism and a flouting of orthodox brahminic tradition acquires protean dimensions and becomes a conflict between faith and heresy, between the spiritual and the materialist, idea and experience, asceticism and eroticism. (Sharma 104)

Indubala Pandya in her essay, “Ananthamurthy’s *Samskara*: A Novel of Complex Structure and Narrative Techniques”, explores different themes of the novel through its complex structure and narrative technique. According to her this novel has “multifaceted protagonist” (135) and its general theme who is the real Brahmin. She talks the spiritual transformation of protagonist and his preoccupation with the decay of Brahmanism.

In his essay “Of Culture and Cadaver: Ananthamurthy’s *Samskara*”, S. Krishnamoorthy Aithal exposes the dark side of orthodoxy and conservatism. “They are

themselves often instrumental in bringing about decay and death of the very culture they seek to uphold and preserve” (83).

This proposed study is intended to study the dark side of binary oppositions represented by Ananthamurthy in his both novels *Bharathipura* and *Samskara*; how these affect individual psyche either in positive or in negative manner; how people have to respond in ambivalent manner and to which extent their ambivalent response is valid or otherwise, especially in Indian context? Because of his ambivalent responses towards tradition, Brahmanism, gender and modernity, Ananthamurthy has been criticized by both the conservatives and progressives. This proposed study is supposed to examine the undercurrent layers of the structures of a society where change and progress can be possible only on the behalf of its traditional values. And this change creates identity crisis for an individual who has to fight the very tradition to which (s) he belongs.

Generally, Ananthamurthy concerns about untouchability and his works, in different ways, are explicate examples of negotiations with this Indian reality that has apparently moved from past into the present. But the present research proposal is planned to focus its attention to the essential anachronistic nature of present. The present carries many traces of past. The reciprocal relationship between the past and present makes it impossible to separate the two. In his novels *Samskara* and *Bharathipura*, U. R. Ananthamurthy represents a society torn in conflict between the old and the new. There is fictional locale in the remote corner of south India, with the old modes of life coexisting with the new ones. N. Manu Chakravarthy writes in introduction to *Bharathipura*:

The apparent irreconcilability between national and regional, center and periphery, tradition and modernity, religion and secularism, global/universal and local and several other oppositional categories sustained for long as valid and justifiable propositions by many epistemological centers,

especially in social sciences, emerge as unsustainable, untenable, and artificial constructs in Ananthamurthy's creative works. (*Bharathipura* xx)

Ananthamurthy deals with all the ideological irreconcilable aspects of an entire society in ambivalent manner. In *Samskara* he tries to unfold the ideological patterns through which the dominant holds a superior position in society. His main contribution is to justify the ambivalent ways when there is no solution between extreme oppositions. The better way to live a holistic life is an adjustment between the two. If traditional ways are difficult to follow than modernistic ways make an individual a deviant. In the novel *Bharathipura*, Jagannatha, the Brahmin and land owner, goes back to his hometown after studies in England. He finds his hometown as highly traditional in its values and he tries to change its social structures which he finds conservative. He wants to enable the untouchables to enter the temple and with this meets the resistance of the higher castes. His attempt to create a system around him and with this his inner freedom fails to cop up with conservative values of his own caste and society.

Samskara was originally written in Kannada by U.R. Anantha Murthy, and published in 1965, and an English translation, by the eminent poet- translator A.K. Ramanujan followed in 1976. Superficially, the novel deals with the problem of performing the last rites of Naranappa, a rebellious Brahmin who could not be excommunicated from his community by the rest of the Brahmins. At another level, his novel *Samskara* is a judgement of life, according to Ananthmurthy's perception of life, through the major characters, Praneshacharya and Naranappa Who are presented as foil and counterfoil to each other. The novel *Samskara* opens with the dead body of Naranappa lying for cremation. Though a Brahmin, Naranappa, had lived the life of a pleasure-seeker, and if at all he had continued to be a Brahmin technically, it was because he was not expelled from Brahmanism or evicted from an orthodox colony called Agrahara. He drank liquor, ate meat

and fish, abandoned his Brahmin wife and lived with a low caste woman named Chandri. Even though Naranappa's orthodox Brahmin friends criticized his ways of living, they could not dare to throw him out of the Brahmin caste because of their own weaknesses, which he had exploited to his advantage. The novel depicts the degenerated ways of Brahminism in an agrahara, a Brahmin colony symbolically representing the malpractice of caste system of entire nation. It had evoked serious controversy right after its publication. The purpose of Ananthamurthy is to make the Brahmin community aware of their hypocritical holiness and to come out to live a normal life. With his roots in Brahmanism he saw the rigid and conservative values of Brahmanism. He saw the impact of caste system on both the classes upper and lower. This is the reason that his works are strong criticism of the handed down values of Brahmanism. Ananthamurthy does not shy away from accepting that he criticizes Brahmins as he writes, "Hurting Brahmins for me born and brought up as a Brahmin, is not an issue that I like, but is inevitable. My writings like *Samskara*, *Ghatashraddha*, *Bharathipura*, have hurt Brahmins. . . What I've written are the essential truth that Brahmins must face" (Sonia 143).

As far as the theme of the novel is concerned, Ananthamurthy has skillfully portrayed Brahmin-Dalit conflict, problems of superstitions in uneducated Indian villagers and marginalization of woman in Indian social system. In the novel, Naranappa, who in his life time had openly mocked at and questioned the prescribed ideology and code of conduct for his caste, exposed the hypocritical and sinful living of the fellow Brahmins, giving a challenge to the most virtuous Brahmin there Praneshacharya "the crest-Jewel of vedic learning", the local guru and of the nearby agraharas, by challenging him, "All your Brahmin respectability, I'll roll it up and throw it all ways for a little bit of pleasure with one female" (*Samskara* 21). There are apparently two male protagonists in the novel- Naranappa, the condemned one, and Praneshacharya, who is shown in constant conflict,

agony and dilemma in the second half of the novel, struggling internally to find the answers to many problems but if we analyze the causes of their predicaments, it is their involvement with Chandri, a low caste harlot who is considered to be impure, unrefined, uncultured because of her birth from a prostitute's womb and who was brought by Naranappa, the higher caste Brahmin, supposed to be refined, cultured since born in Brahmin family. Naranappa's open living with Chandri had caused tumult in the entire agrahara during his life time and now even after his death by leaving his fellow Brahmins hungry and angry. Praneshacharya, 'the crest-Jewel of vedic learning' was unable to come up with a solution about how to cremate the corpse of Naranappa. Neither the scripture nor the Maruti idol in the temple, where he prayed for an answer, offered any solution. Even in death, Naranappa becomes an enemy of the Brahmins. His plague- infested body rots and evinces a stench since none of the Brahmins would come forward to perform his last rites for fear of defilement of their caste. Praneshacharya initially stands for orthodox traditional brahmanical values, but after sexual union with Chandri he realizes that the materialistic world and spiritualistic are not opposite to each other. He cannot access to the spiritual world without understanding the materialistic world and this change takes place in his attitude when he finds traditional Vedas are not capable to answer the problem of present world ("Samskara" of Naranappa). This exposes the incompleteness of traditional ways which are not suitable to the present world. If Praneshcharya stands for traditional orthodox Brahmanism, Naranappa stands for extreme modernistic ways which oppose all the rules and keeps a sight of question on values of traditional ways. His interrogative approach is very opposite to that of Praneshacharya who initially accepts all the social and religious rules without examining them. Naranappa's hedonistic ways and complete avoidance of Hinduism and social taboos make him unbearable and he proves to be an eccentric individual in the society. The entire Agrahara (a Brahmin colony) is threatened by the

epidemic which Naranappa contracted in Shivamogge. Ultimately Chandri cremates his body with the help of Muslim. The problem is resolved by Chandri, an ambivalent figure who stands between the two, Praneshacharya and Naranappa. The two characters, Chandri and Putta stand in between them. Chandri accepts social codes of behavior, but further she paves new path for herself. She remains obedient to Naranappa till he lives, but after his death she chooses Praneshacharya to open new ways for herself by making a physical relation with him. She is the mixture of two who regards for past and cares for present. Another example is Putta who neither belongs to Brahmanism, nor to hedonistic school of Naranappa. However, he has likings for a rich life of varied experiences.

Ananthamurthy's writings examine the nature of a traditional society that is trying to modernize itself. His works are widely discussed not just in Kannada, but in the country and outside too. His novels, short stories and essays have been extensively read and even criticized. His works speak not just of a society, but also of individuals and their dilemmas and compromises at different situations. He represented Indian reality caught between the clashes of caste, class, culture. Generally, Ananthamurthy concerns about untouchability and his works, in different ways, are explicating examples of negotiations with an Indian reality moving from past into the present. He attempted to demolish the falsely projected 'cultural and spiritual superiority' of his caste. But his writings and characterization expose his inconsistency and double edged ideas. Whether he is praising Brahmanism or condemning it, his ideological inconsistency is also apparent in representation of male and female, tradition and modernity, asceticism and sexuality, society and individual, unconscious and conscious, meaning and meaninglessness and rationality and emotions. In *Bharathipura* and *Samskara*, Ananthamurthy represents the basic existential issue what life is and what is the best way to live life holistically. However, he does not represent it directly but it is through the character and thematically studies we get to know about it.

Avasthi is another novel of Ananthamurthy which reveals the paradox of life when the worst things we do are sometimes done when we are trying to help others. Ananthamurthy has shown us so that corruption and idealism existing not in simple opposition to each other, but entwined, almost symbiotically conspire to create our political system.

In general, Ananthamurthy is frequently focusing on the tension between individuals and society in which they live. The storylines set patterns for individuals against society or their family. They have individual impulses, desires, personalized life styles and world views and yet they have to face the fact that they are the members of a family and a society. Ananthamurthy represents individual as torn between personal and social. The enthusiasm for life expresses itself through conflict at various levels. In dealing with the inherent clashes the novelist generally moves in one or two directions, either suggesting that individuals ought to conform to society's standards or suggesting that society is in such a bad state that the individuals are bound to destroyed or feel alienated. The complications Ananthamurthy creates within the familiar pattern of characters at odds with their society or with other characters or with themselves , give a vivid sense of what it is like for particular individuals to be caught in certain situation. Giving the complexity of human life and experience, Ananthamurthy no longer shares the traditional confident assumptions of their ability to understand and describe the world. He challenges in a variety of ways, the traditional perception of an ordered and coherent world which underpins the pretensions to reproduce reality in fiction. However, the very idea of 'reality' conflicts with the term 'fiction'. But then, truth is stranger than fiction, and the function of the fiction is to reveal the ultimate reality. Taking imaginative configuration in comparison to an average human being's sense, a writer enables to take into account the observed heterogeneity and conflict of things and situations.

In post colonial India, in almost all cultures and civilizations, woman is at the centre of life with her creative wisdom and innumerable forms of her female angst. She has experiences of being patronized, with force or ideological hegemony. Her feminine psyche has to cope with the pains, rather than the opportunity of performing different roles in a male dominated society. She also seeks space to assert for womanhood, femininity and identity with love and resistance to overcome of sexual exploitation, domestic violence, demands of children, experiences at work places, and many hegemonic social structures. Ananthamurthy's novels have attempted to show the condition of woman in caste based societies after the independence. His female characters are the strong criticism of Indian social system where upper caste women are pale with the pressure of idealistic womanhood and the lower caste women's free living ways make them deviant. In both the cases they are shown as doubly marginalized, as women and as the personalities carrying the burden of their castes.

Ananthamurthy is not the only writer who has dealt with clashes of life in general or individual psychological clashes in his writings. Many Indian writers having a deep knowledge of Indian heterogeneity prevailed in almost every field, have tried to reflect it in their works. The early decades of the twentieth century witness the rise of many writers whose literary manifesto was to write for social, political and economic purposes. Their purpose was not only to throw light upon the social evils and malpractices prevailing in the society in those days, but also to employ fiction to the cause of social amelioration. Prem Chand, Raja Rao, Mulk Raj Anand, and R.K. Narayan are some writers who have raised radical questions regarding traditional assumptions, established notions in society about gender, caste and religion. The turmoil and the anguish of these new circumstances caused by the conflict between emerging new modes of liberal individualistic modernity and suspicious and collective consciousness of traditional past have become the subject-matter

of these novels which formulate a new consciousness. The novels of these writers portray conflict as one of the few constants in the unstable and evolving fictional scenario, the formative element in determining the action. R.K Narayan in his stories of *Malgudi Days* represents the all locale of India representing the almost every social evil whether it is caste system or gender discrimination. Raja Rao in his *Kanthapura* depicts how the clashes between economically powerful Britishers and poor Indians, between upper castes and lower castes, and between literate and illiterate cause turmoil and an era comes demanding freedom from these clashes. Like these writers, Ananthamurthy also tries to depict the prevalent social hierarchies of Indian social system based on gender caste and economy. R.K. Narayan, like Ananthamurthy shows his own inconsistency about modernity. R.K. Narayan's *English Teacher* represents dilemma of a teacher who works in a missionary school. He gives resignation letter during national struggle. But he seized by a doubt that can we be free from the powers of modernity. Krishna, the main character in the novel is shown in psychological inconsistency about tradition and modernity.

The novelists resist the homogenization of reality, an essential energy of India. They depict conflicts with a bearing upon Indian life at all levels. By posing questions, by uncovering the underlying conflicts, by suggesting re-assessment and re-definition, the works of Amitav Ghosh, Arundhati Roy, Sulman Rushdie, and others help in formulating a consciousness which can perhaps ultimately bring about a constructive change. Far-reaching changes in familial, cultural, social, and political patterns have significantly expanded and altered the nature of Indian reality as depicted in both, the Indian writing in translation and in Indian writing in English. The difficulties engendered by the disintegration of societal structures, individuation and personal differences, ideological clashes and personal conflicts, are all contained within a narrative form which suggests a supposedly prosperous and secure world but which, at closer glance, reveals itself as self

questioning. Aware as they are of the conflicts confronting an evolving individual and national consciousness, these writers are no longer content merely to document reality. They use their novels as a medium for the exploration of the new reality and a subtle projection of values. Ideology does not swamp the text; it is embedded within it and emerges from it. Without the use of any overt propaganda, the texts confirm the authors' commitment to ideals of freedom and justice, in the context of the individual self, family, society, culture, and politics. Rushdie explores the possibility of a hidden laughter, a subversive spirit of mischief undermining authority, in an attempt to question and evaluate a reality embedded in conflicts.

The fiction of the 1980's attempts to power the subaltern higher than his/her state. The effort is to embarrass the powerful for possessing ideologically determined attitudes of inequality and for passing them off as natural. These novelists re-frame experiences which were formerly felt to be dissonant with social expectations by constituting them as new cultural possibilities. The unexpected twists in the narrative draw attention to differences from conventional patterns, thus defamiliarizing the taken-for-granted assumptions. Beside these writers there are writers who deal with these irreconcilable aspects of Indian reality with ambivalence. Like these Indian writers in English, Indian writers in different regional languages have also crystallized Indian inadequacy to overcome its structural differences and deep roots in traditional value system which are hindrance to the progressive, liberal, and secular modernistic visions. They represented the psychological inconsistency of middle and elite class caught between the dilemmas which are basic for holistic existence.

Nissim Ezekiel has also worked on the theme of clashes in Indian society on different levels. The poetry of Nissim Ezekiel often shows his tendency to search for a spiritual salvation after getting frustrated with the external chaos and clashes that arise due to the cultural conflicts which pose a threat to the existence of the individual. His poems

like “Background, Casually”, “Poems of Separation” , “Enterprise” and “In India” depict conflict that occurs on both levels, the physical level as well as the psychological level, and which is caused due to the cultural disparity and heterogeneity that occurs when the poet interacts with the society. Complex social structures and multiple racial co- existence make the existence of an individual more complicated and dangerous. Abhinandan Malas writes:

Ezekiel’s poetry not only depicts the predicament of an individual belonging to the minority community but also makes the reader realize the true nature of the conflict that occurs both inside and the outside individual thus threatening the existential space of the individual. . . . Ezekiel’s poetry presents him not only a representative poet but also as an individual with true identity of Indian sensibility. (Malas 100-101)

Hence, these writers depict different clashes in their works differently and expose their angst towards them. Beside these writers, there are many other writers including Kannada writers, who show their double response to these clashes. However, their ambivalent response can be criticize on the bases of their inconsistent ideologies but their understanding of the irreconcilability of Indian social system forces to become ambivalent.

Fakir Mohan Senapati is one of such writers. Senapati’s has a double response to colonialism as he wants colonialism as well as rejects it. Even figures like Bankim Chandra Chatterji offer sympathy to modernity given by Britishers and project them as good at many places because they brought science and technology in India. Satya P. Mohanty asserts; “Colonial rule is rarely mentioned, and if it is, it is made to seem utterly natural, never a political issue” (*Six Acres and a Third* 21). *Six Acres and a Third* demonstrates Senapati’s ambivalence towards modern western modes of knowledge and towards his ideological inconsistency. Otherwise how can a writer who mocks western knowledge system end up writing a book with praising important figures of western science? In the same way, we can

question how he can be a traditionalist when he criticizes the elaborate stylization of the Puranic and Kavya modes of narratives.

Both Ananthamurthy and Senapati assert through their ambivalent responses that these concepts of tradition and modernity should not be taken as polar opposites, but a tactical adjustment should be there while dealing with these opposites. While opposing modernity, Senapati and Ananthamurthy are not against change. Change and continuity both exist in them. Their complexity as writers can be assessed by adapting this conceptualization of tradition and modernity. We can say that Senapati and Ananthamurthy are the subjects who can be designated as both civil and sly at the same time. Within slavery exists slyness and carnivalization. Senapati is a sly native, someone who took advantage of colonialism in his personal life and criticized its capitalistic ideology. As Ananthamurthy, taking the advantage of his upper caste, criticizes its orthodoxy. Though both try to show their determination in their egalitarian ideologies but they make compromises and thus can be called pragmatic men. Like Senapati, Ananthamurthy's tactical adjustments in a world are fashioned by history and are full of clashes either physical or abstract. In the writings of both the writers there is a kind of syncretism between tradition and modernity. What is undesirable in tradition comes under critical gaze of the narrator as what is repugnant in colonial modernity.

To conclude, the contemporary writers in their own way have attempted to show the paradoxical displacements brought by neo colonial forces of globalization. And they show the unresolved dilemmas of Indians created by the neo colonial forces in different guise of caste, class and gender, and its impact on the Indian psychology. On the one hand, many of these writers are the insiders of these systems and on the other hand they are aware of the cultural disfiguration and dehumanization that the phenomenon has brought. It is for

this reason most of Indian writers' work remain ambivalent in themes and open ended when they deal with binary oppositions, impossible to ignore any one of these.

Chapter second of this dissertation will examine the socio-cultural clashes at various levels, represented in *Bharathipura* and *Samskara*. The clashes of caste and gender are being examined which are caught in the nexus of religion. The connection of these clashes to the clashes of economy and psychology is analyzed with a critical insight. This explores the massive network of relationships between different segments of people in different roles as Brahmins, Dalits, Man and Women in relation to acceptance and revolt, relationships threatened and breakdown, inconsistencies and ambiguities, hidden agendas and ulterior motives.

In chapter third, the existential crisis of the individual will be the focus point of this third chapter. This chapter is an examination how essential attributions collide with postmodern requirement of change which leads to the existential chaos. These two are contradictory to each other and between these two different worlds views an individual experiences psychological inconsistency. Existentialism can be seen as a solution between these two oppositions.

Chapter fourth will be a conclusion of this proposed research. This chapter will conclude all the three chapters.

Works Cited

- Ananthamurthy, U.R. *Samskara*. Trans, A.K.Ramanujan. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1986. Print.
- . *Bharathipura*. Trans. Srinivasa Rao P. Madras: Macmillan India Ltd, 1996. Print.
- Aithal, Krishnamoorthy. "Of Culture and Cadver: Ananthamurthy's *Samskara*" *Journal of South Asian Literature* 16.2 (1981): 83-88. Web. 4 July 2014.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40873687/>>
- Avinash, T. "Constructing the Discourse of Displacement and Ambiguities: Interrogating Post 1990 Kannada Narratives." *Luminare* 3.1 (2013): 127-129. Print.
- Chakravarthy, N. Manu. Introduction. *Bharathipura*. By U. R. Ananthamurthy. Trans. Susheela Punitha. New Delhi: Oxford India Paperback, 2013. xx. Print.
- "Ensure 'Harijan' word is not used: Par panel to govt." *TIMES OF INDIA* 19 Aug. 2010. Web. 10 June 2014. <<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/>>.
- Malas, Abhinandan. "The Individual and the Existential Problems: Critiquing the Cultural Conflicts in Nissim Ezekiel's Poetry." *Labyrinth* 5.1. (2014): 100-106. Print.
- Mehrotra, Arvind Krishna. *A Concise History of Indian Literature in English*. Ranikhet: Paramount Black, 2008. Print.
- Misra, Nirja, Vijay L. Sharma & R.K. Kaul. "Samskara: Three Critics on Anantha Murthy's Novel." *Sahitya Akademi* 25.5. (Sept-Oct 1982): 98-122. Web. 12 May 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23331116/>>.
- . "A Journey Beyond Brahmanism." *Sahitya Akademi*, 25.5. (1982): 102. Print.
- Mohanty, Satya P. Introduction. *Six Acres and a Third*. By Fakir Mohan Senapati. Trans. Rabi Shankar Mishra, Satya P. Mohanty, Jatindran K. Nayak and Paul St-Pierre. Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2006. Print.

- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. *Realism and Reality: The Novel and Society in India*. New Delhi: OUP, 1985. 169. Print.
- Pal, Virender. "Religion, Caste and Modernity: A Study of U.R. Ananthamurthy's Samskara." *Journal of Literature, Culture and Media Studies* III.5-6 2011: 95-102. Web. 12 May 2014. <<http://www.oalib.com/journal/5937/1#U-qTZeNdWmA>>.
- Pandya, Indubala. "Ananthamurthy's *Samskara*: A Novel of Complex Structure and Narrative Techniques." *Sahitya Akadmi* 30.3. (1987): 135-146. Web. 24 Aug. 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23337934/>>.
- Parsad, B. *An Introduction to English Criticism*. Chennai: Macmillon Publishers India Press, 2011. Print.
- Rao, L. S. Seshagiri. *Contemporary Indian Literature*. Ed. K. M. George. Trichur: Kerala Sahitya Academy MacMillan India Ltd, 1984. Print.
- Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura*. Delhi: Orient Paperbacks, 2003. Print.
- Sonia, N. *Samskara. A Window on Brahminic Orthodoxy*. Ed. Rashmi Gaur. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 2006. Print.