

Idea of “Progress” in Mulk Raj Anand

**A dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University for the degree of English in
Master of Philosophy**

Deepak

**Centre for English Studies
School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies,
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067
2015**



Centre for English Studies
School of Language, Literature & Culture Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067, India

Date: 23.7.15

CERTIFICATE

This dissertation titled "**Idea of "Progress" in Mulk Raj Anand**" submitted by **Mr. Deepak**, Centre for English Studies, School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy**, is an original work and has not been submitted so far in part or in full, for any other degree or diploma of any University or Institution.

This may be placed before the examiners for evaluation for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy.

(PROF. MAKARAND R. PRANJAPE)

SUPERVISOR

Prof. Makarand R. Pranjape
Chairperson
Centre for English Studies
School of Language Literature & Culture Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University
New Delhi-110067, India

(DR. SAITYA BRATA DAS)

CHAIRPERSON

Chairperson
CES/SLL & CS
J.N.U., New Delhi-67

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My greatest debt in ripening the fruit that is this dissertation/thesis is due to Jawaharlal Nehru University where the research has taken place.

My first thanks is to the professor, Makarand R. Paranjape under whose guidance the Herculean task of establishing Mulk Raj Anand as a Progressive writer becomes exceedingly easy. At second place, I acknowledge all “credit” to the Central Library (including staff), JNU, especially P.C. Joshi Archives on Contemporary History, with its rich archival material through which I uncovered the history of PWA in India. A special thanks to Dr. Inugurthi Narasaiah (Deputy Director, Archives) from whom I drew valuable information, comments on the Left Movement and the role of CPI in Indian politics. I will never forget the “father figure,” Mr. Surender Kumar (Assistant Archivist, Archives), the real force behind my knowledge on Progressive Writers’ Association. Profoundly Buddhist thanks addressed to Mr. Vedanayagam Swamy and Mr. Aditya Srivastav (Archives members) for providing necessary data/books on the Progressive Movement.

Acknowledgement will not be complete without Prof. Maia Ramnath, Penn State University, USA, for her unique help in Progressive Movement especially for the *Congress Socialist* journal along with the *Left Review*. One more thanks to a foreign friend, Bilal Hasmi, Ph.D. candidate, New York State University, for offering installments of the *Left Review* Journal.

The words are not enough to express my sincere gratitude to the rising “Star,” Ms. Girija Suri and Mr. Huzaifa Omair Siddiqi (Research Scholar, CES, SLL&CS, JNU) for their priceless assistance in the proof-reading, comment and extremely useful suggestions despite their tremendously busy academic schedule.

I have just one last word to say, “Thanks!”

Deepak

DECLARATION

I, Deepak, hereby certify that my dissertation “Idea of “Progress” in Mulk Raj Anand” for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy, is the record of work carried out by me. It has not been submitted so far in part or in full course for any other degree or diploma of any University or Institution.

DEEPAK

ABBREVIATION

AIPWA	All India Progressive Writers' Association
APE	American Progressive Era
Apology	Apology for Humanism
CiB	Conversations in Bloomsbury
CPI	Communist Party of India
CSP	Congress Socialist Party
HM	Premchand's PWA Hindi Manifesto published by Carlo Coppola
IC	Indian Constitution
ICWDC	International Congress of Writers for the Defence of Culture
IPC	Indian Penal Code
IPTA	Indian People's Theatre Association
ITaCS	Is There a Contemporary Civilization?
Manifesto, London	PWA's Manifesto published by Carlo Coppola
MRA: NaN	Mulk Raj Anand: The Novelist as Novelist
PWA	Progressive Writers' Association
TEBLB	The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte
TIE	The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism
TLR-Manifesto	PWA's Manifesto published in <i>The Left Review</i>
VHP	Vishwa Hindu Parishad
WdUS	What do the Untouchables Say?: Beware of Mr. Gandhi
SC&SD	Social Contract and Social Discourse
WW-I	World War I
WW-II	World War II

CONTENT

	Chapter's Name	Pages
	Summary of the Dissertation	6-8
1	Anand and the PWA	9-75
2	Idea of Progress in <i>Untouchable</i>	76-140
3	Idea of Progress in Other Works	141-208
4	Bibliography	209-226

Summary of Dissertation:

The chapter throws a flood of light on the “progressive” odyssey of Mulk Raj Anand in London and later in India, which begins after being inspired by the European ideology of socialism, Marxism and leftism. But, on the contrary, it defends his role as a liberal and nationalistic exiled-writer in the pre-independence period. He tries to ripen the sour fruit of his career in the literary field by fitting in the role of a “hack writer” with editing, writing and reviewing articles for different writers and their publication branches including literary groups, press and journals and his efforts incarnated him into a successful novelist of his period. His close association with Sajjad Zaheer, T.S. Eliot, Ralph Fox, George Orwell and the foundation of PWA is put under question but simultaneously, it saves him from the label of “propagandist” by presenting him as a “Red-Green” aesthete, who had the elements of “theory of Green” in his literary crops. The central argument is a focus on, why Anand was not a Bloomsbury associate or the frontier of PWA. The most neglected part of his life, the BBC Talkie, is carefully bracketed and opened and found, why Stevie Smith projected Anand’s personal life in the character of Raji (Raj becomes “Raji”) in her autobiographical novel *The Holiday*. Anand’s progressive ideas are set in comparison with American Progressive Era, especially with Upton Sinclair and his novel *The Jungle*. Some space is given to his “two-fold progressive” books where his “un-heroic” and downtrodden protagonists witness the volcano of rage at the hands of society. Whereas, the elite characters, on the contrary, help them to raise their voice against the injustice but in “Gandhian” way. To establish the notion of progress in Anand, the background of PWA is checked but special emphasis is focussed upon its Manifesto. Metaphorically, Anand and the association are (en)countered through the acid test of Bhabha’s theory of “mimicry” and wrap up that his/its base was entirely Indian or original. The conclusion presents him as the only progressive Indian Bohemian in English letters and arts.

Untouchable is at the base of Anand’s fictional themes that were continuously used by him in different novels next to come. Falling in the progressive stream of the manifesto, in *Coolie* too, he criticized the priesthood and lingo of Sadhuhood twice. Similarly, *Two Leaves and a Bud* was resisting against the colonialism and authoritarianism of the British. *Lalu* trilogy is a direct attack on Punjabi culture, whereas, *The Big Heart* defines the impact and failure of socialism in India. In *Gauri*, Anand was in the clash with the male domination of society for the rights of his heroine, Gauri. *Untouchable* was written well before the inception of PWA, and if it is progressive, then other novels could be proved progressive on this line or

by following the manifesto or socialism or the Leftist terrain. Anand wrote in *The Hindu View of Art*, “if we are to understand the great creative periods of the past, we must look at them not only in terms of the food surpluses which were available or not available, but also in terms of the ideas generated by the way of life which is the outcome of a subtle dialectic than that yet comprehended by contemporary sociologists” (HVA 12). In fictional works, stories, characters or events are different from each other but the cause is one, oppression of the downtrodden and their helplessness in posing in the confrontation. If one is successful to prove, with the diagnosis of the manifesto, that the novel *Untouchable* is progressive, then same could be verified in context and content of the other novels too. To find the elements of progress mentioned above, I have dealt with *Untouchable* in such great details but the others more cursorily. Some space is also given to Anand’s non-fictional works and his erotic texts including the journal MARG. One could easily trace Anand’s radicalism against patriarchal society, traditionalism and attack on orthodoxy with the weapon of Marxism, Leftism and Gandhism. Most of his novels are celebrating the place of individual in the society by preferring more and more importance to machine and modernism. All the characters are using European theory (or Bhabha’s mimicry) in order to question the Raj whose ruling ideology was based on “natural law” or on the phrase “might is right.” But Anand preferred the socialist egalitarianism wherein the downtrodden, namely, the oppressed, can survive or at least have a fair chance to live.

The final chapter is a survey of Anand’s career as an editor-cum-critic of erotic, art and craft including social documentaries. Herein his novels, MARG and edited texts are checked in the line of manifesto. An attempt has been made to find out, where was he following and rejecting the principles of his handwritten manifesto and apparently, how, even his rejection leads him towards the path of progressivism. With the beginning of MARG, a shift from Gandhian ideology to Nehruvian doctrine is highlighted. Sporadically, the earliest achievements of MARG are justified and to prove my point, I will go through his works about erotica (*Homage to Khajuraho, Kama Kala, Kamasutra of Vaysayayan*); socio-political art or criticism (*Hindu View of Art, Annihilation of Caste: An Undelivered Speech, Roots and Flowers, Conversations in Bloomsbury*) published by the journal’s publication branch. I will also underline his famous three novels *Coolie, Two Leaves and a Bud, Old Woman and the Cow*. After that, I will try to project Anand as a writer of his kind which neither fits in Marxism /Socialism nor in Gandhism, Nehruvism or the leftist ideology. To establish the above statements, some theoretical light is thrown upon the Marxist ideology of “base,”

“superstructure,” “déclassé” and “lumpenproletariat” with the conclusion that that he was a déclassé writer rather than bourgeoisie or proletariat writer. Thus, concludingly, he is an aesthetic bohemian.

Chapter 1

Mulk Raj Anand and the PWA

Mulk Raj Anand was not yet thirty when he, Syed Sajjad Zaheer, and Jyotirmaya Ghosh drafted a manifesto of the Progressive Writers' Associations (PWA) in London in 1935. Apparently, the meeting that led them to this venture happened on November 24, 1934, at the Nanking Restaurant in Soho, London. This British capital became another home for exiled but radical Indian students-cum-writers during the phase of the thirties and forties. Meantime, Anand too found himself gravitating towards the popular literary trends as he associated himself with the Bloomsbury group (he, as a colonial subject, could never become a part of it) consisting of such notables as Thomas Stearns Eliot, Virginia Woolf, Leonard Woolf and E.M. Forster. England also introduced him to the intellectuals of time, such as Eric Gill (the sculptor), Ralph Fox,¹ Cedric Dower, Dawes Hicks (his Ph.D. professor) and the latter's daughter Irene Rhys, and the woman whom he married, Kathleen Van Gelder. As an emerging writer, he was also a member of the India League, the PEN, the Workers Educational Association, the Ralph Fox Writer's Group and the Left Book Club.² In London, Anand began his literary career as a hack writer, essayist, cultural-critic, literary-editor by "reviewing and writing angled critical commentaries on the works of Rudyard Kipling, Virginia Woolf, T.S. Eliot, Edward Thompson, Forster, Lionel Fielden, Stephen Spender and George Orwell" (S. Nasta, NaNWO 144) and finally culminated into a novelist of high rank who, in 1935, started the PWA along with Zaheer.

Anand's first official meeting with the PWA members took place, Zaheer has asserted, in the, "unventilated" but "free" (Reminiscences 38) rented Nanking backroom with the attendees likes Zaheer (Urdu), Ghosh (Bengali), Mohammad Din Tasir (founding father of the *Nairang-i-Khayaal* magazine in Lahore), Promode Sengupta, K.S. Bhat, S. Sinha (TLR-Manifesto 240) and around thirty-five others who meet here (Nanking) to discuss the future of Indian literature. They were also joined by the British Left writers such as Ralph Fox, as an "advisor," as Zaheer acknowledges. This group laid the foundation of an

¹ Ralph Fox (along with Randall Swingler and Edgell Rickward) was one of the members of the editorial board of the journal, *The Left Review* in 1936 and also a member of the British Communist Party. He along with Anand and other joined the International Brigade to fight the Spanish Civil War and was killed there in 1936. After the death of Fox, Anand was called off from the war by the Brigade.

² The details are in Introductory chapter: Cowasjee, Saros. *So Many Freedoms: A Study of Major Fiction of Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1977; and also in Nasta, Shsheila. "Negotiating a "New World Order": Mulk Raj Anand as Public Intellectual at the Heart of Empire." *South Asian Resistances in Britain, 1858-1947*. Ed. Rehand Ahmed and Sumita Mukherjee. London: Continuum, 2012. 140-60.

association which has been famous in Indian literary world with the name of Progressive Writers' Association (PWA). The members had no ready-made outline in their minds, hence, Anand was nominated, as Zaheer noted, its first "president" (Reminiscences 38), and "All communications to be addressed to: Dr. Mulk Raj Anand, 32, Russell Square, London, W.C.I. London, 1935" (TLR-Manifesto 240) and this was again attested by Zaheer's comment, "...all communications in connection with it [PWA] were to be addressed to Mulk Raj Anand at 53, Woburn Place, W.C." (Jalil 231). The movement induced the writers to heal the social fissures with a commitment to transform the outlook of society through their writings. In this sense, Anand was committed to the transition and desperate to produce a street savvy literature of liberation. His roadside characterization was so unique that Khushwant Singh called them "Mulkees" (vi) as they were almost akin to the "proletariat" category of Karl Marx but, sadly, they achieved precious little in terms of a radical shift in thought. Anand's characters were mouth-piece of society and could not fit in line with Homer's definition of Troy-war "heroes" like, Achilles, Hector or Odysseus. In other words, they were not saviors like Hanumana or Krishna, and his female characters were neither *avatars* (incarnation) of Sita nor super-women like Draupadi. Instead, his innocent but symbolical "Adam and Eve" (hero and heroine) were born out of the mud of the conventional societal norms, not because of Satanic force—social myth handicapped them morally. In portraying the never ending struggle of his characters' obsession to live life, Anand revolted like a red rag against religion, orthodoxy and traditional way of life. To give plenty of support to the underdogs, he began his fictional career from the "feet," the untouchables, socially disabled by *Manusamrti*, the Hindu Code of Law. Thus, the PWA aimed to overturn the prevailing Indian customs with the help of progressive's clamouring.

The theoretical supposition of PWA literary circle was on a new line of action as the group believed that literature could bring about "radical changes... in Indian society [when] ...fixed ideas...old beliefs...social and political institutions are being challenged" (Manifesto 6). All above-mentioned features brought together in a manifesto, adopted by the PWA, with which the writers were aiming to achieve the spring of human progress. The word "Progress" had its origin in the fresh orientation towards the future and expressed the ability in the improvement of human conditions with the surety of an advanced future over the present along with a critique of the past. Progress allowed a person to think "that civilization has moved, is moving, and will move in a desirable direction" (Bury 2). The ending of *Untouchable* incorporates all the branches of progress where hope was injected in the naive

mind of Bakha, the hero, with the acknowledgement of the “flush system” in traditional India. Likewise, as per Vladimir Lenin’s leftist theory, the “progress” brought a change in the social system but the condition is that the progressive movement must have three main socialistic principles: the *narodnost* (people-ness, the relationship between art and the masses); the *kassovost* (class-ness, the class characteristics of art) and finally *partiinnost*—party-ness, the identification of artist with the Communist Party (James 1). Anand’s characters, the poet Iqbal, Sudha, wrestler Ratan, Ananta, Lalu could be put into this category. Herbert Spencer offered a different but positive opinion while articulating that the progress had power to eradicate the “evil and immorality” and could help man to become “perfect” (65). Under the spell of progress, human wanted to achieve “greatest happiness” (Spencer 67) to live a better and peaceful life, if not for them then, at least, for their future generations. In simple words, progress could be called a sudden modification in the social structure. Using the words of Spenser, the struggle for existence, desire for change, to fight against immorality are the synonymous for progress. In this way, the idea of human progress could be taken as a synthesis of past and prophecy of a better future. By taking the example of Bakha, Munoo and other in Anand’s novels, the craze of lowest and miserable creatures for a better life could be termed as progress.

“Progress,” Anand thought, is the first desired action for the development of humanity, especially, in the modern age (forties) wherein citizens were struggling against the authoritarian forces (Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Imperialism and so on). To achieve their aim, these dictators adopted the “monstrous form” (symbolically as the Axis Power did in twentieth century by inviting the WW-II or Hitler’s Holocaust) which disturbed the nice balanced scale of society and, henceforth, came the struggle of life.

All the above-mentioned progressive characteristics have abundantly been found in the hermeneutics of Anand, who according to Krishna Nandan Sinha, shed light on, “the cause of suffering” and his fictions are fully based on the “philosophy of humanism” (23). He was demanding equal opportunities, right to education and jobs for all human beings and had a firm belief that the problems like poverty, casteism, racism, untouchability and gender difference could be erased by providing good education or by projecting these societal evils in literature, symbolically in the same way, as the writers of American Progressive Era (APE) did at the beginning of twentieth century. Like Upton Sinclair, Jack London or John Steinbeck, Anand put emphasis on importance and respect of human being. Accordingly, he

presents metaphorically a “blueprint for the solution” (Sinha 23) of existing ill-wills of the society, i.e., untouchability, inequality, child labour, women rights and others. The method of fiction, print and media was most suitable to Anand to achieve the progress. Therefore, Anand’s career began as a literary progressive writer but with the popularity of each novel, he came closer to socio-political dictators, as the PWA had its association with the CPI. In all the three trends of literary, social and political, the PWA was a reformist Indian movement which was led by the London-based Indians who were addressing the economic, political, and cultural questions of India from far off lands.

Anand, as a progressive frontier, challenged those assumptions on which society had targeted some “(not) special” hierarchies (on the origin of class, class, and gender) to live a degraded life. These radical thoughts favoured the development of science, increase of rational views along with the notion of equality in political, social and religious rights. He fully rejected the legacy of the industrial revolution i.e., imperialism, consumption, feudalism materialism, trade monopoly, market economy and so on. He criticized its fruits by labelling as the “false” progress while emphasized on the need of “true” progress of man in social as well as in political domain. The main focus of PWA was to establish a balance between social and economic justice, campaigning against the capitalistic monopoly of industries, and demanding advanced labour conditions, implementation of the Child Labour Act, the Workers Labour Act and fixed job for the unemployed Indians. The progressive litterateur received healthy attention, thus, what was the norm a couple of centuries ago, for instance, untouchability, child labour, child marriage, sati-system, dowry system and other social evils, hardly advocated by the high classes (in open) in twentieth century India. The Sati-system in today’s time could be taken as a far cry of the yesteryears. Indeed, the PWA discarded the yesterday and unethical today so that the writers could borrow a better future for the downtrodden with a post-haste. In the Indian Constitution (IC), all the four categories of government jobs (A,B,C,D) are reserved for the *achoot* (untouchable), so called *harijan* by Gandhi or untouchable by Ambedkar or *dalit* by Phule. In India, as article 16.1 of IC recorded, “There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the State” (6). The campaigners of these programmes, in revolutionary or radical sense, shared a way of past life using the label of progressive quite freely and the word “progress” became their slogan or anthem for resistance. By following the concept “New Freedom,” (the phrase of APE) in which equal rights will be given to all and no special privileges (in Indian constitution, the Reservation

policy is an exception) will be reserved to any one “on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them” (The Constitution of India 6), the PWA associates became torch-bearer for the Indian Constitution which was going to be written by Ambedkar and others after Independence. In this sense, the progress became acronym of social reform and the striving quality for equality, fraternity and brotherhood. To achieve the target, the progressive aesthete prepared a list of principles which were published by the journal *Left Review*³ under the heading “Manifesto of the Indian Progressive Writers’ Association.”

Anand was the chief architect of the success of manifesto as he was the first who drafted it. With the PWA manifesto, brainpower, without a doubt, goes back to Marx who came out with his *The Communist Manifesto* (published on February 21, 1848) for the establishment of Socialism. Similarly, Anand sketched the first proposal in 1935 for a group of young literary writers meet in London for the foundation of “progressivism” and for the beginning of a new Indian literature. “Progressivism,” defined Zafar, “means to come out of arm-chairs into arena of life—its real forces—real problems that call for solution” (88). Professed with socialism and a biased attitude towards Marx, Anand’s manifesto, noted Zaheer, was “very”⁴ lengthy and was, therefore, edited by Ghosh and was finally accepted by *The Left Review* in February 1936 after a second editing by Zaheer. In Anand’s view, its principal concern was to question “individualism” rather than “individual” and it aimed “to produce and translate literature of a progressive nature and of a high technical standard; to fight cultural reaction; and in this way, to further the cause of Indian freedom and social regeneration” (9). India could march ahead, as the radical writer in Anand understood, on the progressive road only if Indians shed off superstitions, communalism, caste/sub-caste status, provincialisms and other false prejudices. India’s futuristic agenda had been penned by Anand in this one page Bible with which Zaheer returned to India.

Anand held the responsibility of London PWA office after Zaheer’s landing in India in (1936) order to establish this new movement, as the British Intelligence Report, dated on July 2, 1936, noted:

³ *Left Review* was a monthly journal which runs from 1934 to 1938. It published from the Britain and it has the honour to be the first Marxist Journal of Britain on cultural studies in English language. This manifesto (English) was first printed in February 1936 (TLR-Manifesto 240).

⁴ Zaheer noted in his “Reminiscence,” “It was decided that a manifesto be drafted to formulate the aims and objects. Four of five persons were commissioned to do this job. Anand prepared the first draft, which was very long. Later this work was entrusted to Dr. Ghosh, who presented his draft before the committee. I was asked to rewrite the drafts of Anand and Ghosh (which we had discussed repeatedly for hours together) and prepare a final draft. After many disputes and long discussion about every sentence and every word, the committee finally approved the draft” (50).

Since the departure of S.S. Zaheer for India, the London end of the Indian Progressive Writers' Association has been run by Dr. Mulk Raj Anand as President, with Promode Rajan Sen Gupta as Secretary (Jalil 208).

Though Anand's contribution to the movement was unmatched yet Ahmad Ali Khan charged, "Others like Mulk Raj Anand remained sympathetic [to PWA] but were unable to render any practical help" (viii) and adds, "that the association's progress from 1936 to 1947 is an eloquent testimony of Sajjad Zaheer's organizational skills, his passionate commitment and his personal charm" (ix). He goes on saying, the aim of Zaheer was to construct "a broadly based organisation of writers belonging to a different school of thoughts or with no affiliation" (ix). The words of Khan had two invisible problems: first, his claim of "no affiliation" could be proved wrong with Zaheer, Jahan, Anand and Zafar's lifelong membership of the political parties such as the Indian National Congress (INC), CPI and CSP. Beside it, no one can deny the support that the CPI offered to the PWA from its inception. The question emerges, how a literary organization can be without affiliation when its founding members were part of one party or the other in a very chaotic period. Apart from this, as an Intelligence Report recorded, "In London the association has very friendly relations with the communist intelligentsia" (Jalil 209). Here, the announcement of Khan dies a premature death in the embryo of his claim. Second, if the PWA was an independent association, as Khan opined, then why was he criticizing (indirectly) the independent writers, like Anand, Khwaja Ahmad Abbas, Saadat Hasan Manto, Ismat Chughtai and Ahmad Ali (Khan's claim is not worth refuting it directly). In fact, the Urdu *ulema/ fuzala* (scholars/researchers) were (obliquely) not accepting Anand as a part of the PWA. The latest example could be served with Priyamvada Gopal's book on the Urdu PWA writers, *Literary Radicalism in India: Gender, Nation and the Transition to Independence*, wherein she noted, "the work of Mulk Raj Anand is a notable absent" (10) as he did not write in Urdu but she accepted him as, like Carlo Coppola did, as "the second most important individual" (5) who, simultaneously, was the first president of the PWA.

Anand was highly admired for favouring the progressive outlook under the flag of CPI or under the spell of socialism cast by Stalin, after whose pact with Hitler Anand changed face by declaring himself "independent"⁵ around 1940s. His progressive views in the

⁵ The Intelligence Report of July 2, 1936 noted that B.F. Bradley, member of Indian Communist Students fraction, "is not in contact with M.R. Anand" (Jalil 209) and "for this reason," stated Jalil, "P.R. Sen Gupta considers him [Anand] rather indiscreet in his conversation" (Jalil 209).

fifties led him towards the BBC job till 1945. There might be some truth in Khan's earlier statement ("Anand remained sympathetic") but whether it was Jahan, Manto, Chughtai, Zaheer, or Abbas, the main quest of the progressive writers was the position of human being in the societal domain. In particular, Anand was flowing in the liberal humanistic river which was against the ideology of CPI or the PWA's demand of socialism or theory of Marxism and even the dictum of Gandhism. One may add to this, like Nietzsche's madman of/in *The Gay Science*, Anand's humanistic flow came before the time, "I have come too early, he said then: my time is not yet..." (TGS 182) but, on a whole, or in reality, it came too late—as it should have come hundred years before, like the Renaissance of Europe. Tumultuous twentieth century was not proved to be a ripe fruit for Anand who, apparently, as per the grapevine of the critics like Naik, Cowasjee, Niven, was at a right place at right time but in wrong century. For the sake of human brotherhood and universal fraternity, he put radical question mark on the old customs for a trial in the open courtroom of society by portraying the tragedy of downtrodden characters. The torture and suffering of Bakha took place in the open, i.e., temple, shop in the city, game of hockey, speech of Gandhi, slap by the high class man, insult by the priest and so on. What did the writer mean when he decided to shake hands with Bakha's quest for human rights? Here, in reality, Anand was criticizing Indian orthodoxy directly in literature with the helplessness of Bakha, which was nothing but an open revolution of "higher class" (Anand) against higher caste.

Anand started the PWA and continuously worked under the umbrella of PWA for four or five years in London but after the beginning of World War II, he preferred to be a humanist writer rather than a "party intellectual," as Orwell thinks about him in his review of *The Sword and the Sickle*. Anand's this line of action was entirely different from his other progressive associates, i.e., Zaheer, Jahan and Zafar. Anand's independent career also had a long history or in simpler words, why did he not prefer to be a party intellectual? In fact, in 1920, Lenin was the chief Socialist-cum-Communist leader who was the voice of the grassroots against the political injustice of bourgeoisie but his followers, particularly Stalin, disdained his socialist doctrine with Ribbentrop–Molotov Pact or Nazi–Soviet Pact (August 23, 1939 with Hitler), hence, the graph of socialism begins to decline. Stalin's "Pact" policy during World War II was totally reverse from WW I's policy of Lenin along with Trotsky, the main brain behind the October Revolution. The situation became worse when Hitler betrayed Stalin (1941) and he followed Britain and France and remained with them till 1948. Thus, socialism (communism) was in zigzag motion sometimes with Fascism and another

time with Capitalism. Before this, the Communist Party of Germany (Opposition, or KPD) supported the “Red Referendum” (December 1931) of the Nazis (Hitler) on the order of Stalin, who was simultaneously the first to congratulate Hitler on his victory as the Chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933. Therefore, the role of Communist Party of the World or Stalin was away from the socialist line. It was wittily and satirically criticized by Orwell in *Animal Farm*, wherein the earliest socialist slogan of Lenin “all animals are equal” (21) was replaced with Stalin’s “All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others” (63). To avoid such kind of controversies, Anand preferred to be independent rather than a party intellectual as he was disillusioned with Stalinism and became a liberal “humanistic” writer. He went to the Spanish Civil War under the guidance of Stalinist Party of London but later he was against it.⁶ In fact, Anand was in confusion regarding his ideology and the words of Orwell’s review of Anand’s *Sword and Sickle* are appropriate here, “Half of me [Indian] is a Socialist but the other half is a Nationalist. I know what Fascism means, I know very well that I ought to be on your [British] side, but I hate your people so much that if we get rid of them I hardly care what happens afterwards. I tell you that there are moments when all I want is to see China, Japan and India get together and destroy western civilisation, not only in Asia, but in Europe” (Orwell, Rev S&S 219). Anand’s partiness can be proved with his membership of the Congress (India and England) and by his works published in their journals, especially *Congress Socialist*. If the PWA was what Khan said, “with no affiliation” then Anand was progressive writer as he left the movement due to the growing influence of CPI but kept writing on the same theme as proposed in the manifesto. In this sense, he was an “uncompromising progressive” or erratic Marxist who preferred to stay aloof from the movement when it was coloured with “Comintern” (Communist International) ideology of the Left. Hence, Khan was not able to find the direct “practical help” in Anand’s engagement with the PWA as he stopped leading the organization and charted his own career with the BBC and later with the MARG. This established him a real progressive writer like Ahmad Ali, Abbas, Manto and other liberals of the movement. The same line of action also separated him from middle-of-the-road political progressive nominees namely, Zaheer, Zafar and Jahan, as all had the CPI in their heart, the CSP in their mind and the Congress in their soul. “As might be expected, it [PWA] is a fairly broad organisation and includes semi and no communists, likewise persons who cannot truthfully be described as ‘progressive’ writers at

⁶ Anand was writing and behaving on Party line till 1940s and his participation in Civil war is its perfect example. His writings in *Congress Socialist*, a journal of Indian Congress’ socialist branch, is its another example. He was personal secretary of Nehru in 1937 is another link to prove his partiness. Thus, by hit and trial method of adjusting him into the given parameters, one could easily project him as a Party intellectual.

all, but who are known to be communists or to have communist sympathies” (Jalil 209). In a single line, independent writers were “truly” progressive while the Party writers are rendered suspect but the question of ideology still remained matrix for the critics which cannot be solved quickly.

From the inception of PWA in India, critics like Ralph Russell, called it a “socio-cultural movement” (104) but for M.G. Hallet⁷ it was a “political movement” as the “extremist left wing politics” was behind the curtain. Hallet, in 1936, was looking for an answer, why was the Comintern secretly wedded with newly formed literary-cultural movement of the PWA? The Comintern wanted, he found, to establish the dictatorship of proletariat in India but they were lacking in writers like Marx and Friedrich Engels, henceforth, they wanted a control on the writers such as Anand, Zaheer, Jahan and Zafar. The party dreamed about the political control in India like newly formed proletariat French Government of 1936.⁸ To make their dream come true, the party needed some intellectuals who could define socialist theory to the masses through their writings. In other words, the CPI needed some radical and revolutionary writers who could challenge the authorization of Congress Party and their newly formed the Congress Socialist Party (1934). Anand’s giving support to the PWA had triggered the euphoria among Stalin led communists, especially the CPI, in India but it did not last long as he was “universalist humanism” (Kapur 30). Long back in history, Comintern considered their movement as the reformist movement, from this time forth, they came in touch with the PWA from its inauguration in London but in India they had other plans. Beside it, they also had to fight against the giant-like political figures such as Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Bhimrao Ambedkar, and Jagjivan Ram (Jafferlot 97-102), who were permanent members of the Congress during 1935.

In countering Hallet and Khan’s criticism, the movement “has been entering upon a new phase,” (On PWA 1) when Anand joined the association of progress. For this reason, Meenakshi Mukherjee underlined, “Progress with a capital P is the keyword in Anand’s novels, and this progress consists in man’s power to master nature through technology, and rationalising the relationship between man and man” (96). In the grim atmosphere of 1940s,

⁷ M.G Hallet was the Home Secretary of India. He sends a circular regarding the rise of movement to all the local governments on August 19, 1936.

⁸ The workers’ party named the “Popular Front” formed the government in France on June 4, 1936. It was the government of the “French Section of the Workers’ International.” Its Prime Minister was Leon Blum—the first socialist and the first Jew who become the Prime Minister of France. Like the Popular Front of France, the CPI wanted to form socialist government in India. While following the tale of their failed experiment, they were following the “French Dream” but their base was the Russian socialism and their root was the Marxism.

Anand came forward to protect the human from the “abyss of ignorance and barbarism” and termed the older order as “sterile, lifeless and false” (Zafar 87). Anand made full use of pen, print media and radio against the Fascist dictator, Hitler, who was using poisonous gas Zyklon-B on the Jews or against the British hegemony which was in love with machine-gun to establish their rule not only in India but also in the world. With the above aids, he was fighting for the celebration of the fundamental right to live, including freedom of thought, speech and action. In straightforward words, he became preacher to those who were “hungry not for bread, clothing and shelter but also for the culture that will put an end to their ignorance, and give them a concrete hope of a better and fuller life, not only after death, but there on this fruitful earth” (Zafar 88). Followingly, Anand’s progressive outlook, in his novels, had twofold dimension: in the first, his unheroic characters (Bakha, Munoo, Lalu, Gauri, Ananta) suffers the maximum; and in the second, the elite progressive characters (the poet Iqbal and Havildar Charat Singh of *Untouchable*, Colonial Mahindra from *The Old Woman and the Cow*) look forward to the future through a progressive glass and played their part in the protagonist’s life and helped him/her to revolt against the society but in silent mode. Both of the groups had practiced the peaceful way which had similarities with Gandhi’s notion of *Ahimsa* (do not harm). Anand’s bourgeoisie characters were privileged (superior since birth or the *Dvija*, twice born) in tradition, opposite to Marx’s proletariat class but they believed that downtrodden and socially disable people could be raised by giving a chance for their upliftment. Charat Singh, Sudha, Janki, Colonel Mahindra belongs to the list which believes in the festivity of equal rights to men. They became friends with the lower strata and prove the old phrase “a friend in need is a friend indeed.” They had a firm belief in love of man to fellow man with the recommendation that the progress of an individual played a central role in the development and evolution of society, culture and country. Like Marx, these characters belonged to upper castes but, unlike him, they never gave fake hope that “the workers of the world unite.” They knew very well that the Indian colonial policy, against Marx views, was based on the notion of “divide and rule” and its result was clearly seen in the Bombay riot scene of *Coolie* or in the strike scene in *The Big Heart*. A Darwinian metaphorical phrase “might is right” was a character in *Two Leaves and a Bud* and in *Death of a Hero*. Though Marx’s statement brings fruit in the hands of some socialist writers/parties (Progressive Era of America, October Revolution of Russia) but under the shadow of above-mentioned metaphor, the workers of India were unable to unite and form a symbolical French or American Revolution. Hence, the elite characters helped Bakha, Munoo, Gangu, Ananta, Bhikhu, Gauri and other but in the Gandhian way. Discarding the higher notion of caste,

these characters became a weapon of progress as they desired improvement in human's lot which, surely, was possible after the increase of social knowledge. In the lack of scientific knowledge, as the views of West interrogated, our society will not be more than a "non-human world" surrounded by the beasts, not humans. Anand's novels had a plenty of beast characters, like Rakha, brother of Bakha and even his sister and father were also ready to challenge the animals and his friends were trying to beat the owl in knowledge. In this sense, Anand's idea of progress was not on conventional Marxist lines of class struggle but more on humanistic lines with an addition of Gandhism.

The PWA started as a protest literature at a time "when writers were asked the question, 'whose side are you on?'" (M. A. Khan xvi). Following Khan, from 1935 to 1947, there were many newspaper columnists who were trying to prove that "non-Marxist writers" were actually Marxist—the writers may or may not be Marxist but the critics were unmindful of such deeper and nuanced realities. Anand's friendly relations with the left writers not only in England but also in India were enough to awaken the consciousness of the critics who gave their judgement by declaring him a "Marxist." The label of Marxist propagandist brought a bad reputation for the literary writers as they were writing against the double yoke of colonialism and also against the pervading socio-political problems of the time, therefore:

... socialists who are not, do not claim to be, or positively deny that they are Marxists are nevertheless swept, by their 'socialist' or 'extremist' views, into the general 'Marxist' classification (Williams 234).

One such case was of Anand, who was termed as Marxist/Leftist by critics during 1940s and he kept denying such a classification, however, it was another matter that his writings have a direct bearing of Marxist concept.

The progressives fully opposed the curtailment in fundamental rights as the threats were supposed to come in the atmosphere of 1940s due to the Anti-Comintern (later Tripartite) Pact or speaking more broadly due to the rise of Axis Power. Some time before the World War II, the young scholars of Europe, America, France, Russia, China and India were looking for an answer to the power of "dictators," (Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin) as the great intellectuals, scientists and writers of the world, i.e., Georgi Dimitrov, Albert Einstein, Thomas Mann, Ernst Toller, Sigmund Freud, Bertolt Brecht, including others, were humiliated and discarded from their own country on the basis of their indirect support to

Allied Powers through their views, writings, speeches and broadcasts in BBC (Ahmad 23-28). The individuals (Romain Rolland, Andre Gide, Andre Malraux, Waldo Frank, Zaheer, Anand and others) who came into support of these writers were responsible for the “progressive” environment of the world. The Fascist rule became more and more brutal to the writers (who were protesting against the authority), by murdering (Leon Trotsky killed after the order of Stalin) them or by putting them behind the bars (Dimitrov, later Zaheer and Faiz) or by burning/banning of those books (of Gorky, Ludwig Renn, Helen Keller, Ernest Hemingway, Marx, Brecht, John Reed, Jack London)⁹ which were showing any kind of resistance. The unnecessary assault of the dictators created *Judenhass* (Jew-hatred) in Europe, or more generally Anti-Semitism was in the air of 1940s. The writers who called themselves progressive began to unite and agitate against the Fascist virus which was injected into the veins of Jew ethnicity and began a campaign in France in 1935. Question arises, “how” everything starts in 1935 or 1936? In fact, progressivism was, from 1930 to 1936, followed by a succession of events, such as, the emergence of Hitler, the Crash of Wall-Street, the attack of Mussolini on Abyssinia, the open revolt of General Franco against democratic Spanish Government and finally the assassination of Federico Garcia Lorca. All the political events played their part in connecting the intellectuals (except Eliot and Pound)¹⁰ of the world but the most central episode was the imprisonment of Dimitrov, the Communist leader of Bulgaria, in the fake charge of Reichstag Fire.¹¹ Apparently, after the WW-I, the proliferation of leftist conventions rapidly increased in the international arena during the twenties, thirties and forties after the dawn of Lenin, the October Revolution or rise of Stalin. It was followed by the association of World Congress against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism (Brussels, 1927), a product of Comintern; the World Congress Against Fascism and War (Amsterdam, 1932), closely affiliated with the Communist International; the International Conference of Writers (Paris, 1935) and the Anti-Imperialist United Front

⁹ On May 10, 1933, “the Fascist mob went on the rampage across the campus of Berlin University burning books by Maxim Gorky, Stalin and German writer, Ludwig Renn. As the embers of Fascism spread across Germany destroying the works of Helen Keller, Ernest Hemingway, Karl Marx, Bertolt Brecht, John Reed, Jack London and many others...” (Ahmad 23).

¹⁰ “...only two great writers supported the forces of oppression. One was Ezra Pound, and the other was T.S. Eliot—the same two poets whom a group of present day writers have extolled. Ezra Pound used to propagate Fascism openly. He was a great admirer of Mussolini. He went to Italy before the Second World War, and broadcast speech in support of fascism, from Rome” (S. Hasan xvi).

¹¹ The Reichstag Building of Berlin was on fire on February 27, 1933. The fire was taken as a plot or conspiracy of the Communists against the Nazi government led by Adolf Hitler, who became the Chancellor of Germany on January 30, 1933, just four week before the fire accident. It is also known as “Reichstag Fire Trial” or “the Leipzig Trial” in which three individuals (Bulgarians Georgi Dimitrov, Vasil Tanev and Blagoi Popov) were captured. The case was in German Imperial High Court, the Reichsgericht in front of the presiding Dr. Wilhelm Bunger. After the fire government introduced Enabling Act, according to which the Chancellor could introduce any official law without consulting to the Parliament of Germany.

(1935) were also under the influence of Left; the International Writers' Association Congress (London, 1936 and Madrid, 1937) were also spreading the communist agenda in the world. The international communist-cum-progressive groups, as noted by Pradhan in her Foreword, "gradually but steadily mobilised public opinion on their behalf" (v). Like them, Indian progressive intellectuals had the "rational" view of the universe and dreamed of a social revival as their society, too, was based on the superstition, darkness and error. These writers were unsympathetic to the non-rational periods of history but do not have a stage, hence, "all Communists Parties [were ready] to create a broad democratic front, including intellectuals, against capitalism" (Pradhan vi). As a consequence, the CPI had chosen the PWA from its very first day in order to find intellectuals who will speak on their behalf, at this point, the fear of Hallet was right. The party had Leftist ideology by following Lenin's (later Stalin's) theory and Anand was much influenced by it in his early career but when Stalinism turned into totalitarian rule, he was disillusioned with it and converted into a, (as noted by Cowasjee, Niven, Narasimhaiah, Naik and others), humanist writer.

In the company of Bloomsbury Group, BBC Eastern Service, Left Book Club, the PWA and other associations, the cycle of Anand's career was running smoothly. Due to this success, his friends were trying to present him a Leftist writer. Louis MacNeice had seen him as "a crusader for the Indian Left" in *Strings are False* who, apparently, was "one of the few people in London who still had public enthusiasms" (MacNeice 209). MacNeice talked about one more Leftist characteristic of Anand while addressing, "The books of the Left Book Club, which by now were mainly of academic interest for the English, were for him more functional, alive, because he [Anand] could make them applicable to India" (209). With the publication of *Two Leaves and a Bud* and with the service in BBC in the company of Orwell, Anand had opened fresh and unexplored vistas of discussion for the progressive production but due to the WW-II and his Leftist relations, he emerged as a propagandist. As a broadcaster, he forced the British to clear their stand on the status of India's liberation but the government suspected him as a "secret agent" (Home Department, Government of India 1) of Comintern. No one had disturbed the peace of government, neither his friends, critics, and nor his reviewer who presented him Leftist. Justice will come to Anand when his role, from 1930 to 1945, will be seen as that of a bohemian, like Hermann Hesse, who was fighting against the plague of Fascism and Imperialism without following the fixed line of socialism, Marxism or the Leftism. Like Hesse, Anand had adopted all means in criticizing the canon of Axis Power by using the missiles called Marxism, Socialism, the Left, the Bloomsbury, the

PWA, the BBC, the Centre (Congress in India), novels, non-fiction and even the artistic mode. If we follow Anand in this manner, then “the strings of MacNeice are truly false.” In Anand’s support, we must take the example of Victorian artist John Martin who was portraying the picture about the Judgement Day where there was no hope/chance for the humanity as all had to suffer for their sin. Similar to Martin’s portrait, in the twentieth century, after seeing the horrors of two World Wars and dropping of super-weapon Atom-Bomb on Japan, the progressive aesthetics like Anand were afraid not about the redemption but about optimism or humanism as they did not believe in the afterlife. “Live and let live” was their slogan to the universe but the literary diktats has different opinion for them in general and Anand in particular. Another pressure was Anand’s bourgeoisie background which served as an assistance to the critics who projected him as a socio-cultural businessman-artist writing about the nightmares of his characters and the situation in which they, as well as he himself, were living. Anand’s novels, in this sense, are not drawing any line on the fall of man or angels or Adam and Eve but these are a cry of a “lost man” who had found nothing new beneath the sky or sun as all was black as night or white as ice. In Anand’s era, a volcano of filth let loose on the helpless masses as some dictators were haunted with the passion to rule the world, as Hitler ordered Hermann Rauschning, “Our strategy is to destroy the enemy from within, to conquer him through himself. Mental confusion, contradictions of feeling, indecision, panic—these are our weapons” (Rolo 18) and again, he commanded, “My object is to arouse outbursts of fury, to get men on the march, to organize hatred and Suspicion—all with ice-cold calculation” (Rolo 20). Due to these carnal desires, the cry of humanity was in competition with a wolf’s howl. The progressives were the *Messiahs* who were fighting against the European greed of power through their literary satires. Out of these prophets, some were considering Leninist approach and some had socialist tendencies, like the CPI.

With the help of CPI, the movement broadened its area day by day and year by year. By the end of 1947,¹² the branches of PWA were spread all across the country. Through the movement, the party willing to repeat the success of movement in Indian politics, henceforth, the effect of the CPI was growing stronger and stronger in the PWA, as Zaheer, Jahan and her

¹² In 1947, the movement’s membership was over 3900 writers in fifty branches in different states of India (it also includes the members of Pakistan and Bangladesh). Its effect had been seen in Bihar, Punjab, Maharastra, Uttar Pardesh, Kerala, Tamilnadu, Gujrat and other states.

husband Zafar (three main writers of *Angarey*¹³) had become permanent member of the party. The movement was at its peak under the flag of CPI but every peak has its base and the PWA started to search its own. In other words, decline of the movement had begun due to the faulty political policies of the CPI.

Some progressive writers revolted against the CPI's involvement (directly or indirectly) and Anand was among them. The first hint of it was the banishment of Ahmad Ali, who thought that in 1939, the movement was divided into two sections: the "creative" and the "political":

...differences arose among the active members of the movement, and it tended to split up into an 'ideological' (i.e., political) and a "creative" (i.e., non-political, non-communist) section, for political affiliations developed and strengthened between 1936-1938 by the former, who were also more vocal and wished to emphasize the role of the proletariat and proletarian literature, is a different story and irrelevant to the period of history.... (Ali and Rashed 95).

Anand, Ali, Manto, Abbas were its "creative" branch, whereas, Zaheer, Jahan and Zafar belongs to the "political" division. Due to the differences in thought between the movement and the CPI, the creative were dropped out/banished from the association. Consequently, the newly formed journal *New Indian Literature* of which Ali was the editor dies its own death. Jahan was an active member of the PWA and the CPI simultaneously—she served the CPI and PWA and IPTA till her death along with her husband, Zafar, as well as with her friend Zaheer. After Puran Chand Joshi, in 1948, Zafar became the General Secretary of CPI in Uttar Pradesh. Ali Sardar Jafri, Amrit Rai, Yashpal and Kaifi Azmi along with Balraj Sahni were the trump cards for CPI. Hence, there was a gap of understanding between the writers such as Ali, Abbas, Faiz, Manto, Chughtai, Anand and the party. Meanwhile, Anand regularly denied the charge of being a member of CPI but he never showed adherence to "the almost religious discipline demanded by a group of people who evolved changing tactics around a minimum manifesto with maximum 'sanctions'" (*Apology* 129). In *Apology for Heroism*, he offered his disappointment with communism as it "denies the people the very liberties and human right for which the revolutions were fought" (142). Anand, again, denied

¹³ *Angarey* was a collection of nine short stories and one one-act play by four writers. The full book was edited by Sajjad Zaheer. The title of the book has many spellings: (in original) *Angare*, or *Angarey*, or *Angaaray* and (in translations) *Live Coals*, or *The Sparks*, or *The Burning Coals* etc. I have chosen the title of its 1932s publication.

his role as a “hard-boiled Leftist” in the preface of *Two Leaves and a Bud* (second edition), as he confessed:

... contrary to superficial allegations, there was not much self-conscious proletarianism in my attitude, as there was in many middle-class writers of western Europe, simply for the reason that I was the son of a coppersmith turned soldier, and of a peasant mother, and could have written only of the lives I knew most intimately.

Indeed, the armchair dogmas of leftism, here, shunned by Anand over the humanist idealism. Moreover, literary bulb of the movement begun to dim as Ali, Zaheer, Manto and Faiz chose to stay in Pakistan after partition but, after some time, only Zaheer returned to India. Anand too turned his back from the movement when CPI tried to control its branches politically. Truly speaking, the man who started the PWA disassociated from it because of the political side towards which Ali was pointing his finger. The point is enough to ring the bell that Anand’s primary allegiance was to his writing not to any ideology and, thus, he fully fits in the role of a liberal writer. One may add to this, though “creative” was part of the movement for a very short time yet the legacy of its ideas, primarily the distinction between “ideological” and “creative” was to remain relevant to the literary critics. In one line, when the movement became too politically controlling under the umbrella of CPI, Anand preferred to change his route from the PWA.

All the writers of association, as the CPI dreamed, should identified themselves with the party and help it to find its socialist goal but Ali, however, did not followed the party and made his way different, hence, he was banned from the party—later Manto, Ismat Chughtai, Abbas and Anand (not banned but change his route) also joined the list. The reason for their expulsion was hidden in Lenin’s essays “Party Organisation and Party Literature,” wherein it was printed that “Everyone is free to write and say whatever he likes, without any restrictions. But every voluntary association (including the party) is also free to expel members who use the name of the party to advocate anti-party views” (47). In case of writer’s eviction, the PWA was following party outfit, especially the Leftist dogmas. On the contrary, the CPI took it over, expelled the founders, and tried to control its entire literary agenda by converting it in politics. Thus, the CPI of 1939 was using force to find the “unnamable” (political status) by using the shortcut named the PWA. But, in truth, it stands for invisible corruption because it represented “betrayal, delusion and terror” which Alain Badiou called, “*le Mal*” (Evil). Herein, the Stalin-led-party represented the Fascism and not

socialism as the main aim was to get power in their hands like the European Imperialists. What did fascism mean here? Using Jean-Paul Sartre words, fascism could not be defined by the number of its victims but by the way it affected the people around them and use of them for their own benefit. Due to this political control, writers like Ali and Abbas were dropped out and Anand changed his ways by becoming an “elite” writer while editing MARG under the leadership of Jahangir Ratanji Dadabhoy Tata. In 1951, Anand’s diversion from the movement was an outcome of that fact that “he was never a member of the Communist Party” (Jalil 416) or “he never became a member of the Communist party but always managed to stay on the fringe” (Sinha 23). Though these writers were part of the PWA for a short spell of time yet they followed the theory of progress lifelong in their writings, like Manto and Anand. Thus, the movement was at its peak when it was without any ideology, as a result, it attracted many new writers in its circle including the name of Anand, Manto, Chughtai, Jafri and others. All joined it because of its two ideological poles: nation and literature for change. But with the passage of time other realist philosophies or theories played important role in their writings such as Manto and Chughtai were under the impact of Freudian sexual behaviour, Anand was on the road to Fabian Socialism along with Nehru. Despite it, the PWA’s “advocacy of the CPI’s line—whether it be on Pakistan, pro-war policy, the abandonment of strikes during the war (so that they do not interfere with the war effort), and the resumption of strikes thereafter—certain members such as Zaheer, Anand, and Jafri began to demand greater ideological fidelity from its members” (Jalil 385). Due to this unbridgeable gap, the writers like Abbas, Manto, Anand, Chughtai, Miraji, Jafari and others were the first who disassociated themselves from the movement. The commitment of these writers was flying in no man’s land, hence, they faced banishment from the party or the PWA which is still a question. Thus, the thematic purity of liberal group was at odds with the political fluidity of the party as dreamed by Lenin.

Lenin noted in the essay “Party Organisation and Party Literature” that “Literature must become a component of organised, planned and integrated Social-Democratic Party work” (45). So, the party wanted monopolized control over the revolutionary literature and it was clear from the words of Lenin, “all social-democratic literature must become the literature of Party.” It was true to some extent that all revolutionary literature in India, till 1940s, was under the umbrella of CPI. To make their organisation more powerful, the party wanted an active control over the PWA. Again quoting from Lenin’s essay:

... literature must by all means and necessarily become an element of Social-Democratic Party work, inseparably bound up with the other elements... and their writers must by all means become members of these organisations. Publishing and distributing centres, bookshops and reading-rooms, libraries and similar establishments—must all be under party control (46).

When we look at the progressive aesthetic such as Zaheer, Jahan, Zafar, we come to know that the CPI was following Lenin by hiring all the writers of PWA. Seven years later, Ali views form a precursor to Pradhan's analysis of the association, who wrote down in the Forward of *Marxist Cultural Movement in India*, "the stalemate in the movement after 1946 could be ascribed to two reasons, one was political and the other organizational, one resulting in the other" (xvii). Herein, "political" hand was directed towards the CPI. Due to the difference in the political and literary ideology, the novelists like Ajneya and Ila Chandra Joshi left the PWA and founded the "Congress for Cultural Freedom" movement. They threw their criticism towards the PWA. According to Joshi, the progressives were "unliterary, professional propagandists, lacking depth, [and were] cunning" (Avasthi 146) writers. Ajneya writes:

Progressives were no different from the sadistic mental orgies of the Decadents.... As it [the PWA] became more and more a communist 'closed shop' organisation, its writings became politically more explicit, guided and canalised and any further suggestion of Romanticism (as in any other 'ism') became taboo. But even before it became completely stupefied itself through intolerance, its ablest exponents were not free from a disguised sadism (Sharma 61).

Debate on the legacy of political or organizational had continued since then to find out, what kind of movement was the PWA—was it a political movement or social or the cultural or Marxist or a blend of it all? At this point, the answer itself became a question and the critics find themselves in the chaos. The movement, more or less, disappeared in 1942 due to the World War II. However, it was through the popularity of Indian People's Theatre Association (IPTA, May, 1943) that the movement became visible again although still under the shadow of CPI. After partition, the movement was again divided into two parts: Indian PWA and Pakistani PWA—the latter being banned in 1954 and Zaheer being awarded death penalty (in Rawalpindi Conspiracy Case) for spreading rumours about the Pakistani Government. It was

only at the request of Nehru that he was freed from all the charges and sent back to India.¹⁴ All in all, the movement came back to home but not for the sake of people or the party but for its final end. The movement died its natural death in around in 1955. The importance of the movement was put into the question when the critics found that the PWA was a “transmission belt of CPI” (Ahmad 6). The problem was witnessed because “the concept [of PWA] was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm” (Anderson 6-7). Hence, the critics checked everything with the political eye.

In the view of the creative section, after the Party took control of it, the PWA became a brand of “propaganda.” Though Anand was the founding member of the movement yet he had never been recommended by its writers as a part of the PWA, especially by the Urdu *ulema*. Despite that fact, Anand and the movement were interrelated to each other. No single event was enough to establish the progressive fervour in Anand, in fact, it had a long history. The most famous incident was Anand’s friendship with Zaheer in London. The second episode was the visit of both to attend the International Congress of Writers for the Defence of Culture conference¹⁵ in Balboulille Hall, Paris, France on June 21, 1935. The third was the association of Anand and Zaheer with Ralph Fox, who attended the Nanking meeting as an advisor and later published the PWA manifesto in the journal *Left Review*. The fourth-point signals towards the funding of CPI or the British Left Parties. The fifth limb could be the ideological glue of Marxism or socialism which shackled the PWA from its inception. Thus, Anand’s association with the PWA was complex and evolving—while he founded the movement, he never fully belonged to it due to his liberal and humanistic ideology which separated him from the party persons and established him a progressive bohemian aesthetic of his own type.

Zaheer noted in his/PWA literary biography how he had the honour to meet Anand who was “literary to the core” and “Having living in England for many years, and married there” which was sign that he had become “quite English.” The same fake charge also

¹⁴ Zaheer’s daughter, Nadira Z. Babbar, writes in her Forward to the book *Angarey: Nine Stories and a Play*, “He [Zaheer] was, in fact, awarded a death sentence and extradited back to India only on the request of Jawaharlal Nehru” (Babbar iii).

¹⁵ The conference was sponsored by Maxim Gorky, Thomas Mann, Romain Rolland, Andre Malraux and Waldo Frank against the Fascist plague of Hitler.

levelled against him by George Orwell while reviewing *The Sword and the Sickle*.¹⁶ In truth, Zaheer's meeting with Anand in London and later in Nanking was not an incident. To find the root, one has to go back to the calendar year 1932. The Nanking gathering was a curious outcome of an event happened in December 1932, the publication of a pamphlet entitled *Angarey*. It created a scandal, like Salman Rushdie's novel *The Satanic Verses*, by poking fun of Muslim God and his prophets. In fact, "Most of the stories in this collection, lacked depth and serenity, and contained a good deal of anger and agitation against obsolete and retrogressive values" (Light 6). Thus, the book created a space for the emergence of progressive radicalism. The scandal's consequence became evident on March 15, 1933 in the form of an enormous Muslim protest against this "filthy pamphlet" (Mahmud 448) along with the demand to proscribe it under Section 295-A of the Indian Penal Code. Later, as Zaheer noted in *The Light*, "the UP government confiscated the publication" (6)—as for the criminal offence, as per the act of 1898, of outraging the "religious feelings" of a particular community. The protest, similar to the case of Rushdie, followed by a *fatwa* against its central editor-cum-writer, Zaheer, who became "subject of harsh propaganda" (Light 6) and fled to England in order to save his life. The progressive thoughts of Zaheer were clearly reflected in "Reminiscences" by his reaction on this proscribe, as he was "glad to know that my first literary effort had shocked the old, bearded fogeys" (39). In consequence, the pamphlet could be seen as "the picture of a world dying and new world being born" (33). Hereafter, a cultural crusade began with *Angarey*, in other words, this small book became a preface or an introduction to the movement soon to be begin from the Nanking Restaurant against prevailing norms of society, politics and religion. To put it differently, Zaheer, not Anand was the key mover of the PWA in both London and in India. On the eve of November 24, 1934, the Chinese Restaurant became the point of genesis of an up-coming avant-garde movement which was based on the principles of a manifesto,¹⁷ drafted by Anand. Thus, Zaheer propelled the engine of PWA through the unequivocal emphasis on transformation and the portrayal of a degenerated society in his works. To make his satire more powerful, witty and direct, he had to start a movement along with other intellectuals like him and

¹⁶ While reviewing *Sword and the Sickle*, George Orwell, in whose company Anand enjoyed some time at the BBC Easter Service (1941-45), considered him "better" writer as compared with the "average run of English novelists" (218). The PWA writers, like Anand, added Orwell, were "interpreting Asia to the west" (218) but simultaneously full of "self-pity and race-hatred" (219). The writing in English turned them "in a species of alliance with" the British, like Anand's Bloomsbury's relations, hence, they were rejected by the Indian audience. In the words of Orwell, "Mr. Anand does not like us very much, and some of his colleagues hate us very bitterly; but so long as they voice their hatred in English they are in species of alliance with us" (219).

¹⁷ In the words of Ahmad Ali, the "original manifesto" of Anand was in the form of a "full book" (91).

Anand was a perfect front for this group. Without a movement or group individuals like Zaheer would be easy targets as Rushdie became later for *The Satanic Verses*.

Anand, Ali, Zaheer, Abbas and other main writers of the PWA were intensely aware of the fact that the PWA could be merely an expatriate group in England and will not be able to produce good “nationalistic” and public literature while living in London. Therefore, they decided to transfer the group to India and apparently the job was assigned to Zaheer. His efforts took fruit and the association was heralded in India on April 10, 1936. With the founding of PWA, the Indian culture, as Nehru’s Independence speech followed eleven years later, “steps out from the old to the new” (175). This was the first sign of progress because India had, as Rushdie writes in *Midnight’s Children*, “made a tryst with destiny” (116). The official Indian PWA of 1936 was renamed as the All India Progressive Writers’ Association (AIPWA) which, as Rushdie noted in his novel *The Moor’s Last Sigh*:

...was the group of distinguished writers who gathered for a time under Aurora’s wing,¹⁸ Premchand¹⁹ and Saadat Hasan Manto and Mulk Raj Anand and Ismat Chughtai, committed realists all; but even in their work there were elements of the fabulous.... (173).

The movement also included Zaheer, Ali, Jahan and Abbas. The doyen of Hindi literature, Munshi Premchand, was nominated as its first president in Lucknow meeting. The AIPWA also had the blessings of Rabindranath Tagore and Sarojini Naidu:

In fact, Sarojini Naidu²⁰ attended the first conference of the PWA and Jawaharlal attended meetings and contributed articles to the journal published by the PWA and Tagore continued to bless its activities. There is a report that Nehru²¹ addressed a

¹⁸ The location of Lucknow conference was the auditorium of the *Rifah-e-Aam* Hall.

¹⁹ Amrit Rai recorded, how his father, Premchand, was requested by Zaheer to preside over the conference of PWA, but, “He [Premchand] replied, ‘As for the presidentship, I am not for it. I say this not out of modesty but because of my shortcomings.’ He suggested, instead the name of K.M. Munshi, Dr. Zakir Hussian, and the best of all, Jawaharlal Nehru, though he acknowledged that each of them was likely to be up to his neck in politics with hardly a moment to spare for literature. He then thought of another name. ‘But why don’t you try Pandit Amaranatha Jha?’ He also interested in Urdu literature, and he may aggress to preside” (Rai 344). This quote is related to how Premchand joined the PWA in 1936 as its first president and whose names are suggested by him. Many of the writers have nothing to do with the PWA.

²⁰ Sarojini Naidu also attended the fourth Urdu PWA conference in Haripura in 1938.

²¹ As per Carlo Coppola unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Nehru addressed the Urdu PWA Conference in Allahabad in 1938. He favoured writer’s individuality but questioned, “if individuality is such that he remains aloof from the society, he is a useless writer... if society has a part in his individuality...then the individuality requires the strength of the nation and moves the world” (Udru Poetry, 1935-70: The Progressive Episode 195) quoted from (Ahmad 34).

session of Hindustani Progressive Writers' association held in Allahabad on 16th November 1937 and Tagore sent an illuminating message²² there (Pradhan ix).

Premchand, Maulvi Abdul Haq, Josh Malihabadi, Firaq Gorakhpuri, and Qazi Abdul Ghaffar, as Zaheer explained in *The Light*, were among the first who said “yes” (viii) to the manifesto. All these writers were giving air to resistance but Anand was totally diverting his route by writing fiction in English. After checking Anand's contribution in the PWA with hit and trial method of critics, the central questions emerges, “How to compare?” Anand with others and “to what extent” his views were different from his colleagues? To unlock the bracket of “how to compare” Anand with others, in fact, one should return to the question: what will be included or excluded from Anand's characters and texts and why? Who will draw the line: what should be put into the category of literary or political; left or propaganda; social, humanistic, Marxist or Socialist in Anand and others? How his writings have challenged the authority? Finally, who were the critics of Anand before Independence?

Most of the works of Zaheer criticized the religion or were a sharp critique of the “masculinity.” Rashid[a]²³ Jahan kept on writing about the “gender” issues from the spectacle of CPI. Ahmad Ali was basically a left-leaning aesthete, who left the PWA because of Zaheer's adoption of Marxism-Leninism as official doctrine. With Manto, things were even more complicated, a progressive as well as a self-revolutionary by becoming independent—just not the card-carrying CPI member type like Zaheer, Jahan and Zafar. In all the progressives, Manto was the only one who gave preference to “obscenity” which earned him the reputations of being a controversial writer as he obsessed with the representation of “body” in his works. On the other hand, Anand's way of narrative writing took him to another level as he put his pen on all the major issues of degraded life of Indian society. Before independence, he was the only progressive writer who journeyed with the theme of progress with full devotion. Anand's engagement with the Spanish Civil War was another

²² The letter of Tagore as followed: “To live in the seclusion has become second nature to me, but it is a fact that the writer who holds himself aloof from the society cannot get to know mankind. Remaining aloof, the writers deprives himself of the experience which comes from mingling with numbers of people. To know and understand society, and to show the path to progress, it is essential that we keep our fingers on the pulse of society and listen to the beating of heart. This is only possible when our sympathies are with humanity, and when we share its sorrows... new writers must mix men and recognise that if they live in seclusion as I do they will not achieve their aims. I understand now that in living apart from society for so long I have committed a grave mistake... This understanding burns in my heart like a lamp, and no argument can extinguish it” (Russell, *The Pursuit of Urdu Literature: A Select History* 210).

²³ The real name of Rashid was Rashida Jahan, who was concurrently famous with the name Apabi or *Angarewali* (one who described in *Angare*).

aspect which differentiated him from other associates of the PWA—Anand was the only Indian PWA member who had visited the war in the Northern France, the Western Belgium, and the Southwest Netherlands along the North Sea. The bitter experience and grim picture of War portrayed in *Across the Black Waters* (1939)—the only Indian English novel which has its setting in the World War I. He not only begun the PWA but also brought into our consciousness the untouchability, child labour, bounded labour, women issues and other social problems. In this comparison, the progressive pilgrims were wandering only in literary jungle with single theme but what bound them in a single bunch was their utopian hope to destroy the impact of British Empire from Indian zone, and overthrow the root of capitalist world economy from the soil of *Bharat Mata* (Mother India).

Whatever will be the resemblance or distinction between Anand and the others, the conclusion will ultimately be one: Anand was not only a Marxist, Socialist, Gandhist or humanist but a courageous and straightforward writer. He did not remain aloof from the existing social malaise but, instead, he struggled hard to heal them by interrogating in his novels. The question raises its head like a monster: whether Anand's progress was a successful one or a failure? In fact, Anand's progress was working silently, insensibly and slowly. The *Angreji Sarkar* had seen nothing in slow changes of progress but Anand's resistance became powerful after a lapse of time. The impact of progress, in truth, could not be witnessed rapidly but the problems raised by Anand's novels were fading day by day—though they did not fully vanish but slowly moved towards the edge of their eradication or at least reached the middle of their journey. Anand's progress was uneven or zigzag in motion but simultaneously have local or global concerns of sustainability with its symbiotic relation with the human world and more especially, it was putting extraordinary emphasis on the moral concern. Its central aim was to criticize the massive boom in profit. The progress was, as Anand believed, essential for conventional India because no society could modify the structure of masses without giving them special advantage. The word “advantage” raised its figure towards the progress but Anand's progressive ideas, like the movement, were caught in the web of controversies as the critics had used every weapon in their arsenal to end his progressive rampage.

The controversies are roused when an expatriate writer like Anand begins his literary career “elsewhere” (London) and later shifted to another “land” (India). In the lack of any real and fixed centre, the critics trace back to the source in order to dig the root, founding

basis or the principles on which his themes were based. The absence of “centre” was the lack of subject in his novels. The centre of Anand was not at the “centre” (India or Congress) but on the “left,” (the CPI, the PWA or the Europe) then the critics tried to “de-centring” it by relating it to Marxism or socialism as there was no natural origin. But according to Derrida, the centre had no natural “locus.” Symbolically, the same Derridean theme of de-centring is applicable in Anand’s case as the political *pandits* (critics) were busy to check “all the reference to [find] a centre, to a subject to privileged reference, to an origin, or to an absolute *arche*,” (286) but no one succeeded to locate the “origin” and the result was followed by a chaos. Not only Anand but the movement was also criticized on the same line of action that under the influence of European culture, Anand/movement produce a literature which was suitable only to European social, economic, political and cultural environment, not to the Indian standards. Anand was later named by the critics as the Marxist-cultural or social-political writer against Fascism or Imperialism. However, it was not the sole criticism of Anand: he was also accused of being a leftist writer who came to India with the help of the British Leftist, Ralph Fox, Dower, Zaheer and others. He was also criticized on the grounds of his CPI orientation and his connection with Russian socialism. As a hard-boiled devotee of the Gandhist and Marxist doctrines, Anand was termed an anarchist or propagandist²⁴ whose aim was to criticize the policy of the government through his writings. Thus, the critics offered “a series of substitutions of centre for centre,” (279) hence, the controversies made it difficult in locating the real meaning of Anand’s literary saga or the movement.

The movement landed in India along with the controversies surrounding the inaugural Lucknow meeting on April 10, 1936 but Anand was absent. The aim of the foundation was to construct “a broad democratic front of patriotic writers” (Joshi 46) in India, especially in the literary field. Anand was physically present in the second PWA conference wherein, as Zaheer recollected in “Reminiscences,” all the writers took a semi-oath to reject “the old style, form, sentiments, rationality, in short almost everything old, and thus carried its arts and literature to the limit of absurdity” (45). In the view of Partha Chatterjee, it was not the only meaning because the “script of colonial enlightenment” (5) had been taken in a wrong way by Hallet. Due to this false notion, Hallet issued a circular regarding the PWA to all the local governments on August 19, 1936. The movement was, suspected Hallet, under the control of the British leftist writers, as well as, the International revolutionary writers. Thus,

²⁴ What a writer sees and writes often termed as anarchy, or, propaganda, or, revolution but “What was seen by capitalist institutions as a market often contradicted what was seen by bourgeois ideologists as a culture,” (Williams 245).

the association aimed at establishing a society while “having interest in intellectuals, cultural and social subjects with the object of spreading communistic ideas and gaining converts.” But Hallet was not sure about its revolutionary nature. Hence, he cautioned, “its development should be watched with some suspicion” and all local governments should notify them with “friendly warnings” because their policy was affected by the Comintern Russia (Hallet i; 1-5). In his circular, using the words of Raymond Williams, the Home Secretary was “talking of excellence and humane values and discipline, in the same breath; seeing minor demonstrations as ‘anarchy’ and ‘chaos’ and opposing them in the name of reason and culture and education” (7). Anand wanted to stop such narrow definitions of freedom²⁵ put forth by the government, as Tagore nicely recorded in *Nationalism*: the “narrowness of freedom is evil which is more radical, not because of its quantity but because of its nature” (24). To take the freedom of speech and action from the *Gori Sarkar* (White Government) was the sole aim of PWA because the government had strict surveillance on the movement by monitoring each activity and action including the personal life of PWA writers, especially Zaheer,²⁶ Zafar and Anand. Hallet had some relief in regard to the Calcutta Conference of 1938, wherein Sajaanikanta Das, a Bengali press member who covered the news for *The Statesman*, observed that “there was nothing progressive in this [PWA] move, that literature could only be dynamic and not progressive, at best it would be literature to incite ‘coolies and *mazdoors*’ with a coat of raw sex” (Pradhan x-xi). But these views were answered by the movement with the passage of time by representing all sections of society.

The PWA literature became instantly popular in *gulam Bharat* (colonial India) because its heroes appealed to a sense of hope and brought into the light a Western-style from a literal point of view. Anand wanted “modernism,” (criticism of traditional ways) so he was running behind the “pursuit of an ideal of freedom on the part of the exploited” (C 217). This modernism had been seen satisfactorily in Zaheer’s *Angarey*, Anand’s *Untouchable*, Premchand’s *Godan*, and Jahan’s *That One* to an extreme level. The writers of above-mentioned works “attempted to establish the existence of revision, reform, even radicalism”

²⁵ For Matthew Arnold, freedom “was not only a question of being free to speak but a kind of national life in which people knew enough to have something to say” (Williams 5).

²⁶ Zaheer noted in *The Light*, “they [British and the Anglo-Indian officers of the Bombay Police and Customs] were standing erect and motionless..... their cold, silent, gaze was fixed on the ship [in which Zaheer returned to India]... After this [checking of passport] I was permitted to leave the ship but the CID personnel stuck to me as though they were my bodyguards” (2). He further added, “Each one of my books, each piece of paper, was pulled out by the British Customs and Police officers, one by one, who then proceeded to scrutinize them. When I protested, the police inspector was embarrassed and apologized. He said, “I have been ordered to do this” (3).

(Jalil xvi). Like the British renaissance, the progressive period was a time of drastic changes in:

...social consciousness, with stripping away of religious and feudal modes of thinking, revolt against the intellectual dictatorship... new discoveries concerning the potential for freedom and power in man and new sense of man's responsibility for himself. The enlightenment brought a new stage in the revolt against the dictatorship of the feudal and absolutist past with the development of philosophic materialism and the new historical consciousness associated with it (LeRoy and Beitz 13).

Thus, each and every branch of Indian social hierarchy was checked and put under the inspection of radical reconsideration. The main object of PWA and manifesto was to "rescue literature from the priestly influence in whose hands it had degenerated" (6). Hence, the PWA writers started writing for oppressed people who were suffering from "the basic problems of hunger and poverty, social backwardness and political subjection" (8) in a tremendously turbulent period. These priests, *pandits* and *maulanas* were molested by the resistance of progressive texts which simultaneously portrayed the helplessness of grassroots or masses. Pre-PWA literature and politics, Premchand argued, was "unscientific" as it was unable to expose the contradictions of capitalism. Therefore, the radical wanderers, like Anand, came up with an alternative to a scientific movement in which society must be envisioned as a harmonious body. By taking society as a civil society, Anand proffers a photograph of India perceptibly parallel to the society wherein instigator exists and interrelates himself with the weaker section.

"Let me begin talking about" noted Anand, "my own growth as a progressive writer. My earlier writings were naive, impetuous and sporadic utterances coming from intense feelings. I found myself embroiled in sad moods, despairs and agonies" (MRA Remembers 176). The above words from Anand's conversation regarding his themes with the editor of *Indian Literature* journal at Hauz Khas, Delhi, on November 22, 1992 could be seen as a prologue to "progressive" career. In his diehard pursuit of progress, Anand knock at the door of social needs/demands of people in 1940s and canvassed what they get in return, especially Bakha, Munoo, Gangu, Lahu, Ananta, Gauri and Bhikhu of his novels. The killer of Gangu in *Two Leaves and a Bud* was set free by the colonial law. The heroine, Gauri, thrown out of the house by her husband, Panchi, and due to tradition, she was not given any chance to take divorce and re-marry herself with someone else—oppositely Anand himself married twice:

first with Kathleen Van Gelder and second with Shirin Vajifdar. All the remaining novels had a similar pattern of problems, thus, most of the ending did not match with the idea of progress or the adopted manifesto. Anand himself revolted against the manifesto, as he commented in one of his letters, “no novelist worth of his salt writes from a manifesto, as life does not yield to such treatment” (MRA:NaN 128). As a reply to the critics, Anand’s characters must not be studied under the tag of a particular school, as his novels are more than a social and philosophical doctrine of the age in which he wrote. To put it bluntly, his literary crops were a “protest of humanness against humanity,” (MRA:NaN 128) and if a writer’s “humanness” labelled as propaganda then the category, indeed, would comprise a large list, i.e., Balzac, Tolstoy, Dickens and so on. He described the existing malaise in his writings and stamp enquiries on the face of *Vilayti Sarkar* (the foreign government) which was ready to defeat the sitting duck in terms of action. Anand’s harsh criticism was like the wind which gives motion to the duck.

In a nonagenarian life, ranging from 1905 to 2004, Anand wrote around twenty memorable socio-political and semi-autobiographical novels, one of which earned him Sahitya Academy Award and around six dozen of short-stories and more than thirty non-fiction books (including edited books) on various Indian subjects like dance, music, painting, architecture, education, politics, fine-arts, literary criticism, personal-letters, description of monuments and sculptures, on erotica and many other fields. He also wrote many journalistic critiques for BBC London, for the Bloomsbury Group and on the Spanish Civil War which published in the journal *Congress Socialist* as well as some publishing work for the Socialist Party of England. He also contributed countless essays in different national and international conferences of high esteem. In London, he was the key promoter of Gandhi’s second edition of *An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth* (1940) and Nehru’s *An Autobiography* (1936) (S. Nasta, NaNWO 144). Disdaining his literary achievements, the socio-political dictators chalked him out as a “propagandist” or “anarchist” and the new literary critics (Gopal, Jalil, Mir) put aside him from the “progressive” mode by taking the PWA’s domain only in Urdu or Hindi. They never tried to project the English literary sphere. In between two shores of literary *ulema* (Urdu scholars) and social *pandits* (leaders), there emerged a continuous controversy regarding Anand’s status as a progressive writer. In the

midst of it all, Anand was, what Janet M. Powers described him, “wunderkind”²⁷ (433) and simultaneously the only “progressive” in the Indian English literature in the heart of twentieth century. He had spent half of his life in England and rest in India in asking the burning socio-political questions to both, the *Gori* and to the *Bhuri Sarkar* (the White and Brown government) but never got any satisfactory answer of the highlighted problems.

After spending his springtime youth and a big part of his middle age “in the radical anti-colonial atmosphere of inter-war London that he began to articulate” (S. Nasta 140) Indian subjects and recorded them in the literary historiography. Throughout his life, Anand was an “outsider” for Europe as well of India and no country accepted him as “insider.” Reason was his writings, in which he wrote, as noted in *Apology for Humanism*, with a “sense of locality and a wider, more human outlook” (55). His demand for “the new life, a new humanism” (Apology 118) was rejected by the authority. By defining the present and past through the characters of his novels, Anand was voicing against the *Firangi Sarkar* (British government) for the equal right and “progress” for Indians.

Anand shared his writings and ideas with Ralph Fox, Randall Swingler and Edgell Rickward, the trio were the editors of the journal *Left Review*, a branch of British section of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers in London. This group laid the foundation stone of Anand’s progressive career by helping him to publish his *Untouchable*, especially Rickward who suggested him the name of Wishart publication branch. The train of progress was gathering speed and momentum from all corners of India when Anand came to address the second AIPWA conference in Calcutta, 1938. During his speech on the podium, he repeated the manifesto’s aim of being against “the negative defence of our culture against reaction at home and abroad” (On PWA 1). He acknowledged the “progressive” writers as one who revolted against the classics alongside the established order. The utopia of Anand’s hermeneutics was propelled by one obsession: the “progressive” guidance could mitigate the capitalistic evil. Was it true? When the critics read his novels they could not stop themselves from calling him a progressive writer. In the dull atmosphere of 1940s, he was challenging the phenomenal existence of “survival of the fittest” by demanding human rights through the establishment of a democratic society. The nation was obsessed by the fury of developmental

²⁷ Power wrote, while reviewing the book *The Wisdom of the Heart: A Study of the Works of Mulk Raj Anand* by Marlene Fisher, “Mulk Raj Anand, wunderkind of twentieth-century Indian arts and letters, is a novelist and essayist, as well as the founder and editor of a remarkable art magazine, *Marg*” (433).

change in society when Anand ignored the tradition and redefined the range of a new future of India in the filthy atmosphere of the twentieth century.

In the year 1936, the progressive thoughts of Anand inspired him to join the International Brigade in Spain during the Spanish Civil War. In 1938, he returned to India in order to attend the second conference of All Indian Progressive Writers' Association. In the interim, he associated himself with Indian National Congress and the Congress Socialist Party of India. As a progressive member of the World Peace Congress in 1937, Anand was busy in supporting "a wider coloured unity" with the help of Dover in England. Like the PWA conference of 1938, Anand had already organized a gathering of the coloured community in 1936 as noted in an article in *Socialist Congress*. Dover suggested Anand to draft a "joint memorandum" which was later recognized as "the right of the coloured and subject peoples to organise on their own account, or in association, without distinction of race, class or colour, propaganda for peace" (14). Like the first World Congress of Writers' for Defence of Culture, the progressive memorandum was signed by the delegates representing the Indians, Chinese, Eurasians, Indonesians, American Negroes, West Indies, Africans, Tunisians, Arabs, Jews, and other subject peoples. Similar to the PWA manifesto, the memorandum was a "partial answer to those who believe that 'local loyalties' will prevent the progress of coloured amalgamation" (14). Anand's humanistic as well as progressive services towards mankind earned him the International Peace Prize from the World Peace Council in 1953.

Thus, the idea of progress was at its peak in Anand between 1933 and 1937—it began with the novel *Untouchable* and reached the top of the mountain with the editing of *Marxism in India*. In 1935, he started the PWA with a group of people who had radical perspective on art, culture and literature in accordance with their manifesto and their political understanding. The group continued to have a consistently progressive stand on the question of nationality, gender, class and ethnicity. In the continuation of their revolutionary position, the movement threatened the British hegemony with their socio-cultural movement. Within the group, Anand had a history of being a merchant of reformist and revivalist of progressive forces in the country and beyond. On the calendar, the progressive movement started in 1936 but in Indian English literature its roots go back to Anand's *Untouchable*, which became a trail-blazer in Indo-Anglican fiction. In *Untouchable*, as Anand noted in *Is There a Contemporary Civilisation?*:

...the orthodox and conservative elements fight a rearguard action against everything new, the influential minority of its forward intelligentsia, in spite of the recalcitrants, are busy integrating the cultural of the 3rd century B.C., the 4th Century A.D., and the medieval periods, with the machine civilisation, which came in from the West at the end of the 18th century and which has matured into the contemporary atomic age of the mid 20th century (ITaCC 1).

From 1931-34, Anand published four²⁸ complete books which were under the phrase “art for art’s sake” but with and after *Untouchable*, he rejected it and adopted socialist realism in his writings. Hence, for the critics like Rajni Palme Dutt, in the early stage of his career, Anand was not a progressive. Dutt dubbed him as “a tyro” (Jalil 210) and Narasimhaiah christened him as a “propagandist.” Neglecting the criticism, from 1935’s International Writers’ Conference against Fascism to the Fourth Triennial Conference of the Association for Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies (1977), Anand repeatedly gave speeches at the progressive seminars in many different countries. He helped Zaheer in the founding of Progressive Afro-Asian Writers’ Association (later renamed as Association of Asian and African Writers) and again in the first Afro-Asian Writers’ Conference in 1958 in Tashkent, Africa. These activities had brought together the progressive writers of two largest continents at one place. Here the aim of Anand was, following the manifesto, “To cooperate with those literary organizations whose aims do not conflict with the basic aims of the association” (Manifesto 9), thus, he was swimming in the ocean of progressivism.

In early career, Anand was not only a Bloomsbury member but had relation with its various writers from 1930s as he was also part of Eliot’s *The Criterion* from 1932 to 1934 and a “proof corrector in the Hogarth Press” (CiB vii) of Woolf. With the joining of Bloomsbury and other different publication branches in London, like Charles Dickens’ career, the kite of Anand’s creative writing was flying out of the gravity level in the atmosphere of literary sky. His *Persian Paintings* (1930) has become a part of Eliot’s Faber Criterion Miscellany series. Another Bloomsbury member, Forster wrote a Preface for his first novel *Untouchable*, whereas, Woolf wrote a Foreword for *Letters on India*.²⁹ Orwell, BBC fellow and friend, was defending his works against the malaise of critics and friends.

²⁸ The four published books were *The Curries and Other Indian Dishes* (1932); *The Hindu View of Art* (1933); *The Golden Breath* (1933) and finally *The Lost Child and Other Stories* (1934).

²⁹ *Letters on India* directly had an echo of Marx’s *Letters on India* published in 1853 in serial form by *New York Herald Tribune*. These letters were criticizing the British policies for killing the Indian culture and tradition. Anand was following Marx’s views directly in these letters.

His connection with Eliot, Forster, Woolf could be seen in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*. Apart from the membership of publication branches like *The Criterion*, Hogarth Press, Left Book Club, Faber and Faber, Lawrence and Wishart (introduced by Rickward), Routledge (suggested by Herbert Read), Anand was related to the popular published journals of the time, named, *Listener*, *The Spectator*, *New Indian Literature*, *New Statesman*, *Life and Letters Today*, *The London Mercury*. After attending World Writers' Conference in 1934, Anand had begun writing for Writer's International's newly founded journal *The Left Review*, which began in October 1934 and worked successfully until May 1938. Like Dickens or Eliot, Anand started his early career in the form of journalism by working, reviewing and writing for journals and periodicals. Thus, Anand "emerged from the slough of despond cafes and garrets of Bloomsbury and formed the nucleus of the Indian Progressive Writers' Association" (On PWA 1). While comparing the PWA with the Bloomsbury intelligentsia, the aim of Anand was to establish an Indian movement of Indian writers that could speak of their native country and gave strong reply to the Bloomsbury writers, who were against India's independence (especially Eliot). Despite his early relations with Bloomsbury Group, he did not consider them "democratic." In fact, the coin also had another side. Bloomsbury intelligentsia criticized Anand severely for taking a part in the Spanish Civil War from the "Communist Side" (Stalin) and in the view of Nasta, he was "refusing to drop his communist commitment to Stalin after the outbreak of war in 1939." Partying of the ways between Anand and Bloomsbury was visible in Leonard Woolf's Preface to *Letters on India*. The Socialist commitment towards Lenin (or Stalin) was again highlighted by Anand by his request to the Wishart Books³⁰ to transfer the publishing rights of his novels *Untouchable*, *Coolie*, *Two Leaves and a Bud* to the Socialist Book Club in Allahabad (in 1939) along with leftist his friend Lytton Strachey's work *Theory and Practice*.³¹ Later with Eliot's literary father's, Ezra Pound, announcement of his open support to Mussolini, the gap between Anand and Bloomsbury became deep but he kept in relations with the famous personalities of the time. All things apart, if he became a Bloomsbury member, in the first place, then it would be a literary suicide for the newly formed PWA as Anand was leading the movement in London after Zaheer's return to India. Secondly, if Bloomsbury offered Anand a permanent membership, then there could emerge a kind of propaganda as the British, since

³⁰ Wishart published Anand's *Untouchable* and later it was one of the first few British publishing House which banned in India due to the Sea-Custom Act and Press Rights in India.

³¹ Letter dated July 28, 1939 addressed to Anand from Z.H.Ahmad of the Socialist Book Club, Allahabad; held in Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University (Ref: 3006/S-3), p. 1-3 (S. Nasta, *Between Bloomsbury and Gandhi? The background to the publication and reception of Mulk Raj Anand's Untouchable*).

1936, had taken for granted him as the leader of “Indian students’ Secret Communist Group” (Home Department, Government of India 1) in London and had a close eye on each of his activities. The same could be established by the Home Department’s and Intelligence Bureau’s report on 25, 1936, in which the:

Information has been received that SS Zaheer has advised M.R. Anand, Secretary of the Indian Progressive Writers’ Association in London, that the copies of the Associations’ publication, “New Indian Literature” have all been confiscated in India and has suggested that steps should be taken to have questions asked in the House of Commons about this matter (Home Department, Government of India 1).

Anand wanted to secure himself from the eagle eye of colonial authority. Beside it, his love for Bloomsbury turned into hatred when Eliot and Pound openly wedded with Fascism. Sibte Hasan remarked, Eliot and Ezra Pound were two writers not influenced by “Progress” and the latter was the admirer of Mussolini and went to Rome in order to give support to the Fascism. Anand too witness this, “Even when the challenge of Mussolini and Hitler fascisms began to confront them in newspapers, the Bloomsbury group, except for Protestants, Forster and Woolf, remained aloof” (CiB viii). Pound goes beyond the mind of Anand and praised Mussolini in his BBC Speeches which were broadcast in/from Rome. Anand defined the attitude of Bloomsbury in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*:

When Mussolini wantonly attacked and occupied Ethiopia, they [Bloomsbury writers] saw it as a tragic joke that this Italian was reviving Caesarism. Hitler’s occupation of Austria only brought frowns. And when Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain signed the Munich Pact and conceded Sudetenland to Hitler, they seemed to be taken in by ‘promise of peace in our time’ (viii).

If we put Anand in the centre then Progressivism versus Fascism was present as the anti-fascists writers like Stephen Spender, W.H. Auden, Cecil Day Lewis, Edward Upward, Louis MacNeice were dubbed as “‘Leaning Tower’ School of poets” (CiB ix) by Virginia Woolf. The case of BBC was not much different, hence, Anand did not prefer Bloomsbury. He was part of Bloomsbury, so he could not be termed progressive by literary mafias of the forties but his friendship with Bloomsbury was something problematic from beginning to the end which raised him to the level of a progressive, especially in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*.

When Eliot, in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*, advised Anand that Indians should leave their governmental task to the West, what does he mean by the “empiricists?” According to Anand, the empiricists means only the British but following Khan’s statement, in (in)direct manner, Eliot belongs to America, a colony to England in past but in the 1930s he was on the same land. So the imperialism for him, here, could be the Axis Power as Eliot preferred them over the colonial countries. The relation of Anand and the Bloomsbury or the PWA has/had suffered at the hands of postcolonial critics as they are unable to shed light on Anand’s role as a socio-political activist. Instead of it, they categorized him as a (anti)nationalist, Marxist, communist, leftist lumpen, social-realist, Gandhist, humanist, anarchist, propagandist or socialist. They flow in the direction of his famous novels but the stone of non-fictions is (*Letters on India, Conversations in Bloomsbury, Apology for Heroism, Roots and Flowers, Hindu View of Art, Is there a Contemporary Indian Civilization, The Dancing Foot, and Singingline*) left unturned by them. Due to this critical absence, Anand remained invisible on the literary map of the world, especially after his return to India. Another important theme called “Anand as a BBC Talkie” is still waiting for a *messiah* (like Vladimir and Estragon were waiting for the Godot in *Waiting for Godot*) to explain it.

The most progressive moment was Anand’s job in BBC Eastern Service³² after accepting (February 1942) George Orwell’s invitation to join its Indian Transmission Section. With the programme “Through Eastern Eyes,” Orwell intended to “interpret the West, and in particular Great Britain...through the eyes of people who are more or less strangers,” (West 286) and result was Anand’s appointment in BBC. In the company of Orwell, Anand had been showing revolutionary and nationalistic fervour in *Hindustani* Radio episodes by supporting Gandhi’s *Bharat Chhodo Andolan* (Quit India Movement, August 1942) in London and by his biting satire towards *Firangi Sarkar* (British Imperial Government) for the imprisonment of Indian national leaders. Though Anand and Orwell were not supporting the “German State” and bitterly criticized its alliances yet they were giving positive voice to Subhas Chandra Bose’s meeting with Hitler. In connection to Bose, the BBC Broadcasts were injecting the dose of belief in the veins of Indian intelligentsia and the students residing in England that “the conditional allegiance of the Indian nationalists, especially the two million soldiers, in the fraught context” of the Freedom movement (Ranasinha 57). In the

³² Orwell started his career as the Talk Assistant of Indian BBC in August 1941 and later became its Producer. Before him, Sir Malcolm Darling invited Anand for the BBC in March 1941 but he rejected the offer with the stated reason that he was ‘torn by conflicting loyalties’ (West 15).

move of Bose's praise, there was some space for doubt: why they were in favour of Bose and against Hitler? Why Bose, who was approaching the Axis Powers, was not an enemy to BBC Radio, especially to Anand? In fact, the road takes one to Bose's appointment as the President of Indian Congress wherein the CPI was favouring him and also was the main force behind his both appointments (1937 and 1939). As a close friend to the CPI members such as Zaheer, Rashid, Zafar, Dover and others, Anand was well aware of Bose and his role in India's struggle for freedom. Here, Anand was not at "doublespeak" (Orwell's term from *Nineteen Eighty-Four*) and fully progressive as he was giving air to Indian nationalism from BBC's Room 101 (the room later showcased in Orwell's *Nineteen-Eighty Four* wherein Winston Smith was taken at the end of novel). During the World War II, as the programme BBC Overseas Service aired, "radio has come near to being a fourth armament" (Tallents 9) and the speakers like Orwell, Anand, Wickham Steed, Sir Melcolm Darling, Quintin Hogg, Sir Ramaswami Mudalian, Lord Hailey, H.L. Brailsford, Sir William Boveridge, Sir Atul Chatterjee, Desmond MacCarthy, Kingley Martin, Sir Samuel Ranganandhan, Lord Lytton were representing India in media/ press/ newspapers/ prints/ broadcasts by criticizing the British government for putting India in the War and simultaneously were the firm supporter of Indian Freedom. One day, hopes Darling, the English "should be able to hand over the reins of government to India herself" (BBC: IaFF). Anand was not directly/physically involved in Indian Freedom movement but he was showing much a wider and invisible nationalism in BBC which was creating a nationalist and Indian audience not only in London but also in his native land, as Orwell noted in his letter to George Woodcock, "we are really only b'casting for the [Indian] students" (268). In London, Anand was, via BBC and his Socio-Marxist writings, mobilizing the opinion of British intellectuals in favour of Indian Independence.

In BBC, Anand and Orwell were, as Kristin Bluemel noted in *George Orwell and the Radical Eccentrics* ex-centric "friends" and "radical eccentrics" (18-19) but still there was a line of divergence between their political ideologies as Anand verified, "A whole year was occupied in verbal quarrels with George Orwell: whether the Republicans would have won if the Anarchists had not been recalcitrant. As he was with the Anarchists, and I...the Republicans, the debate remained inconclusive. Though we ... remained friends" (SMF 82-83). Orwell too had the same respect for Anand's notion of peace and a worldly humanism, the feelings from which the writers of most depressed time were unknown. He was away from the "party line" as Orwell noted in his war-diary, April 3, 1942, "Anand has not got

these vices. He is genuinely anti-Fascist and has done violence to his feelings, and probably his reputation by backing Britain up because he recognises that Britain is objectively on the anti-Fascist side” (417). Orwell was giving a helping hand to Anand not only in securing him a job at a time when printing was under censorship but also by becoming a saviour to him by going against the government, which wanted to remove Anand from BBC’s service. Under the shadow of Orwell, the authority was unable to take action against Anand as his past was clean (neither socialist, Marxist, Leftist, Bloomsbury nor related to any other group). Here Anand was set free by the colonial “court” (government) from the charge of “prosecutors” (critics) who were trying to prove him a secret-student-social-agent or follower of Lenin or Left or propagandist. Though he was inspired by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and was also a member of many socialistic branches in London and India yet he never identified himself with any particular group like Nehru, Zaheer, Orwell, Bose, Zafar, Joshi, Jahan and others and remained independent lifelong. His role in India League, Bibliophile Bookshop in Bloomsbury, PWA’s radical journal *Indian Writing*, the connections with Bloomsbury and its writers, association with Lawrence and Wishart publication, were of an editor not of as its permanent member. These places, associations and publication branches for Anand were not more than a “contact zone” point where the unknown East shakes hand with the modern West by sharing their cosmopolitan thoughts on the different culture, identity, and nationalism. Using the phrase of Robert Frost, these places were trying “to connect” unknown East to the modern West and were creating a peaceful and new world order by speaking against colonial hierarchies. The impossible task of erasing the gap of understanding between India and Britain had been re-started (first started in novels of Forster or Rudyard Kipling, Raja Rao which failed) with Anand and Orwell association in BBC as they represented themselves into “two parallel lines” (East and West) which meet at an infinite level but, in truth, they never touch each other.

Anand’s BBC progress was the first example of the emerging Indian “Tiger” (India’s national animal metaphorically Anand or common Indian) on the international sphere against the corrupt, misrule and bogus principles of the British government in India and war policies of the Europe. The reformist attitude of Anand helped many London-based-Indians to understand the importance of independence by erasing their lame defense of British bourgeoisie class. Anand fixed one more tile of petty bourgeois reform which was mingled with nationalistic approach. His radical, resistance, and reformist ideology established him as the only fighting force against the monopolization of British power in India from London.

Stevie Smith was influenced so much by Anand's this quality that she based the character of Raji of her autobiographical novel *The Holiday* (1949) on Anand's War-Life, friendship with Basil Tate (Orwell) and the job of both in BBC:

Our friend Raji is... the most intelligent Indian in London... Raji has this fine intelligence and a warm heart. He is an honest person upon a centre fixed. This is rare, and rare indeed in an Indian. He has been in an English prison-camp in India and has been beaten up by the Indian police...

Raji makes us laugh...

It is wonderful that Raji can be so generous and so free, for his upbringing was in an oppressed atmosphere (Smith 13).

The novel takes the clock back in 1941-412 and narrated the first account of Celia (Stevie of real life and also the narrator of novel) and her friendship with Basil (Orwell), Lopez (supposedly Inez Holden) and Raji (Anand). Celia was well aware of the writing ability of Raji who had just finished a non-fictional but "true [book] about India" and advised that "English people ought to read" but conclude that due to their false notion of superiority, the British "do not want to read" it. This non-fictional work was none other than Anand's *Letters on India*, which was "one of the most oppressive things the English have brought to India is the sense of secret opulence in a land of poverty" (Smith 97). In the novel, "a young violent English person" entered in Raji's life like a deity by securing him a job in BBC in the most turbulent time. Though the friendship was strong yet Celia feels an ending gap between the "two hearts" (Anand and Orwell or India and England) because "no easy feeling of equality between the intellectual Indians and English people was possible in India as long as this evil thing [the British Raj] was still in existence" (Smith 13). This "English person" was, indeed, Orwell of real life who protested against the authorities over Anand's appointment in the BBC, as an Intelligence File recorded:

Eric Blair has been telling...his Indian friends that his department was endeavouring to get Mulk Raj Anand (a famous Indian Marxist novelist) on the staff, but...the India Office was strongly opposed to the appointment. He assured his friends...that he was going to challenge...the India Office to dictate as to which people should be employed

in his department. Blair considers...Mr Anand is a well-qualified candidate for the post (Travis 3).

Anand's autobiographical work *Apology for Heroism* (1946) clearly approved Celia's application of "equality" with the words:

I [Anand] don't want to exaggerate the significance of such differences of opinion as I had with them [the British], because there can be no friendship between people if they do not agree to differ about many things, but I am also firmly convinced that there can be no dignity in the personal relations of British and Indian intellectuals unless British writers realize that the freedom of speech and opinion which they take for granted is denied to their friend in Africa, and unless they see to it that intellectuals everywhere enjoy equal rights of citizenship, so that chauvinist nationalisms can break down and give place to a fraternity of men with new ideas (52).

The decline of friendship had begun after two years of Anand's service in BBC. By the end of 1943, Orwell preferred be a part of the *Tribune* over the BBC and resigned from the post but Anand continued his service to the radio until his sad return to the lap of *matrabhumi* (Motherland) in 1945. The BBC period lasted only three years for Anand but symbolically presented him as a bohemian personality or dogmatic Marxist, whom no one will see in the literary battle after the WW-II.

The spring of Anand's creativity as a novelist began to dry in England when he left for India in the late 1945. Hence, he took a new line of action by starting the job of editing a private journal, Modern Architectural Research Group, popularly known as MARG (1946). The journal termed as the loose encyclopedia of Indian arts—financed by J.R.D. Tata of the Tata Group from the day of its inception. The trend of flourishing of Indian art which had begun with *Persian Painting* reached at its culmination point with the installation of MARG. Thereafter, he shifted his focus from fiction to art. His interest had diversified in the content and context of the subject matter. With the beginning of private career, he totally discarded Marxism and socialism and adopted the tag of liberal humanist—though critics had different views on him. While editing the journal, Anand surrendered himself to capitalism, hence, the weakness in career had been traced by the critics like Cowasjee, Niven and others. Despite it, he kept a strong hold on the criticism of older beliefs, as seen in *The Road* and *The Old Woman and the Cow*. Anand himself accepted this in *Apology for Heroism*, "unable to

understand all these contradictions, I began to write. But an impulse which had arisen from the necessity to reform Indian society soon became an attempt to show off” (20). Like the strict left progressive Zaheer, Zafar, and Jahan, Anand never came out of the ivory tower to lead the masses. He preferred to stay in his aristocratic cabin and simultaneously writing and talking on the themes of downtrodden through the auto-biographical colouring.

Following the manifesto’s first resolution “the establishment of organizations of writers to correspond to the various linguistic zones of India; the coordination of these organizations by holding conferences, publishing of magazines, pamphlets,” (8) was Anand’s primary concern in India. After independence, he managed the task of organizing the first Asian Writers’ Conference (New Delhi, 1956). Two years later, he represented India in the USSR as a joint leader of Afro-Asian Writers’ Conference. In 1962, Anand sponsored the formation of the Bureau of Afro-Asian writers in Colombo, and simultaneously, he was Indian official in the Cairo’s Afro-Asian Writers’ Conference—he represented India twice in Cairo and in the second of 1969, he was member of the Bureau Meeting of Afro-Asian writers. His other progressive conferences included, the Australian Peace Conference (Melbourne, 1961), the World Peace Congress (Helsinki, 1965), the World Writers Meeting (Weimer, 1965) and Commonwealth Writers’ Conference (Australia, 1968). He was also the organizer and Secretary-General of the fourth Afro-Asian Writers conference (New Delhi, 1970). Thus, as recorded in the manifesto, “we shall foster through interpretive and creative work (with both native and foreign resources)” (8) were fully applicable as here, too, Anand aesthetically followed the fundamental ideology of progress.

The foundation of PWA, writing the manifesto, conferences and seminars were pointing its finger towards the progressive notion of Anand in Indian period. The effect of Marxism came out in the shape of a manifesto, the primary concern of which was, as Anand explained in the Bombay Conference, to “brought a new awareness to the writers of the role that [they] can play in the modern world” (On PWA 13). He mentioned in his article “Many Languages but One Literature”:

Alongside the pervasive influence of Gandhian ideas on Indian literature there came especially from the thirties onwards, the emergence of progressive writing.... The Progressive Writers’ Movement owed its impulses to the struggle against the rise of fascism, and focused on an awareness of the privation and subjugation of the working people in the countryside and the towns (40-41).

The colonial government was worried that the PWA would penetrate the Indian horizon like a prowling lion whose hunger sought a new hunt for prey and it would grab the whole of “nation” into its clutches. With the establishment of PWA, the new literature was making its room for the deprived and downtrodden people. “It is absurd,” asserted Anand, “to impose a formula to determine the qualities of a class” (On PWA 5). We should shed “sophisticated” literature and must follow the revolutionary tendencies in our literature because we lacked the experience of struggle. With its various branches in the vernacular language, the association was moving towards “cosmopolitan orientation” as Anand articulated. The intelligence report noted that Anand’s first and second novel entitled *Untouchable* and *Coolie* were published by the “communist firm” of Wishart-Lawrence (an incorporation of Wishart & Co. and Martin Lawrence & Co.). It added:

Untouchable had been translated into Russian, and a considerable sum in roubles awaited in Anand’s disposal in Moscow. He intended to visit the Soviet Union in order to spend his money, but for some reason the trip appeared to have been postponed. Two further novels, *An Indian Tragedy* and *All Men Are Equal*, were shortly due for publication (Jalil 209-10).

In one of his letters to Alaister Niven, Anand announced about his progressive writings, in which the critics would find only “the displacements, the repudiations of the tribe, the wanderings, agonies of loneliness, exaltations, heartbreaks, furies, ribaldry, fantasies and the people neither heroic not hopeful, hot high-minded, not low-minded, but transformed by the native poet’s mind...” (18-19). No doubt, his heroes lacked heroism but they exhibit strong heroic gestures which introduced a new kind of silent revolution in the blood of socially weak characters. Anand’s non-fiction works are entirely different from the fictional one, as they were discretely a stinging satire on the “*Angrezi Sashan*” (British rule).

Anand took progressivism beyond the imagination of the ordinary man in *Letters on India* (1942) wherein he castigated his satire towards the British rule for denying “freedom of speech” to the Indians. Hence, the PWA was ready, as the fourth resolution of the manifesto recorded, “to fight for the right of free expression of thoughts and opinion” (9). Anand asked Indian writers to note down the themes and issues related to class, caste and status of women but the contemporary writers, especially the Indian English novelists, showed no interest in the plea and changed their route. Raja Rao’s *The Serpent and the Rope* and *The Cat and Shakespeare* had nothing to do with the lives of have-nots. Naik questioned:

Had it not been possible for a modern Indian writer to write about the contemporary situation in his country, without specifically tackling social problems such as untouchability and the exploitation of the poor, though a general awareness of the Indian social scene with its confrontation between traditional and modernity is bound to be seen in his work? (177).

The critics could attack several aspects of his novels such as Gandhism, socialism, Marxism, humanism and other but his non-fictional critical works fulfilled the progressive thrust. In *Letters on India* and in *Apology for Heroism*, he managed to depict strong resistance against the British.

Walter Benjamin wrote that “articulating the past historically does not mean recognizing it ‘the way it really was.’ It means appropriating a memory as it flashed up in a moment of danger” (393). Anand’s relation with the PWA propelled such a kind of picture in the mind of critics who were confused by his status: whether he was socialist or Marxist. The progressive career of Anand, in the light of Cowasjee’s statement, was “a compromise between traditional beliefs and the secular life” (3). He presented Anand as a writer totally dissociated from the concept of “party intellectual” but his point contradicts his own view with the statement from *So Many Freedoms* wherein he quoted that the year 1941 was a time when Anand was a “member” of the Indian Congress Party and the English Congress Party and, simultaneously, from 1932 to 1942, he was also the member of the British Labour Party (25). Anand wrote, Cowasjee added, four articles for *Socialist Congress* journal in 1937, which was the organ of the Socialist Party of India, a branch of the Indian National Congress. Thus, he was a permanent member of the centre. Again, Anand’s *Letter on India* (1941) was, as Leonard Woolf’s introduction to the book recorded, “a first-class statement of the “extreme” Congress case” (vii). Anand’s own words gave strength to the point:

At the second conference of the International Association of Writers for the defence of Culture held in London on 19th-23rd June of 1936, I had the honour to represent India and reported to the Congress about the work which the Indian Progressive Writers’ association had achieved since its inception (On PWA 13).

Here the loyalty of Anand was in the favour of Congress rather than the PWA. The critical notions of un-progressiveness in Anand were at its peak when he was termed more bourgeois or an academic humanist as he never tried to change the atmosphere around him but, instead, he

interpreted it in most humane ways. We can personify Anand as a rat, who, while sitting in the hole closes his eyes after having seen the “snake” (metaphorically Nehru) with the thought that everything is right or danger is over but, unluckily, it is “dead” (morally in literary themes) in the very next minute. The Marxist critic in him now routed towards bureaucratic doctrine of criticism, as seen in his first three novels. The socialist impact in Anand’s blood was more evident when he declared “that in order to give a deeper and moral real basis to democratic socialism we might sign a minimum manifesto for a broad based Indian humanism which is implicit in our contemporary emphasis on ‘Destination Man’ and the methods of self-giving as against self-withholding” (ITaCC x). When the question of ideology comes, it becomes difficult to establish Anand as a progressive writer solely on the basis of PWA’s principles. Yet, one cannot dispute the fact that the Congress and the CPI inspired hundreds of young intellectuals from the different professions who (writers, novelist, poets, artists, and socialist) dedicated their life lives to (the class of CPI includes, Zaheer, Zafar, Jahan Amrit Rai, Makhdoom Mohiuddin, Krishan Chander, Kaifi Azmi, Faiz Ahmad Faiz, Sahir Ludhianvi, Sardar Jafri, Jan Nisar Akhtar, Asrar ul Haq Majaz well known as Majaz Lakhnawi, Yashpal and so on) the service of the Party but adopted the policies of Gandhian life-style and Anand was the leader among such-class of intellectuals.

The political critics had a different notion of Anand’s career: for them, he was nothing more than a propagandist. Anand declared that “If the attempt to discover the meaning of life in any given environment is propaganda, then I am a propagandist” (Naik 176). Anand’s semi-documentary novel *Morning Face* recorded the same line of action, when he angrily asserted that “the French and the Russian revolutions were to burn in my flesh wherever I was” (508). His proletarian bias resulted from an avid reading of Marx and with the conceptual influence of leftist thinkers like M.N. Roy; and humanists like Gandhi and Nehru; and above all, the Western philosophers like Hume, Locke, Hegel, Kant and others. All great intellectuals had whetted his curiosity and changed the whole perspective of his thinking. His thesis under the left professor Dawes Hicks and marriage with Kathleen Van Gelder, on one hand, and his association with Fox, Zaheer, Forster, Dover, Orwell, Nehru, on the contrary, helped him in building his progressive thoughts. Anand manufactured his social awareness of the assumptions which were drawn from the Russian writers, i.e., Tolstoy and Maxim Gorky. Anand’s efforts were extremely instrumental in establishing the movement as one of the most powerful literary storm roaming throughout India and the group became dogmatic and

doctrinaire of the age in itself. In this sense, he was a blend of both: socialist thoughts and Marxist leanings.

On the base of above statements, Anand's progressive writings had two fold dimensions: on the first pole, he was writing for India's freedom from the colonial clutches, on the second pole, he was fighting against the Indian rotten society holding the weapon of leftist principles of Marxism or Socialism. The time of 1940s was famous for Anand's headlong plunge into socio-cultural Indian life and the period, for Cowasjee, was that of a "momentous change" (2). While advising the writers in the second PWA conference, Anand announced, "the development of minority cultures in Russia will give an example to our regionalists of how extensive literature can grow up in a very short time if we have faith on the organisms which we wish to create" (On PWA 19). In this conference, being a member of the Congress, Anand was clearly advertising for the Indian Congress as he asked the writers for "the writing of new textbooks in Congress ruled provinces where the primary education is being adopted on the line of the Zakir Hussian Report" (On PWA 19). Before the beginning of the WW-II, Anand believed that the Congress and Gandhi could win freedom for India. Although Anand was not directly linked to any political movement or party till 1933—it was fact well-known that he had a direct bearing of Gandhi in his works. Despite being a Marxist, he admired the determination of Mahatma in fighting against British Raj. Gandhism became another major problem in the way of Anand's progressive route. In all the novels, he showed the impact of Gandhi but his heroes denied it. When the influence of Gandhi began to dim, Anand changed his course and came close to Nehru, a Fabian socialist. Thus, his cry for Indian freedom had a firm belief in Gandhism and the Congress Party but his writings are speaking diverse to his ideology.

Some critics thought Anand was following Gandhism as there was a direct or indirect bearing of Gandhi in his works whether *Untouchable* or *Lalu* trilogy. This is, however, not true. When Gandhi asked Anand to write a pamphlet on untouchables, he rejected the advice and came with a full novel *Untouchable*. In the same novel, the anger of leftist ideologues was clearly visible in their criticism of Gandhi, voiced by the poet who calls him an "orthodox." Gandhi, "they" (leftists, especially Ambedkar) thought, was not giving untouchables the rights they needed. Unlike Anand, the poet in *Untouchable* revolted against Gandhism as he was only giving ideas about untouchables and did nothing for the upliftment of their lives. Narasimhaiah, Naik and Cowasjee criticized the novel because of its ending

with the thought of scientific toilet but they forgot that the structure of the novel is one day in the life of an untouchable. How far could he have moved in one day? If the book ended without the Flush System then the novel could be put into the category of Gandhism but Marxist notion lead its ending towards chaos. In *Sword and the Sickle*, Lalu was not satisfied with the advice of Gandhi. In fact, Anand was not against Gandhism but he was describing the rotten, traditional, fully orthodoxical and conservative Indian society with the help of leftist theory of Marxism or Socialism in his novels and putting, simultaneously, his ideal on the pages.

Anand was attempting to change “*insaniyat*” (humanity) by showing the helplessness of his characters and, thus, with the PWA, he laid foundation of “new possibility” (Gopal 9) in literature with his “utopian impulse” (A. Singh 5). All in all, he was inventing not humans but soul, which was in rest from the dark ages—no one dare to disturb the sleep of the dark giant, except Anand, who interrogated one point, “dead are all Gods: now do we desire the overman to live” (Nietzsche, TSZ 59). Since the days of industrialization, his intellectual mind was raising a voice against the centralization of power in ghettos of religion or ethics. Anand never talked about religion, rationality, Hinduism (like Vivekananda, Tagore or Aurobindo) but brought anti-colonial national movement (via literary writings) which metamorphosed into internationalism, socialism, realism, Marxism, Gandhism or into other grouping. He wanted concrete betterment of oppressed which would not be possible, as Fanon advised, without “political teaching,” hence, his career translated into transpire from a literary writer to a political propagandist.

Anand, like many Marxist critics and intellectuals, was fighting mechanically for the cause of the “proletariat” without firsthand experience—as he was born with a silver spoon in his mouth in the house of a silversmith who changed his profession. Like his father Anand too became a *sepo*y in World War II and fought from the side of the Communist Party as a French frontier in Spain. Cowasjee noted that his war-career as a *sepo*y, like his father, lasted “for only a fortnight” and thereafter he became active in journalist wing after the death of Ralph Fox in 1937. “Anand wanted to join the Ambulance Unit,” as Cowasjee quoted, “but he fainted at the first sight of blood while watching a blood transfusion operation performed by the celebrated Canadian surgeon, Dr Norman Bethune” (20). In the war, his heart was healthy but his mind was weak and this was the dilemma of Anand throughout his writing career.

In this sense, Anand had been criticized from the elitist point of view. It was ironical for a writer to be attacked by those for whom he claimed to be speaking, the lower class. The member of this category criticized him for not being a part of their community and dubbed him as a “*Harijan*” writer. In this Gandhian type, the bourgeois and high-class elite intellectuals heartedly offered themselves to the lower classes despite their *Dvija* (twice born) backgrounds. This problem was aggravated by the selective endings of his novels—none of his heroes (Bakha, Munoo, Gangu, Lalu, Ananta, Bhiku and others) protested directly against the circumstances in which they were placed. His heroes hopelessly waited for a Godot who never visited them. Yet, as Rafiq Zakaria notes in his book *Price of Partition: Recollections and Reflections*, whatever be the criticism of Anand one cannot argue that he “...never missed an opportunity to give an accurate picture of India to the English-speaking public or to correct the wrong propaganda unleashed against her [India], particularly by the Tory press” (108). Anand became a profound critic of prevailing life and manners of India by criticising the existing orthodoxy to the utmost level in his writings.

The image of progress had its impact on Bakha, Munoo along with Gangu and Lalu, when they went to the railway station in the first, second, third and fourth novel. All the heroes became the drivers of modernity through their journeys on/in train, bicycles or by any other means of transportation. The train became an instrument which masked an arched entry from the Inferno to a place where Munoo breathed pure air. Half in fear, half in wonder he met a coolie, Prabh Dayal, the impotent man, in a situation more akin to “a nightmare, in which elephantine giants are trampling on his body and wired two-horned devils were lashing him with fury” (62). Despite this, like a dog, he followed his master to Hamirpur for work in a pickle factory. Similar incidents had happened with Gangu, Ananta and Lalu. After reading Anand’s earlier works, critics could imagine the impact of socialism in his novels but whether it was *Untouchable* or *Coolie, Two Leaves and a Bud* or the Lalu Trilogy, the reader found themselves in a maze while searching the influence of Marxism in these works. As a socialist, Anand condemned “the personal greed, selfishness and lack of values promoted by the dominant tiger economy of the Western kind accepted by us *ad-hoc* after the attainment of freedom, in spite of the proclaimed ideal of the Socialist Pattern of Society” (ITaCC x).

There was *ad infinitum* (continuously) hinting of the same in the last chapter of *Untouchable* where Bashir talked about Marxism yet, it was not the revolutionary one in nature as dreamed by Marx. Capitalism was the base of *Coolie*, whereas, imperialism

dominated the plot of *Two Leaves and a Bud* but Marxism had not been given any room by the novelist either in the novels or in the thoughts of his characters. Though the socialist members such as Sudha, appeared in the texture of *Coolie* but the disruptions caused by a strike in this scene leads to her failure to unite the working classes. In this way, Marx's phrase "Workers of the World unite" failed in the novel. Lalu's character embodies some forms of the Marxist ideology but he too, like Sudha, was not able to lead the proletariat, hence, the final part of the trilogy became an unsuccessful experiment of Anand in the field of Marxism.

Anand denied the impact of socialism or Marxism on a regular basis in his writings but his characters were totally opposite and were influenced by the same theory, i.e., Gama in *Lament on the Death of Master of Arts*; Lal Singh in *The Sword and the Sickle*; and Ananta in *The Big Heart*. These characters adored the peasants' rule of Russia as Gama consoled the dying Nur: "We want workers' *raj* just as it is prevailing in Russia" (*Lament on the Death of Master of Arts* 39). In *The Sword and the Sickle*, Anand clearly revealed his political orientation through Lalu, who addressed the peasants about the Russian proletariat victory: "Today the gates of new life will begin to open for you. For, in far land so called *Roos* [Russia], too, the peasants once suffered as you do, and then they set up their *raj*.... And now the peasants and workers are ruling there and all men there live like brothers" (133). The character of the poet in *Untouchable* was similarly based on Marxist leanings as he "read Rousseau, Hobbes, Bentham and John Stuart Mill..." (186). The poet talked about Marxist change in the context of the "flush system," pointing out that this change will be "organic not mechanical." He fully professed the Marxist ideology with "dictatorship of the sweepers" (173) in the last chapter. Again, by quoting Nehru's speech in *Is There a Contemporary Civilisation?* Anand wrote:

...the urge and the genius of the people of India, and the background and the conditions in which they live make the "Socialist Pattern of Society" desirable, because no other pattern is likely to lead us to the results we aim at within a measure[able] period of time (127).

Though Anand denied being a part of any school, yet his characters were proof of his bent towards the most popular theories of the time, socialism, Marxism, or progressivism.

After reading Anand's socio-Marxist novels, one could bring home the idea that his characters were victims of the same problem to which Marx alluded as "labour." Whether it was Bakha and Lakha of *Untouchable*; Munoo, Prabha, Hari and industrial workers of *Coolie*; Gangu and his family in *Two Leaves and a Bud*; the craftsmen in *The Big Heart*; Bhikhu in *The Road* or Gauri in *The Old Woman and the Cow*, all had been suffering from the holocaust of capitalism. All were forced to sell their labour in order to survive but society did not allow them an independent and respectful life, hence, some died, like a dog's death (Munoo, Gangu, Ananta) and other continued to live an absurd and alienated life (Bakha, Bhikhu, Gauri). These incongruous characters represented the "radical changes [that we]re taking place in Indian society," (Manifesto 6) at a time when the capitalistic mode of production was sitting at its paramount. These characters played a vital role in bringing the socio-political as well as economic and non-economic changes in the lives of have-nots in society.

Anand not only offered the grim picture of workers' life, the relationship between master and the slave or man's engagement with society in didactical relations through Marxist labour but also illustrated how labour secured a high or low place for individual in the capitalistic society with or without socialist tracts. His early writings created havoc in India and its natives were disturbed with the conditions of oppressed class. The colonial government did not try to improve the lot of people but had hostile feedback towards *Untouchable* (banned in Punjab), *Coolie* (forbidden in Shimla), *Two Leaves and a Bud* (prohibited in Assam) and against the Lalu trilogy (proscribed in Punjab)—ban was lifted from his novels only after the independence. These books reminded us of the hectic days when people had suffered physical and mental torture at the hands of imperial rule as well as under the feudal setup. To put in different words, these works became a great mine of the life of downtrodden in the factories of the forties. Anand's heroes, Bakha, Munoo, Lalu, Ananta and many others were injected with the European view of standard life but whether it was Anand's heroes or Ambedkar, all were painting the ingrained truth of pervading social malaise of India. India's problem was, what Max Weber called, "social class." To paint this category, Anand came out as a slog and drudge painter by depicting the different shades of symbiosis of culture. The highlighting veracity of writer could not be obfuscated by the critics' not erudite manoeuvres on existing problems or by calling him a propagandist.

The literary arm of PWA was thoroughly CPI oriented yet Anand did not follow it blindly. In 1949, the same year that Abbas was displaced from the movement, Anand was dubbed as “a decadent by the Bombay group of the PWA” (Chronology 45-46) because he portrayed workers and peasants as good and bad in the same breath. Most of his novels had a myth: the cantonment was in utmost poverty but his characters were in mystical silence, whereas, suppressors called it spiritual attainment. Why did the problem of ideology occur? The answer had been suggested by Anand in his *Apology for Heroism* wherein he stated:

I struggled to weigh up the double burden on my shoulder, the Alps of the European tradition and the Himalayas of my Indian past, all my sense aching to realise the significance of the history of my country, all my heart and brain devoted to the search of those causes which had led to its present degeneracy (67).

Under the double burden of Marxism and socialism, Anand never forgot to criticize the Indian upper caste which brought “new turn to the contemporary Indian sensibility” (A. Singh 42). Due to this impact, the ethos of age had seen the spring of transformation, not instantly but slowly with the pace of a tortoise.

We confront the problem of Anand’s political involvement while establishing him as a muscular progressive writer in spite of his writings on the harsh realities: life of slums, child labour, corruption in government and in business, disease and racial prejudices. Through the progressive writings, Anand was defining the un-narrated tale of Indian life and prejudices to which the West was unknown. The middle-class readers were fond of Anand’s novels as they came to know about the existing problems of India. When he landed in England, he came into contact with the people belonging to Left (such as, professor Dawes Hicks; Irene; George Orwell, member of the Left Book Club; his first two novels published by the Wishart-Lawrence, a club of leftist publishers; Ralph Fox, who published the PWA Manifesto, was a Leftist and so on). Inspired from these personalities, he became a member of the British Congress and later of the Indian Congress including the Congress Socialist Group. Though Anand was not a comrade in CPI yet he was in touch with all big names, who were in relation with the party. This portion of his political odyssey disabled him from the path of a PWA writer. In the thematic verities and regarding the controversies, Naik compared Anand with a huge “banyan” tree with various branches in the following words: “One might complain of the rugged unevenness of the banyan, of its gnarled and twisted branches and its uneven growth; one might notice a hole in the big trunk where an owl has

made its nest—and yet one cannot, after all, but admire and respect the impressive stature of this ‘green-robed senator of mighty woods’” (185-86). Such was the quality of Anand.

Anand’s thoughts, in his novels, of socialism and Marxism became a sandwich in which the salad of left is mixed. *Untouchable* (last Chapter), *Coolie* (Hindu-Muslim riot) and *Two Leaves and a Bud* (imperialist) were some kinds of Marxist texts but the *Lalu* trilogy has been comparatively seen as a Socialist book, as *Lalu* and other characters required social revolution like of *Roos* (Russia). Anand’s life in London was in the company of socialists but his early life (1929-41) was totally dominated by Marxism and Gandhism. The socialist philosopher in Anand questioned:

Whether the old philosophies of India, which were certainly dominantly idealistic, were valid among the people, today, when a ‘Socialist Pattern of Society’ a secular democracy based on a parliamentary system and a planned economy, are operating in our mind (ITaCC ix).

Anand was more of a socialist than a Marxist. Though he edited *Marx on India* yet his characters in the novels are/were not fully Marxist. Like Nehru, we should call him a Fabian Marxist or Leninist or Socialist writer of Indian downtrodden. To put it differently, he was, as noted on the head of the book *Persian Paintings* “a distinguished oriental critic,” which means he was thinking along with the European way of life. In other words, without having firsthand knowledge of the experiences of his characters, he was successful in bringing tears in the eyes of so called humanists. Anand blended both the Indian and European theories and canvassed a new portrait of India which was not accepted in *toto* by the traditional Indians. Hence, we have a struggle of ideologies (mimicry of Europeanism) in Anand’s case as India was still waiting for actual progress.

Critics like Coppola, Ali, Cowasjee, Ahmad, Jalil, and Gopal, seemed to follow Alexander Pope’s phrase “To copy nature is to copy them” (The Essay on Man 168) while criticizing the PWA as a mimicry of European colouring (Leftism, Marxism or Socialism). Coppola gave wind to the boat with his view on Indian PWA, with stress on the point that the movement:

...shares a number of common features with socialist realism, the official literary doctrine formulated and espoused by the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union in the

early thirties, a doctrine which sought to regiment and enlist the talents of writers and artists for the various five-year plans and social uplift programmes. As a result, the arts were to be used to glorify the communist work ethic, to depict in a positive light the life of workers and peasants, and to show the enemies of the communist state in a negative light (On Asrarul Haq Majaz 47).

As per Homi K. Bhabha's theory, the mimicking of so many Western ideas in a local movement was nothing but "imitation" for the sake of criticizing traditional India but, on the other hand, he termed it another form of Indian resistance towards the British hegemony. Applying this theory to Anand's works have different shades as most of his marginal characters (Iqbal Nath Sarashar, Lalu, and Ananta) were influenced by the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union and bourgeoisie players (Charat Singh, Sudha, Colonel Mahindra) were longing for social uplift programmes of lower strata. There was a huge difference in ideas, ideals, life and living-style of both shores of Anand's characters offering a space to Bhabha's theory of mimicry.

The concept of mimicry will be helpful in checking the origin of the movement, as well as, the curve of progressive thought—the dual formation leading to important questions such as what constituted the "progressive?" Mimicry was the "desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same but not quite" (Bhabha 86). Bakha and Munoo's desire of coming close to the higher class could be taken for granted as "reformed" aspiration which, for Bhabha, was silent form of opposition. Using Bhabha's theory, the roots of PWA led to the World Congress of Writers' for Defence of Culture in Paris and later in London, Anand was present in both the cities to give his progressive views. Here, Anand was attracted towards the Leftist leanings of Britain which is evident in his involvement in the PWA movement, which was later cultivated in Lucknow, India. Hence, it could be called mimicry of Europe.

The PWA's actions were far away from being authentically mimicry as they gave voice to their original Indian cultural premise, as Zaheer writers in "The Vision of Paradise" in *Angarey*, "Human understanding is an enemy of faith and belief" (87). The words reflected the line of "infidelity and irreligiousness" against the blind faith in religion or the denial of enlightenment which was nothing but the original Indian theme. Rakhshanda Jalil came forward in the defence of movement by saying that "...the PWA was not a foreign plant grafted onto Indian stock rooted in native soil that, with diligent watering, produced strange

and exotic fruit” (xviii). But despite this claim, in one way or the other, the association was influenced by “authenticity” of Europe. The words of Shabana Mahmud proved this claim that the movement had drawn all its:

... inspiration from the writings of James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and D. H. Lawrence, and in some cases from Marxist writings, the young writers experimented with new techniques of writing which aimed at a more direct impact in its stark and unvarnished portrayal of human existence (Mahmud 447).

There was some room for the doubt when PWA had seen as an original project. Before the founding of movement, on June 21, 1935, Zaheer and Anand went to attend the International Congress of Writers for the Defence of Culture (ICWDC) conference on June 21, 1935, in Paris, France. The writers and journalists invited from all over the world while some others like Anand and Zaheer were attending in order to give a report on it. With her speech on the problem of colonization, Sophia Wadia, the founder of Indian P.E.N, was officially representing India. She discussed how the British brought homogeneous education and culture in Indian domain though it was entirely different from the Indian values and traditions yet Indians were accepting it.

What is true for the education of the child holds true for that of the nation, which is after all but a collectivity of individuals, or grown up children. Already modern education is feeling the effects of the most artificial regime which forces all individuals to follow the same line of development instead of helping each of them to find his own way...humanity can progress only by the collaboration of all nations, each having its own distinct donation to make to the common good (Wadia 7).

Her opinions on the modern Indian education system and nationality were similar to the watch of Raja Rammohun Roy and Macaulay in the mid-1830s, who were demanding scientific way of education in India. This “scientific” education is given preference in Anand’s *Untouchable* where Bakha had a dying-hard desire to “*tish-mish*” (English) of the British, similarly, Munoo wanted to be a future “machine mechanic” or “engineer” with the help of new education. Lalu had explored new way of revolution through British Army and Ananta was under the impact of scientific theory of Socialism. Bhikhu constructs a new highway which connects the traditional India with the modern civilization. This road was prepared by Roy, who was without a doubt, the father of Indian modern education and

Macaulay was favouring him from the British side. Regarding the new education in English (before Macaulay's "Minute on Education"), Roy noted down in his letter to His Excellency that the old "*Sanscrit* system" of education will lead India towards "darkness" so the need of India is the "Baconian philosophy." Like Roy, Wadia was in favour of "modern education" for the real development of child as well as of the nation and even for the progress of humanity which was under the burden of artificial regime of traditions. Roy, like Wadia, was requesting the colonial government to "promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, anatomy, with other useful sciences," (595) with the help of English language and Macaulay was their mode of transaction. The words of Wadia, speaking symbolically, had a similar tone like that of Roy's letter with the demand of more liberal education system but former's way of projecting India was rejected by Anand and Zaheer.

Were Wadia and Roy representing originality or mimicry? The answer was suggested by the nationalist writer, Tagore, for whom, Roy³³ was "thoroughly Orientalist"³⁴ as he learnt the English language at a later stage but "this helped him to realize that, truth can never be foreign, that money and material may exclusively belong to the particular country which produces them, but not knowledge, or ideas, or immortal forms of art" (The Way to Unity 465). But Anand and Zaheer had a different view: Wadia lauded the conventional concepts of spiritual and mythical East—in fact, she was presenting India from the views of Oriental intellectuals like Marx and Macaulay. Like Marx, Wadia stated that the British brought with them not only the development but also the notion of superiority which was forcing Indians to feel a "genuine" sense of inferiority. In the conclusion of her speech, she threw some light on how the nation was struggling for cooperation instead of domination of one class by the other, hence, "Our ideal is then not in competition but collaboration; it is not the exploitation of one class by another but the mutual cooperation of all classes; it is not fratricidal strife but international peace" (Wadia 7). To the zest of speech, Wadia was offering the wrong end of a

³³ Following the dictum of Tagore, "Rammohun was the only person in his time, in the whole world of man, to realize completely the significance of the modern age. He knew that the deal of human civilization does not lie in the isolation of independence, but in the brotherhood of interdependence of individuals as well as of nationals in all spheres of thought and activity...his attempt was to establish out peoples on the full consciousness of their own cultural personality, to make them comprehend the reality of all that was unique and indestructible in their civilizations in the spirit of sympathetic cooperation" (668).

³⁴ In the view of Tagore, Rammohan Roy "was thoroughly oriental in his early training and did not study English till he was of mature age. He was a profound scholar of Sanskrit, Persian, Arabic and he learnt Hebrew in order to study the Old Testament in its original oriental setting. He knew more of Sanskrit scriptures and Indian philosophy than any contemporary *pandit*.... [He] trained his mind for the free acceptance of truth" (The Way to Unity 465).

stick by giving air to the misconstrued notions about India, similar to that the Europeans had. In this sense, she was not representing the progressive forum but the colonial outlook or even she was parallel to the reactionary critic as compared with Anand and Zaheer—both of them were appalled at the method of presenting India in the international conference. The latter went to the extent of saying, “It would have been better to leave India unrepresented rather than send her to represent the country” (Reminiscences 42). Herein, Anand and Zaheer were openly rejecting the Orientalist way of looking at the problems of India, especially, the Paris conference (in indirect manner). Though they were against oriental demonstration yet they were, in some way, inheritors of the same kind of fever with which Wadia was suffering. If Wadia was encouraging English education, Anand and Zaheer were the ambassadors of Leninist or Marxist principles. They never followed the *desi* nationalistic Gandhian notion and often criticized him directly or indirectly, sometimes in the name of orthodoxy, sometimes under the spell of Marxism or socialism. For them, Wadia was speaking on the behalf of British but they themselves had the same virus in the subcutaneous layers of their mind. In one line, all were mimicking as well as were original in their ideology but they were pulling leg of each other by not allowing one to promote the vision of their group or associations as they have their own philosophy to follow.

After the conference, Paris emerged as the “queen of the world” by becoming the centre of different literary and socio-cultural movements around the world. In the words of Zaheer, “The progressive writers’ movements in the various countries were being integrated not only intellectually but also organizationally. This was a big stride in the path of the creation of international culture” (Reminiscences 42). After one year of the Paris conference, the PWA changed its location from London to Lucknow but its writers maintained their connection with the European Left movement by becoming the part of its “foreign” branch. Anand was invited to the second International Writers’ conference in London where he delivered a speech. These bonds played a significant role in flourishing the Indian literature into the European countries, in broader sense, into the different parts of the world.

After the strong check of Paris event, for the critics, the PWA was nothing but a group of writers who were “coping”—the term from Makarand R. Paranjape—actions, dresses, lifestyle, language and customs of the colonizers. This line of PWA was apparently matched with the view of Macaulay’s “Minute of Education” regarding the status of Indian society:

There are, in modern times, to go no further, two memorable instances of a great impulse given to the mind of a whole society, of prejudices overthrown, of knowledge diffused, of taste purified, of arts and sciences planted in countries which had recently been ignorant and barbarous (598).

It was mainly because in the early writings of Anand, “we find echoes of Maxim Gorky, Vladimir Mayakovsky, A. V. Lunacharsky, Dmitri Furmanov, Alexei Tolstoi, Ilya Ehrenburg, Henri Barbusse, Louis Aragon, Ralph Fox...” (Coppola, MISAL 67). In using Macaulay words, Anand’s semi-heroes (Bakha, Munoo, Lalu, Ananta, Gauri, Charat Singh, Iqbal Singh) belong to “a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (601). Thus, whether the novels or the characters, Anand was mimicking Europe. Beside these claims, there was a “third space”—the term of Bhabha—that was outside the domain of East and West sphere and that theory was Universal. Going by a Universalist approach, Anand desired to bring “radical changes” in Indian society. When we talk about the movement and Anand under the impact of Europe, the question came, were progressive writers not-aware about India in the cultural sense? The answer must be that the question is wrong. The PWA was an ultra-modern movement for the medieval India and its writers wanted that India should be termed as the most modern. Anand was giving fire to those questions in the thirties and forties which are the burning issues today, i.e., child labour, women equality, employment, equality, fraternity, brotherhood, erasing the distance between rich and poor and many others.

The colonized characters of Anand tried to mimic colonizers (the British way of living) and as a result they subjugated their own people for their power position. Munoo’s uncle, Daya Ram, the Chaprasi of Imperial Bank of India and his boss Nathoo Ram and Lala Onkar Nath in *Coolie* could be served its perfect example. Due to this, the lower class became doubly colonized but the imitators never had the ability to achieve equality against colonizers, hence, they emerged as partially decipherable. The half-sympathy of the sepoy for Bakha in *Untouchable*, the failure of tea scene and Mainwaring episode in *Coolie*, the assault on Gauri in *Old Woman and the Cow* are the exemplary. The colonized forgot that the “copying” did not allow them to imagine a different situation: how to get all-power from the British into their hand. Hence, they became the slave of failure. In this sense, both, the colonizer and the colonized were the same—the latter replicating the format in exercising the power over the lower class. The colonial culture of the people could be divided into two

levels. On the deeper level, the colonizers booked all authority over colonized in the name of a rule but, on the surface level, they denied authenticity to colonize. The colonized people, like the heroes of PWA (Bakha, Munoo, Lulu, Ananta, Gauri, Bhikhu) kept in searching the European authenticity of life, hence, they forgot their race, culture and national representation. The yearning for authentic “authority” was nothing except the mimicry. Even Ambedkar’s wearing of the coat and tie could be seen as an image of imitation. The Indian PWA project and Anand’s characters only repeated the partial presence of European thoughts that was the basis of mimicry. But Anand shepherded a new-fangled epoch of free thinking with a courage, anger and rebelliousness in his original works. This kind of mimicry was a reply to the colonizers, especially with *Angarey*, as Ahmed Ali declared:

The movement had heralded an intellectual revolution as significant as anything since Rousseau’s affirmation that “Man is born free; yet everywhere he is in chains” and Nietzsche’s declaration that “God is dead.” And the most earth-shaking utterances of the movement are to be found in *Angarey* (Mahmud 454).

However, he pointed out that “Neither the practise nor the intention of the authors of *Angarey* was Marxist” (Ali and Rashed 97) Whether or not, movement was caught up in the contemporary European political situations or directly/indirectly influenced by British’s Labour Party’s “Left-Wing,” (Mahmud 454) so called, “the neo-Marxist Left” of 1930s. The new writers of Indian cultural front were caught in the web of left or Marxism while writing their works but they were the first radical revolutionary of their kind.

The question of how progressivism was a form of mimicry is yet to be answered. Here let’s take two statements: first, the movement was not mimicry; two, movement was mimicry. Let’s accept statement one with the view that the PWA was not mimicking the coloniser at least in traditional manner. In counter attack, one can use the words of Rashed, for whom, the PWA was “influenced by the Marxist ideology” (Ali and Rashed 93)—it was nothing but the sign of imitation, hence, the first statement became false. The Progressives had shown a strong belief in a radical approach by engaging initially in the European thoughts. In attaching themselves with the Marxism, socialism and left politics, the PWA members wanted to be the part of “United Front” of the Europe. The statement once again becomes false.

Now let's accept the second statement that the PWA was mimicry. Following Bhabha's theory, the movement was mimicking only the social dogmas of colonizers. The PWA was not a movement for the elite but for the lower classes as well as the middle classes. Its aim, according to Rashed, was "to write for and on behalf of the proletariat," which for Ali, "is neither proved nor borne out by the example or precept of the original members of the movement or its creative section" (Ali and Rashed 95). For Bhabha, the line of mimics could be checked in "the works of Kipling, Forster, Orwell, Naipaul and to [t]his emergence, most recently, in Benedict Anderson's excellent work on nationalism" (87). These streaks were not followed by the association—there were some exceptions, like the novels of Anand *Untouchable* and *Coolie* wherein the semi-hero had a die-hard wish to copy the British culture, wearing of foreign dress, shoes and coat which help them in becoming Babu or Sahib and willing to speak English. Thus, the movement was totally original Indian project started by the exiled Indian students in London under the ideological glue of socialism.

In the above sense, Anand's works bore a brawny relation with socialism but socialism by no means was the policy of colonizers. The movement was coping only, what Pope said in *The Essay on Man*:

Those Rules of old discover'd, not devis'd,
Are Nature still, but Nature methodiz'd;
Nature, like Liberty, is but restrain'd
By the same Laws which first herself ordain'd. (66).

In the critical sense, the PWA was started in the imitation of Russian communism—more especially, to give their support to Dimitrov, the communist leader of Bulgaria—by the group of Indian scholars "to put the clock back and to become the creators of a new civilization" (Zaheer, *Reminiscences* 34). The collapse of communism in 1917 brought the social and economic crisis in the world. After the World War I, the liberated colonies were rapidly developing as nations. Hence, after the fall of Tsar in Russia, the nationalism became a dominant feature of "victorious anti-colonial struggles" (Chatterjee 1). To the bottom of it, movement was:

... a spirit in opposition, rather than in accommodation, that grips ... the romance, the interest, the challenge of intellectual life is to be founding dissent against the status

quo at a time when the struggle on behalf of underrepresented and disadvantaged groups seems so unfairly weighed against them (Said, *RtI* xvii).

The PWA invented modular nationalism which was inherited from Europe and by doing this it became producer of modernity. Anand was the biggest creator of freshness/ newness in colonial India. The movement never dreamed to create a self-nationalist mission so it mixed itself up with Marxism or socialism to achieve its aim. Like the World Congress of Writers for the Defence of Culture, the PWA writers:

...had felt the necessity of eschewing their individualism and organising themselves to save civilization and culture from the rising tide of reaction and degeneration. This was the only way by which they could help the forces of progress, give full scope to the development and flowering of the creative abilities, and thus, in an organised manner, save themselves from annihilation in this revolutionary age (Zaheer, *Reminiscences* 40).

The mixing up of others' good ideas must not be called mimicry. The mimicking will not be called mimicking if it was demanding for identity, reformed social life, regulation, discipline, strategy of reform. If someone called it "mimicry" then it was "empty mimicry" because this kind of imitation being close to the "dream of post-Enlightenment civility" (Bhabha 86). On this charge, the progressives were free from mimicking. Unlike the capitalism or earlier mercantilism, socialism was never ideological pole of British rule as used by the PWA.

What Marx imagined about India would be entirely different if it was under the impact of socialist banner, henceforth, the Marxism could not be labelled as an outline of mimicry—the progressives were only mimicking the economic, political, social and cultural policies exercised by colonial practice, which again was not mimicry. Using the words of Paranjape from the essay "Coping with Post-colonialism," "The West was merely a geographical and material location for [t]his plural sensibility, a location which [t]he[y] used, often than, to ... our advantage" (42). The Indian mimicry only repeated rather than represented the European vision. At one level, progressives, therefore, did not mimic the Europe but it should not be taken as granted that the imagination they built was totally original for forming a nation.

The manner in which the colonized people (after freedom) imagined their nation seemed to be colonized by their own dreams of imitating the West. The words of Tagore must be followed if one has to criticize the PWA. He said, "In India what is need more than anything else, is the broad mind which, only because it is conscious of its own individuality, is not afraid of accepting the truth from all sources" (The Way to Unity 465). Though Anand may have been jammed in the ambush of mimicry yet he added new supplementary colour to the ambivalence through mimicry. The statement might be true or semi-true or false but it was a established fact that Anand's ideas were neither Indian nor European but the progressive or the humanist and, above all, the universal.

The hectic problem of mimicry/ propoganda entered in Anand's career because of his use of two colours: Red of Marxism and Green of Socialism. In Anand's writings, we can see the effect of Red and Green but it was not enough for the social and political *pandits* who later charged him of being a Gandhist, Leftist, and sometimes a Rightist or a bourgeoisie writer. Anand was neither like a 'tomato' (thoroughly Marxist), red from outside and inside and nor like "grapes" (Committed Socialist), green from both inside and outside but equal to a "watermelon" (Phrase of Warren T. Brookes): green from outside but red from inside. If one look at him as a mixture of Marxism and Gandhi's ideal theory of non-violence then he could be an "Apple," which was red from outside and white from inside, but simultaneously, Anand was also not like a "turnip" (completely non-violent like Gandhi) that was totally "white" (peaceful) from inner and outer look. Similarly, in Anand's case, whatever would be the colour of Fruit but with his doctrines, Anand was representing the weakest stratum, who were roaming at the bottom of society, as shown in his novels. The taste of Anand's works, like the above mentioned fruits, brought not only the happiness (short lived) for the consumer but also the good health, which was the first requirement of peaceful life for downtrodden (in all theories of Marxism, Socialism, Gandhism, Leftism, Rightism, humanism and many others).

Anand was an amalgamation of tri-colours of Saffron (dying impact of Marxism), White and Green of the Indian national flag³⁵ during thirties and forties with a Gandhian badge of *Charkha* (Spinning Wheel) in the centre which symbolizes, indirectly in theory, Marxism, Gandhism, Socialism and *Charkha* denoted to the ordinary working masses

³⁵ In the year 1931, the Indian National Congress adopted this flag including Safron, White and Green colours with *Charkha* in the centre on August 6, 1931 but first hoisted on August 31, 1931, a date declared as Flag Day.

(factory workers, peasants and so on). Before *aazadi* (independence), Anand bravely fought against the bigoted social-cultural reformers, political ideologues, the orthodox *pandits* (priests) and fanatics for the sake of grassroots but just some days before the freedom, July 22, 1947, Anand, metaphorically, fed up with the Gandhian and Marxist idealism and his *Charka* being metamorphosed with *Ashoka Chakra* (stands for “Wheel of *Dhrama*” or religion). Like the changing development of flag, a bend in the river of Anand’s career could be seen by his changing his ideological route from Gandhism to Nehruvism (proletarians to bourgeoisie) and also the way of looking at things, themes and subjects. The reactionary press (Indian and British media), his foreign and Indian friends, the progressives (the Bengal Branch), and literary mafias were critically countering Anand’s move from “Left” to “Centre” but he faced it in a Gandhian way. Anand did not pay much attention to the reactionary voices. Like Winston Smith, the protagonist of Orwell’s *Ninety Eighty-Four*, Anand came out of BBC Room 101 (from West to East) and did not want to visit it again.

John Barry’s “theory of Green” will be helpful in solving the jigsaw puzzle of socialism, Marxism, humanism in Anand’s texts. It would be wrong to name any writer as a “political-propagandist” as the socio-political commentators had labelled him. In fact, Anand’s propaganda had pointed its fingers towards “Green Politics” and more closely connect the novelist with “Green,” who were the devotees of that ideology which had merged with ecology, environmentalism, peace movements, feminism, conservation, democracy as well as with the civil liberties, social justice, non-violence. Its adopters had emerged as the supporter of social progressivism like Anand and his fellow friends of the PWA. If one thinks about the party they followed, the answer surely will be “Left.” All these elements were abundantly found in Anand. Despite the political ideology, adherents to Green had a “higher” worldview, i.e., Gandhi, Spinoza Uexkull were only a handful of this long list. Anand followed Gandhi’s humanistic approach towards society for the benefits of depressed, and in doing this, he adopted Marxist preaching for forming his views as well as the socialist route to elaborate the subject.

The first Indian literary foray into Green politics had witnessed its growth with the establishment of PWA in different vernaculars after the Lucknow conference in 1936. The PWA had been inspired by Anand’s notion of “radical” changes as articulated in the manifesto and its associates were ready to struggle against cultural reaction, hence, they had

the honour to be the first writers in literature as well in politics who decided to “fight for the right of free expression of thought and opinion” (Manifesto 9) of the people.

Though Green theory had all the qualities of Marxism apparently, it is different from the same. In reality, the Marxist notion was based on the “revolution” but the Green were totally opposite by demanding a peaceful solution as practiced by Gandhi. The second problem with Green theory was their ideology of “thinking globally but acting locally.” The same problem raised its head against Anand and other members of the PWA. If he had written novels within ground of the religious context then, inevitably, his reputation could gain more stars, as compared with the current position. Due to this problem, the critics had found the seed of anarchism and anti-imperialism in his works. On the other hand, Anand’s Green left ideology was an amalgamation of ecology, environmentalism, socialism and Marxism. If he had the “green” (social justice) colour of socialism then he was not able to escape from the “red” (communist) of Marxism. In this sense, Anand was “Red-Green,” one who adopted socialism with anti-capitalistic view but had begun his career after being inspired by the Marxist theory, in a nutshell, Anand was a “watermelon.” After 1945, Anand became liberal, separated from the “Left wing” (indirectly) but remained a slave of socialist-Marxist political leanings. In the light of these theories, Anand came as a strong fighter who raised his voice against the capitalistic system which was based on ecological crises, social exclusion, conflict, inequality and many other problems of the existing India. In real sense, socialism and Marxism had its own way of casting its unique spell of any writer who was living in forties and Anand was not able to escape from it.

If Anand was a Green writer then, how is Green related to the idea of “progress.” The very fulcrum of Green doctrine rejected capitalism and industrial revolution over the increase of democratic practice for which the Green movement had begun.

While one is keen to stress the scientific credentials of green politics and to accept that green politics can be seen as part of the ‘progressive’ narrative of humanity, in sense of the improvement of our lot as a result of our increasing knowledge of the non-human world, this is balanced by an acceptance of the moral and the epistemic limits this process (Barry 251).

By passing the Indian Untouchability Act, 1931 and the Children (Pledging of Labour) Act, 1933, the colonial authority turned the table on their challengers by claiming that the progress

had been achieved but Anand's critique of untouchability in *Untouchable* and child labour in *Coolie* brought the frog out of the well and showed the reality which the British were denying over and over again. In *Two Leaves and a Bud*, *The Big Heart*, the Lalu Trilogy, *The Road*, *The Old Women and the Cow*, Anand brought into notice the sordid life and narrow outlook of the West towards the slummy East, the most ignored backyard of world civilization, which the West had tried to restore by healing the social fissures but on their terms.

The green politics put emphasis on the local, grassroots-level political activity and decision-making policy of the government with the demand of equality for downtrodden, have-nots, deprived, underdogs section. Hence, its inheritors demanded to increase the role of deliberative democracy which should be based on the direct involvement of the citizen, who must be given power to influence the decisions of the government. If one gave up the "idea" of progress then he will not be able to imagine an ethical utopia or a good future but Anand was entirely opposite. Like the Green theorists, Anand's notion of progress had been dealing with social as well as political sphere. Hence, capitalism, imperialism, modernity were expertly interwoven in the background of his novels. In this respect, the progress of pre-independence was raising its finger towards Jurgen Habermas' idea of "unfinished project of modernity," on which Anand was putting his pen. The influence of these kinds of thoughts had abundantly been found in the texts of Henry David Thoreau (America), Tolstoy (Russia) and Elisee Reclus (French) and Mulk Raj Anand from India.

If the critics choose only the problems mentioned in Anand's fruits and then compare his age's situation with the American Progressive Era, one would unquestionably find: the existing Indian government was fully aware of the social problem and doing nothing like Theodore Roosevelt for the improvement of social life of the poor. They were passing bills, like Untouchability Act, Reservation in Politics and Education, Factory Act, Child Labour Act and so many others but afraid to implement it on the larger scale. On the contrary, when the American government found any progressive book, they deliberately tried to heal the wound of mentioned problem, as seen against Upton Sinclair's progressive *The Jungle* (2006), which exposed the Chicago meat packing industry. Strict actions were practiced by Roosevelt, the president of America from 1901 to 1908, in passing the Federal Meat Inspection Act (1906) and the Pure Food and Drug Act (1906) as a response to Sinclair. In India, the opposite was happening with the writers who bring out these types of fact into the consciousness of readers and leaders. The government frequently named them propagandist,

spy, or, sometimes traitor. The texts of such type were banned and often the writer booked on false charges by the government and put behind the bars, as seen in Zaheer's case. Anand had brought out the evil of factories in *Coolie* and the condition of the tea plantation of Assam in *Two Leaves and a Bud* but the government engaged in no authoritarian action. It might be possible that Anand's facts were not as accurate as of Sinclair's (though Sinclair's claims were rejected later) but the slum description of Anand's was authentic and truthful, as seen in *Untouchable*, *Coolie* and *Two Leaves in a Bud*. All the descriptions of Anand were taken as an act of political propaganda and earlier mentioned three novels with Lalu trilogy were banned in India.

In American Progressive Era, many fundamental rights were addressed to women and the right to vote was their major victory. The pursuit of total equality involved not only for the right to vote but also for the issues such as divorce, access to higher education, abortion and birth control as well as equal opportunities to the professions and occupations. The American women overcame the persisting laws which discriminated them on the origin of sex, the oldest brand of exploitation. After nearly eighteen years of Independence, the Indian women were away from any rights as seen in *The Old Woman and the Cow*. From the centuries, they were not more than the animals (baby producing machine) for the men. With the tragic tale of Gauri, Anand brought the cat out of the bag and this cat metamorphosed into a tigress and roared against the male dominated society with her head held high.

The corruption of authority was visible in society but on literary plane it was invisible as Anand show a lamp on the bribery-racket of police in *Untouchable* and *Coolie*, in *The Old Woman and the Cow* and fraud in judicial system in *Two Leaves and a Bud*. It served as a symbol of the British oppression rather than justice. Whether it was *Coolie*, *The Sword and the Sickle* or *Private Life of an Indian Prince*, police became a mere instrument of work under the hands of capitalists, feudalists or imperialists. Like most of the socialist writers, Anand too presented them as cruel, merciless, and corrupt to the last level. Many older writers were pleased with new imperialism but the progressive writers were against it. They were strongly romantic with their dream of the optimistic future but like Roosevelt, the Indian PWA did not get a reliable political ally, so they were happy with their half-success which sometimes lead them towards the propaganda.

Both, Anand's literary career and the PWA were born in one of the most turbulent period of Indian history but both had been counted as the most potentially and prosperous

episode of South Asian literary and cultural sphere. After its inception in 1936, the PWA worked successfully till pre-partition era. As a result of the partition in 1947, two nations were born: India and Pakistan. From this time the progressive movement was a “the failure” for Gopal (5; 12) or for Talat Ahmad, it was not been able to achieve “its aim” (5) and its decline begins after 1947 and ended nearly in 1965. Despite these difficulties, the efforts of Anand were enough to secure the PWA’s “place among the modern literary movements of the world” (On PWA 1). Its writers were satisfied with the idea that “Our initial success is more due to our outlook in presenting neglected lives of our largest section of the people of Indian than our artistic accomplishments” (Pradhan xvi). Though Anand sided with the Left in politics (aiming democracy, republic, election, majority, unanimity, house, court and so on) and have “elite” status in society yet he sensed that the transformation was inevitable, hence, he wanted to make it radically progressive. From the very outset, Anand seemed to be a traveller, like Ibn Batuta (who journeyed through Africa and Eastern Europe in the West; and to the Middle East, South Asia, Central Asia, Southeast Asia and China in the East) describing the whole of colonial India through his experience. In his happy days, Anand was happy like Batuta and reverse in sad days. The critics fashionably utter while tracing the roots of PWA that no great novelist/ poets/ playwrights were produced by the movement but time never remains the same. Who knows, which of the current writer will be declared “great” in the next century? In fact, writer’s reputation depends on the criticism. William Shakespeare was literary dead with the onslaughtment of French criticism in the mid-eighteenth century but after Samuel Johnson’s criticism in *Plays of William Shakespeare* (1765, ten volumes) and his “Preface to the Plays of William Shakespeare,” the reputation of Shakespeare kept on increasing with each passing year. To reserve the loss of memory of a bygone age and writers we had to be “boats against the current, borne back ceaselessly into the past” (Fitzgerald 148) and try to reclaim its/his legacy at least in the words. Anand has passed away just ten years ago but today the tumultuous chapter of Indian intellectual history has become a pale shadow of the past. There was no denying fact that Anand heralded a new method of interrogating questions on the cultural historical backdrop and political scenario of that time. The dreamers of progress were realists and did not believe in the phrase of John Keats: “A thing of beauty is a joy for forever” (120). The romantic notion had zero effects on them as they had seen the horrors of World War I and brutality of Hitler. The news was everywhere that Hitler announced the Second World War but no editorials were written about the poverty, discrimination of women and *Dalit* by the higher class, except the voice of Anand, who majestically strode onto the stage of socio-cultural production. He was, no doubt, the writer

of the have-nots, the under-dogs and the down-trodden. He was writing at a time when India was the most backward, superstitious and underdeveloped because of misrule (foreign and national) which was full of raids, loots, plunders and coercions. One can praise or criticize Anand but cannot ignore his characters' role in laying the briquette of Indian English literature.

Anand's heroes (Bakha, Munoo, Lalu, Gangu, Ananta) were neither Promethean's characters nor Carlyle's "champion" or Nietzsche's "superman" but like Blake's "chimney sweepers" and Dickens's "orphans" they were one of those dispossessed and feeble victims whose lives were made moribund by despotic traditions of olden times. They were trying to collect their dreams but the "Titanic" which they build was also struck the iceberg, and the result was the same that had happened in 1914: the crash or the death of its dark passenger(s). Anand was responsible, as the critics defamed him, for not making his heroes radical/progressive. In *Untouchable*, he did not allow Bakha to convert into the different religion which could earn him respect. What was the reason? For the critics, the character of Bakha was based on his personal odyssey. In his youth, wrote Cowasjee, Anand "toyed with the idea of accepting Christianity, but to the boyish mind the 'ugly, tortured image on the cross' was frightening. Years later he was to examine and reject Christianity with other Indian religions for their shortcomings" (3). Bakha also had the same feeling which terminated him from a rebel to a "failed" hero. In fact, Anand's conscious mind helped him to gain "authentic" experience of the have-nots, like Bakha, in the cantonment which enabled him to depict all forms of exploitation in *Untouchable* with transparent clarity but his biographical influence transcended the novel towards the non-progressive line. Similarly in *Coolie*, most of the time Munoo ran away from the situations in which he was placed as the book quoted, "...he had meet Prabha when he run away from Shamnagar; the elephant driver who brought him to Bombay; Hari; and he certainly wouldn't have met Ratan he had not come to Bombay" (244). The million dollar question emerged, why did Munoo not run away from Mrs. Mainwaring's episode though was willing to? Why did he not show the courage again? Did he commit, as Sartre asserted, a "superior suicide?" or as Camus articulated in "The Myth of Sisyphus," "His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land" (6). In fact, Munoo had "to fight for a wage in this cursed world and then to have nowhere to go, nowhere, nowhere" (C 194). In Shimla, he was happy than any other place in life as his mistress has taken care of him and offered him healthy fruit to eat and also showed sympathy towards him during his illness. Like Forster's

A Passage to India, Anand tried to build a passage between the West and the East but the result was same as seen in the novel of 1924. These heroes were trying to come out of their existence successfully but they failed when the question of industrialization/ capitalism/ colonialism came up. Like Abdul Rahim's *Baburnama*, the work of Anand did not describe only one subject but his subjects represented the whole, including objects because there was not "only one" but many like them. The average characters who act without a pattern replace human beings in Anand's writings. Hence, the characters, like Bakha, became the representatives of imperative class/ group at the same time. Using William Wordsworth's phrase, he wanted to go beyond the "far off things" of the conventional world. Due to this urge, he was able to go beyond naturalism and produced some extraordinarily efficient and grim pictures of his times but he failed to accomplish what Balzac, Tolstoy or Dickens accomplished—on the whole, Anand was successful in neglecting the phrase "art for art's sake" of the Victorians.

The problem of a fixed aim is encountered by the critics as the PWA was a heterogeneous movement of some writers out of which a particular group belonged to the "to-be-writers" and other stood for the established writers—one portion of the movement was communist while the second preferred the socialist leanings but there was also a third corner which was independent. Whatever should be their ideological anchor, they had a strong will to change the world and Anand was not an exception. Whether Anand was a socialist, Marxist, humanist or leftist, his hatred towards imperialism never misguided him from the original facts of Indian life. He continuously depicted his anger against the Brahmanical feudalism, caste, class and old customs which imprisoned nine out of ten people in India of 1940s. Anand emerged as an ancestor of a new stream in Indian English novel in the most violent period of the twentieth century. The most difficult task in connection to Anand was/is to establish him as a revolutionary philosopher or a radical thinker. Whether it will be acceptable or not, he was the only one voicing for culturally progressive socio-political values which earned him the label of "humanist." There had been significant difference between Zaheer and Anand when placed on contravention of tradition: other members were directly wedded with the Communist Party which led them towards the socialist highway but Anand was much more liberal in protecting the human rights. With his progressive aim, he fuelled the PWA engine to act in a way which would form a new democratic society in which the miserably derived section could survive.

Some persisting elements transcend Anand towards the line of propagandist. First was his bent towards Marxism and editing of *Marx on India*. The second was his reflection of ideological theories of Gandhi. Third reason could be stated as his involvement in the PWA—a literary hand of the CPI and finally to work on the line of the Indian National Congress. Despite the charges, the progressive elements in Anand were so strong that Pramila Paul referred him as “Indian Daedalus” who was caught in the map of propaganda. The premature death of Kausalya at the age of nine, ostracizing of his aunt Devaki for having a meal with a Muslim woman which was followed by her suicide, and lastly, Anand’s beating by police under the charge of breaking the curfew, murder of his beloved Yashmin by her husband with whom Anand was ready to elope under the obsession of love, were some incidents and accidents which sharpened his sensitivity towards the progressivism. As a progressive writer, Anand cried in *Morning Face*, “I must see my imagination of prejudice against everything in the past. I must discover the invisible, deeper links with the ancient poets, which had probably come down into my own wild imagination” (335). Anand had sympathy even for the people whom he “despised, and being tender to the least little moth over the flame of the hurricane lamp” (335). In a single line, Anand was on the line of Progressive route.

The critics had the power to thwart any social change represented by the PWA through their criticism. During forties, Anand emerged as an outdoor enthusiast hunter whose image of contemporaneous tangibility was against antecedent culture. It geared up to protect the Indian wilderness so that the future of weakest segment of society could share his imbruent nature and become non-weak section. Anand’s works were imbued with the revolutionary spirit, and under its spell he quipped in the introduction to *Two Leaves and a Bud*, “I am of my time and the atmosphere of the thirties with its hangover from crises influenced me strongly.” If some palpability fights reasonably well for the weakest segment of society, they were often called propagandist by the government of colonial India as Ambedkar was termed as a “Spy” of the British government or a “traitor” for India. If Ambedkar was a “traitor” for the Congress then Gandhi was an “anarchist” for the British, as Eliot described him in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*—Anand was/is/will remain lock, surely, in the same group.

The PWA followers were energetically parading modernity and social consciousness in their works related to the stretch and squalor of working class. Early PWA wanderers were

committed Socialist who planned to fight against Fascist order, older establishments, as well as, they were fully atheists with their nose curved towards the Left or Marxism. They had tried the boldest attempt to bridge the gap between old and new orders through their stinging satire with a misty hope for a bright future which was covered with wet-liberalism. In this sense, the progressives, like Anand, were looking forward “[with] the hour of the knife/ the break with the past, the major operation” as C. Day Lewis noted in his poem “The Magnetic Mountain.” In the real sense, they had little heart, courage and stomach for blood, as Anand turned his back from the Spanish War when he heard the news of intellectuals’ death on the battle front, like Christopher Caudwell, Ralph Fox, John Cornford and Charles Donnelly. Coming to this kind of conclusion might be neglecting the accomplishment of the writer, who was young and educated revolutionaries. Thought he came back yet he shows the horrors of War in *Across the Black Waters*, especially his stay of three months in Spain as a journalist who was reporting war for the Republicans. Anand’s fear, fainting at war after the sight of blood in an operation by Dr. Norman Bethune, was nothing but the fear of a common man sent to a war without any preparation. In reality, Anand was an average man in war who was doing uncommon things in his first career, thoroughly opposite from the next to come.

The rationality in action was totally invisible from Anand’s texts in the second career as he was, consciously or unconsciously, acting without the light of action as enlightened by the manifesto. Once leaving the path of progressive, Anand was not been able to come back in the picture. Did Anand move away from Jonathan Dancy’s concept of the “Practical Reality?” The practical reality was nothing but a model of the writer as a rational agent acting on the base of reason, both “moral” (49-60) and “practical” (60-70). Now the question came: did Anand follow the tradition of a rational “agent” (1) in his career which Dancy described. Anand post-independence career, true or not, served him as an umbrella as a man facing the rain of criticism in the middle of his career. As a novelist, he was working on the fact but what about the second, wherein he rejected the fundamental beliefs of self-created manifesto. On the base of practical reality, Anand was not in the line with Dancy’s concept of a “rational” agent as far as the second career concerned, we could come to this judgement on the base of his writings and books which he wrote or edited.

Anand was highly confused regarding his literary status or ideology and simultaneously as less honest with himself but his description of disgusting slum life, the demand of dole for affected workers of the factories, spotlight on the corruption in social and

political sphere was so real that it offered a new kind of topic and subjectivity to the literary Indian world which it seldom had in the past. After reading Anand's texts, the reader could conclude that he was a "Camera" which shoots the tragic and horrible picture of Indian past but "doing nothing," like Christopher Isherwood, "I am a camera with its shutter open, quite passive, recording, not thinking. Recording the man shaving at the window opposite and the woman in the kimono washing her hair. Some day, all this will have to be developed, carefully printed, fixed (Isherwood 7). Anand's faux-naif heroes were enough to establish him a very "Odd Fish" in the ocean of Indian English writings. One must pay homage to the progressives for handling of ideas and writing on the ostracized mode of writing by poking his nose in the normal order of life by criticizing it to the utmost level. The PWA came with the zing and zest which was hardly adopted by R.K. Narayan, Raja Rao and others *lekhaks* (writers) that were to enter in the literary world. Anand could be seen as a twentieth century Indian, educated from London, buffeted by numerous ideologies, socio-political creeds and pseudo-science while believing in the wholeness of life.

Chapter 2

Idea of Progress in *Untouchable*

Background

Untouchable (1935) was published by Anand beyond the equator (in London) just one year before the existence of PWA. The progressive fundamentals were active in the novelist well before the printing of this novel which shows Bakha's hardcore desire to be a *sahib/Babu*, whose silent resistance posed questions to both colonialism and the native orthodox Hindu status quo. Bakha's imitation of the British was the real progress or it could be seen as his mental conversion like Ambedkar of 1935. In the intervening time, the boat of Bakha's life crossed the city where he crashed into a high-class man who rewarded with him a slap; afterwards, he sailed through the temple and see a "giant" who molested his sister, then he encountered a Sadhu and a fascinating bull. Subsequently, he attended the marriage of his beloved and then meets Hutchinson who wanted to convert him into Christianity. Then he saw "Bapu" (Gandhi) with his eyes and finally shook hands with the Marxist propaganda, the machine. Bakha's progress is checked in the light of manifesto which clearly shoots the fire of satire on *Sadhu* and lingo of *sadhuhood*. The structural "progress" of plot could be divided into three parts: open/silent revolt of Bakha (from beginning to the temple scene); his closeness with the high class (from the incident of lady's scene to the first solution); and the confusion (from hockey scene to the end, including all the three solutions). The solutions in novel, as Forster suggested, geared up with the entry of Hutchinson but, in truth, it begins with the Game of Hockey. Not three but four solutions are hinted as "Game" becomes the real progress. Moreover, the novel recommended two societies, higher and lower but by the end, there emerged a "third society" (symbolically) which included the youth, gentle and educated people as projected in the "fourth solution." The conclusion shows, how the novel literally bears some fruit for the future's *Harijans* with the establishment of the Indian Constitution.

The progress of *Untouchable* is Lilliputian due to its slow transition and more revelations in Christianity, Gandhism and in socialism. Bakha has found zero possibilities of hegemonic change at that time. After the zigzag course of up and down, he accepted his fate with sadism and finally, as Forster said in the Preface, "His Indian day is over and the next day will be like it but in the surface of the earth if not in the depths of the sky, a change is at

hand” (16). Thus, it was Anand’s progress, not Bakha’s, which runs down on every page of the novel. The conclusion, for Anand, paved a way for “ideological” revolution which was totally opposite of the French Revolution—Bakha seemed to be at peace with Gandhism or he was “Untouchable Gandhi.” “In this way,” as noted by Anand, “the huge question mark ‘whither India?’ which hangs on our hearts may be answered, even though in a partial manner” (ITaCC 8). Apparently, Anand presented Bakha’s economic truism or the “have-nots” fascination towards the “haves.” The charge of H.H. Anniah Gowda is that Anand’s society is “false” and he presented the wrong picture of society under the impact of Marxism but if Gowda had read Alberuni’s *India* of eleventh century, then his view towards *Untouchable* would be totally different.

Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels and Jean-Jacques Rousseau emphasized on bloodshed, so-called revolution, as the only way to achieve human progress in society, class, caste, economy, state, politics, culture and religion. Change in scenario will occur, they believed, only when the proletariat masses will overthrow the bourgeoisie class structure with an alternative. The proletariat had no country, Marx thought, as there was an enormous gap between both shores of the river, in terms of social status and only the revolution can fill this fissure. Anand was experimenting with not a grand Marxist theory of “revolution” or bloodshed, instead, he enlarged the public space by showing the miserable lot of his characters within the existing society, which denied the fundamental rights (to life, work, speak and freedom of speech and action) to the common men. Rejecting oldest form of the Marxist tradition, Anand “felt that I was not only a rebel but revolt itself” (MF 497). The above words offered Anand’s progressive nature, who harvested the thorn/fruit of PWA on Indian soil. His novels, recommended A.S. Dasan, should be read as “works of protest literature,” (93) wherein Anand “criticize ruthlessly, in its political, economic and cultural aspects” (Manifesto 7). The seed below the fertile land was harvested in the form of *Untouchable* which suddenly came out as a bud in 1935. The novel and the PWA stood for desired change in the existing order, not only in caste, class, hierarchy and hegemony but also in the literature. Before the inception of the Association, the base of Indian literature was utterly romantic, imaginative and far away from the real life. While comparing it with the British creative writings, Lord Macaulay termed it a “waste paper basket” (On PWA 12). After the First World War, the thoughts of nationalism were raising their head in the colonial countries where the progressive associates were giving fiery voice to nationalistic problems such as poverty, feminism, backwardness, hunger and others. Like Marx, Anand believed, the

British “broke up and changed India, but refused to renew it” (Letters on India 38). These problems had been challenged by the PWA in general and by Anand in particular, which changed the Indian English literary scenario altogether. The followers of progressivism entertained the “spirit of progress” with the stress that “out of the present turmoil and conflict a new society is emerging” (Manifesto 7). The new society will be a “civil society” which will not be based on bogus ethics and theories of the old sage, i.e., Manu, whose principles are noted in the *Manusmṛiti*. The progressivism gave air to the emotional exhibitionism of those depressed classes who were suffering under the colonial rule as well as the Brahmanical feudalism. Both of these colonizations were the root cause of degraded life standards of the Indians, especially the *achoots*. As a progressive frontier, Anand wanted, as the manifesto stressed, “the closest touch with the people” (Manifesto 7) and accordingly, he “[wi]ll foster through interpretive and creative work (with both native and foreign resources) everything that will lead our country to the new life for which it is striving” (Manifesto 7). All the above-mentioned elements of progress are abundantly injected by Anand in *Untouchable*.

Untouchable projects Anand’s social necroscopy of India during forties with diverse notions of progress which were embarked on by an “unaroused” and “unresponsive” eighteen years old “*Jemadar*,” named Bakha, whose “Heredity had furrowed no deep grooves in his soul where flowers could grow or grass abound” (U 105). He was suddenly forced into the progress of profession from scavengers to a sweeper in the city without an “unenlightened will.” He “emerged from the world of that rare, translucent luster into which he had been lifted, he stumbled over a stone and muttered a curse” (U 39). He was dreaming of a good future after the speech of Gandhi but later he showed his interest in the “machine” (modernism). By the end, Bakha had lost to none but he was “self-defeated” hero in the microcosm of outcast crowd as he was unable to making his mind and accepted his present/future. At one position, he was happy with Charat Singh and afterwards in the company of Hutchinson and his progress was at the peak with Gandhi’s speech and climax beings with the introduction of “flush system.” Bakha did not acknowledge the social norms like his father, Lakha, but he never revolted against it as Marx theorized it. Consequently, he was in the same position which John Milton described as the “middle flight” (1). Bakha was in the middle flight because neither he was wholeheartedly revolutionary nor bore it silently, as constantly thinking of implementation of it in rebellion. Therefore, conclusion of the novel or Bakha’s life was no conclusion at all. Like the American, French or the October Revolution, progress will be effective only by radical struggle of people or by violence but

Bakha badly lacked both, so in the absence of progressive desires, his life “fall like the cold blood from the injured bodies of hunted beasts” (C 193). Forster claimed in the Preface that in the novel “the human body [was] relieving itself,” (8). Therefore the plot is based, using Edward Said’s phrase, on the “structure of lies or of myths” (Orientalism 14) of untouchability, the oldest brand of human exploitation in India.

If we look through the eyes of Cowasjee, Niven, Narasimhaiah then *Untouchable* was not a “progressive” work, especially in its ending. They charged it to be written during 1929, edited in 1933, and published in 1935. Truly enough, the novel was published one year before the movement started and the point make it even more important and pioneering in establishing Anand’s progressive nature. Apart, the PWA was not a movement but an idea or enlightenment and the amalgam of new dimensions turned it into a “pure” novel. The question arises, how a novel could be pure when its “subject” was untouchability and untouchables who were the most “impure” creatures of Indian society. The term pure is not associated with any physical purity—its meaning is the “subject” matter as Forster puts it, “it has gone straight to the heart of its subject and purified it” (6). No “literary” writing was visible on untouchability before *Untouchable*³⁶—the socio-political treatise of Bhimrao Ambedkar, Jyotirao Govindrao Phule and others (all wrote in regional languages) were there but literary field was totally barren and Anand was the first who harvested the crop of Indian oldest curse, untouchability, in non-fertile literary land of old feudal system, which was later ripened by a host of writers, authors, critics, historians, lawyers, political pandits and leaders. Anand defiled the question of purity by interrogating the laws of Manu, hence the term pure. The progressive thoughts helped Anand in “creating something that did not exist before, precisely in such epochs of revolutionary crisis they anxiously conjure up the spirits of the past to their service,” as Marx noted in “The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte” (1). “The book seems to me,” mentioned Forster in the Preface, “indescribably clean” (7). After facing a severe criticism of publishers on the subject of “dirty” or “indescribably clean,” the novel was finally published by Wishart in 1935. One page of Forster’s *Passage to India* (1924) was ruthlessly criticized by the English due to the dirty scene of scavenging. Similar to Forster’s work, Anand’s protagonist, Bakha, was a “dirty” sweeper of low-caste as

³⁶ Anand himself wrote in the preface to the second edition of *Two Leaves and a Bud* “... until I began to write about the outcastes the *periahs*, the peasants and the bottom dogs of my country to resurrect them from the obscure lanes and alleys of the hamlets, villages and small towns, nothing very much had been heard or written about them in polite literature in the languages of our sub-continent...the world I know was the microcosm of the outcastes and peasants and the soldiers and working class” (Niven 21).

compared to the self-respected white readers in English. Harsh criticism of the socio-political diktats was active when Anand's text was checked through the *agni pariksha* (burning test) of purity and criticized on the account for not being a "pure" by stating that there were many socio-political movements³⁷ against untouchability (the issue to which the novel was addressed), under the banner of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Swami Shraddhanand, Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy, Erode Venkata Ramasamy or Periyar, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi who led various movements such as, the access to well, temples, schools, colleges, government jobs and other rights for the *Sudra Jati*. To silence them, one must use the manifesto, in the light of these movements "Radical changes are taking place in Indian society. Fixed ideas and old beliefs, social and political institutions are being challenged" (7). The big giants were trying to burn the woods of untouchability but still Bakha was far away from the self-desired status. There was still a point where the alternation is needed and the novel was an attempt to highlight it.

All the above-mentioned movements were related to the social or political radical reforms which had nothing to do with literature. The great leaders like Tilak, Shraddhanand, Coomaraswamy, Periyar, Gandhi came forward to eliminate the curse of untouchability but all failed to bring the right to access to well and temples for the untouchables³⁸ till 1929. Saying metaphorically, they were like clouds without water which could not help the barren land of untouchables as their movements produced little fruit to the members of *Bhangi* castes. By the late of 1939s, Ambedkar questions to the Congress:

On 17th August 1939 Mr. B. K. Gaikwad, a member of the Scheduled Castes in the Bombay Legislative Assembly, asked a question as to how many temples in the Bombay Presidency were thrown open to the Untouchables since 1932 when Mr. Gandhi started, his Temple-entry movement. According to the figures given by the

³⁷ Many social, political and cultural movements were started to remove the "curse of untouchability" and to establish the equality between the *Sudras* and the *Dvija*, twice born Brahmins. In 1917, the Congress in Bombay passed a "motion" to discuss a resolution on: "...the necessity, justice and righteousness of removing all the disabilities imposed by religion and custom upon the Depressed Class...by prohibiting them from admission into public schools, hospitals, courts of justice, and the use of the public wells etc" (Sisson and Wolport 183). Later in 1920 the Congress voted to pass the "resolution" to condemn the "sin of untouchability." In 1922, the Congress Working Committee (CWC) was set up to prepare a plan about the equal status of untouchables but the Committee was never on the "high flight" to achieve the "goal." Due to the shortage of the funds, the CWC later handed over the problem to the *Hindu Mahasabha* in 1923. The *Mahasabha* declared "untouchability" was against *The Vedas*. The name of Gandhi must be acknowledged and last but not least Bhimrao Ambedkar whose effect forced the British Government to put ban on untouchability—the colonial government banned untouchability with *Census of India* 1931.

³⁸ At some places the untouchables forcefully took the well in their control under the leadership of Ambedkar.

Congress Minister the total number of temples thrown open was 142. Of these 121 were ownerless temples standing on the wayside which were under the care of nobody in particular and which nobody used as places of worship. Another fact revealed was that not a single temple was thrown open to the Untouchables in Gujarat, the district which is the home of Mr. Gandhi (Ambedkar, WdoUS 261).

Thus, there was an enormous gap between the promise to eradicate untouchability and its implementation on the ground. The very hint of this failure could be located in the third chapter, wherein Sohini goes to the well in order to collect water for her thirsty brother, Bakha. Indeed, *achoots* (untouchables) could drink or take water from the well, as shown in chapter, but they had to depend on “touchable” as they were not allowed to take water directly from pitcher, well, river, lake or some other public space. At some places, they demanded separate wells or water sources for their *Varna* (as digging well was very costly) but until they got it, they had to request passersby, especially three higher hierarchies, to pour or put water in their pitcher. Ambedkar, in 1927, led a non-violent *Satyagraha* (a Gandhian theory practiced at Mahad, Raigad) in order to fight for the right to water of Chavdar Lake. In Sohini’s case, the socio-reformers, including Ambedkar, were concerned on the point of taking water but no one pay heed to the point, “how” and in “which situation” did untouchables receive the water from well for their daily needs? Did *Manusmrti* mean the only truth for them or was there any “racket” behind the law? Were these untouchables physically exploited in the shade of Manu’s code? All these stones were left unturned by the elite’s or Dalit’s movements. In order to dig up the answers, one must read Anand’s and India’s first progressive novel *Untouchable* because a literary tract had the power to portray what remained hidden from the eagle eyes of social and political philosophers (Periyar, Gandhi or Ambedkar).

Following the manifesto, on the plain level, *Untouchable* was representing “the actualities of life” of the *Sudras* (untouchable) in general and *Bhangis* in particular but on the deeper level, it gave feedback to *Manusmrti* and demanded a compensation of discrimination for the sufferers which forced the leaders to “redress the age-old disabilities of the lowest castes” (Sisson and Wolport 6). In this slim novel, Anand brought out, as Forster recommended, “a hideous nightmare unknown to the West” (8). The novelist indirectly directed his satire on the laws of Manu that were dominating the Indian society from the olden times. As Anand wrote in *Untouchable*, in Manu’s India:

The outcastes were not allowed to mount the platform surrounding the well, because if they were ever to draw water from it, the Hindus of the three upper castes would consider the water polluted. Nor were they allowed access to the near-by brook as their use of it would contaminate the stream. They had no well of their own because it cost at least a thousand rupees to dig a well.... Perforce they had to collect at the foot of the caste Hindus' well and depend on the bounty of some of their superiors to pour water into their pitchers. More often than not there was no caste Hindu present (26-27).

In the year 1920, when Tilak died, one-seventh of the Indian population had been suffering from the disease of untouchability. Regarding the water problem, they were thoroughly at the mercy of “the chance of some gentleman taking pity on” (U 26) those who were waiting near the well or the river as portrayed in the novel. When Sohini reached at the well there were ten other outcastes but there was none to help them—all the eleven female untouchables requested to the passerby for water but no one had sympathy for to them. The burning question is, what was progressive in Sohini's task of getting water?

In the novel, following *Manusmṛti*, the work of bringing water was assigned to the *nari jati* (female) untouchables who went to the well with the balanced pitcher on their head. All women gathered around the well for water but they had to request to the other “higher three castes” due to ethical establishment. There was a space of physical mistreatment, in other words, these untouchable women were used by the Hindus (not all) for their “physical” pleasure. Gulabo, the washerwoman, was exploited by a “Hindu gentleman in the town who had been her lover in her youth was still kind to her in middle age” (U 28). At this point, the orthodox Hindus, who discarded the untouchables, were found in relationship with them for the pursuit of their sexual satisfaction. The case of untouchability was ignored by the higher *Brahmins* over the completion of male's “desire.” These points were not in the light of any reader whether Indian or European so to float them on the shore of sea of Indian literature, “It is the duty of Indian writers to give expression to the changes taking place in Indian life” (Manifesto 6). But the problem for Anand was: how the relationship of the first “three” hierarchies with the “fourth” one could be named as a change? The answer must be: the first three hierarchies were ignoring *Manusmṛti*—which advised that even the touch of an untouchable fe/male could defile any hierarchy but they were doing it willingly by discarding the religion, as the case of Pandit and Sohini or Bakha and slap of high class man. As a true

progressive writer, Anand had clearly brought these changes into the pages of *Untouchable* with the help of Gulabo, Sohini, Lachman, and Pandit Kali Nath.

Gulabo was not the only female character used for pleasure by the high class. Sohini was also a victim of *Brahmanical* sex-scandal in conventional society. A Brahmin named Lachman, the Hindu water-carrier:

... looked sideways towards Sohini.... He too had noticed her before and felt a stirring in his blood, the warm impulse of love, the strangely affecting desire of the soul to reach out to something beyond, at first in fear, then in hope and then with all the concentrated fury of a bodily and mental obsession (U 35).

He went beyond this and “sometimes he had playfully irritated her with mild jokes, when she came to the well and he happened to be there. She had responded with a modest smile and a subtle look of her shining, lustrous eyes” (U 35). Sohini was also attracted towards his advancement. The third lecherous man, the *pandit* Kali Nath “had as good an eye for a pretty face” (U 33) that was Sohini. The *pandit*:

... had seen her before, noticed her as she came to clean the latrines in the gullies in the town—the fresh, young form whose full breasts with their dark beads of nipple stood out so conspicuously under her muslin skirt, whose innocent look of wonder seemed to stir the only soft chord in his person, hardened by the congenital weakness of his body, disillusioned by the congenital weakness of his mind, brazened by the authority he exercised over the faithful and devout (U 33).

The untouchable women, especially in the novel, had charming figures. Gulabo “was a fair-complexioned, middle-aged woman, the regularity of whose supple body bore even in its decay the evidence of a form which must, in her youth, have been wonderful” (U 27). Sohini:

...had a sylph-like form, not thin but full-bodied within the limits of her graceful frame, well rounded on the hips, with an arched narrow waist from which descended the folds of her trousers and above which were her full, round, globular breasts, jerking slightly, for lack of a bodice, under her transparent muslin shirt. Bakha observed her as she walked along swaying. She was beautiful (U 26).

It was easy for some lewd Brahmins to catch these wonderful and beautiful “butterflies” in the web through the flattery.

It was impossible for the *pandit* Kali Nath to make love and cross the boundaries laid down by *Manusmirti* in public sphere as doing this will defile his “pure” reputation—Gulabo’s lover was also living in the city so that no one could find him guilty easily. The words, which Anand wrote in *Lament on the Death of Master of Arts* were fully fitted to the character of Kali Nath, “God gives man the gift of holyness so that priests can obtain their ends” (16). Like Gulabo’s lover, the *pandit* played the dirty trick. He took the shade of religion and ordered Sohini, “Why don’t you come and clean the courtyard of our house at the temple.... Tell your father to send you from today” (U 34). Sohini had no authority to say “no” because, as per the law of *Manusmirti*, they were bound to serve the Brahmins:

एकमेव तु शुद्रस्य प्रभुः कर्म समादिशत् ।
एतेषामेव वर्णानां शुश्रूषामनसुयया ॥³⁹

Hence, after prior permission from her father, Lakha, Sohini left for the temple. The “dark” side of the *pandit* played havoc on him when “he looked long at her, rather embarrassed, his rigid respectability fighting against the waves of amorousness that had begun to flow in his blood” (U 34). The animal in him was at fire in the temple. He called her in temple by his own wish but when Bakha, her brother, came in he started shouting “polluted, polluted, polluted!” (U 69). The question is: why were the rules of *Manusmirti* applicable only to Bakha (male) and not on Sohini (female)? After his entry in the temple, Bakha was terrified by his mistake but his first impulse was the fear for the crime which Sohini had committed. The scene totally changed when Sohini told him of the *pandit*’s behaviour with a twist. She notified him with “sobs” what had happened with her at the door of courtyard:

‘That man, that man,’ she said, ‘that man made suggestions to me, when I was cleaning the lavatory of his house there. And when I screamed, he came out shouting that he had been defiled’.... Sohini was weeping. She shook her head in negation. She couldn’t speak.... She sobbed and [says]... ‘He-e-e just teased me,’ she at last yielded. ‘And then when I was bending down to work, he came and held me by my breasts’ (U 70).

³⁹ This tenth *sloka* of chapter could be translated as “Only one work did the lord ordain for *Surdas*, viz, to ungrudgingly serve the three above-said social orders” (Manu 32).

Before Sohini finished recounting her sad experience the *pandit* fled away from the scene.

The progressive writer in Anand questioned: why *pandit* was invisible from the scene when Bakha was in rage? Did he commit any fatal mistake? Was not he disguising his physical advances under the costume of religion? The conclusion of scene was, Sohini was molested by the high class man, to put it in different words, the *Pandit* tried to rape her. To divert the mind of the people from his fault, *pandit* cried “polluted, polluted, polluted!” (U 68) for Bakha. The word polluted could be used in the second sense. As per the above quotation by Sohini to Bakha, the “word” might be used for Sohini by *Pandit* when she “screamed.” The *Pandit* wanted to show that the girl performed mistake or he accidentally touched her but unluckily Bakha was there and blame was put on his small shoulders. Both the brother and sister were untouchables but if one accidentally collides with a *Dvija* then he gets slap, on the other hand, the *Brahmin* was forcefully using the female as an object of pleasure. Untouchables were denied rights from centuries on the base of *Manusmrti* which simultaneously prescribed extreme punishment for the Brahmins who were guilty of transgression crime but nothing is practiced here. The *Pandit* was free. Where were the laws *Manusmrti*? Where did the notion of priesthood fly? Was there any religion left or it became a “game” to use others? The radical writer in Anand knew the answers and was trying to expose the hypocrisy of existing system.

How the novel could be tagged within the progressive line if one sees it from Sohini’s angle and talked about the well and temple scene? The older leaders (Gandhi, Tilak, even Ambedkar) were busy bringing some rights for the untouchables but it was Anand who showed a lamp to the real progress and brought into light the awful nature of some opportunistic *Brahmins*. The words of manifesto, “It is the object of our association [PWA] to rescue literature and other arts from the priestly, academic and decadent classes in whose hands they have degenerated so long” (6) are fully applicable here. It demanded the liberation of Indian society in general and the untouchables in particular from the priestly influence. Even today, the condition of many of “the Sohini-s” (female untouchable) of modern India have similarities with the situation of Sohini in *Untouchable*. It might be possible that thousands of the Sohini-s were raped or molested by the priests in past but only the sobbing of Bakha’s sister were recorded and the voice of others never noticed by any except Anand. It could be, symbolically speaking, the literary or progressive effect of Sohini’s episode that in post-independent India, there are some laws against these kinds of fake *bapus*. The similar

kind of awful nature fully exposed in Madhu Kankariya novel entitled, *Sej Par Sanskrit*, wherein a modern “*bapu*” molested a young girl in his *Ashram* who meets her tragic end but cast her revenge upon the *bapu* in rage. Oppositely, in the 1930s, there was no such kind of practices of vengeance or laws. Under the shadow of loose laws, Kali Nath was protected but the artificial laws of *Manusmṛti* were challenged by the radical thought of this novel—the laws were later revived in *The Indian Constitution* of 1950. In this sense, the novel has done its progressive task by “revising” the Indian tradition society, at least, for the new Sohini-s of India.

Progressive History of Untouchability: 1891-1935

One of the few earliest historical texts on untouchability is Alberuni’s *India* wherein he showed caste system of the eleventh century India. Alberuni projected a shadowy hope about the social change in coming years and time:

...will change everything that he has brought and the dignity of the Brahmans will be gone to such a degree that a *Sudra*, their servant, will be impudent towards them, and that a *Sudra* and *Candala* will share with them the presents and offerings... All this will result in a rebellion of the small ones against the great ones, of the children against their parents, of the servants against their masters. The castes will be in uproar against each other, the genealogies will become confused, the four castes will be abolished, and there will be many religions and sects (380-81).

With the implementation of Indian Constitution, the words of Alberuni started to show their power. In the nineteenth and twentieth century, before *Azadi*, Phule, Periyar, Gandhi and Ambedkar were leading “a rebellion of the small ones against the great ones,” hence, four *Jatis* are “in uproar against each other” with the aim to abolish the caste. In the eleventh century, Alberuni was thinking about the progress by erasing the gap between Brahmans and *Sudra* or *Candala* and in the twentieth century his dream is in making. In other words, the notion of equality is in the beginning but from Alberuni to Anand, nothing great has happened in the life of untouchables, and the reason could be, the untouchables were not on the line of Satan’s advice, “awake, arise or be forever fallen!” (Milton 26). The question was canvassed, why the untouchables were not been able to “awake” themselves? The answer (could be) found in the layers of social history that they did not have any great leader like

Satan, who revolted against the Creator. After a long gap of thousand years since Alberuni's work, the untouchables were happy to find Ambedkar amongst them.

"It is true, Mahatmaji," replied Ambedkar to Gandhi, "that you started to think about the problem of Untouchables before I was born" (Keer 165). Like Satan, Ambedkar was displaced from the social-Heaven of equality as he said, "Gandhiji, I have no homeland" (Keer 165). The question of "homeland" became a prestige of nose for both Gandhi and Ambedkar as Marx thinks that the proletariat belongs to "no country." The hunt for a homeland began the fight between the two giants: who will be the representative of the untouchables? Anand jumped into the fray and made the matter more complicated by writing this novel and by trying to search for the homeland for his semi-progressive hero, Bakha, who "had begun to work at the latrines at the age of six and resigned himself to the hereditary life of the craft but he dreamed of becoming a sahib" (U 45). Like a woodpecker, Anand was trying to build a "home" for Bakha in the dead-tree of social hierarchy but this noble task caused a stir in the hornet's nest of Brahmin-led-society as they were ready to attack Anand with the sharp and biting sting of their criticism. Bakha had a problem from the Paleolithic period when some customary forces spit the poison of ritual on his community as the narrator of the novel asserted:

For though the serfdom of thousands of years had humbled him, the tropical emotions that welled up in him under an open sky had lessened his respect for life. He [Bakha] came of peasant stock, his ancestors having come down in the social scale by their change of profession. The blood of his peasant ancestors, free to live their own life even though they may have been slaves, raced in him now. 'I could have given him a bit of my mind,' he exclaimed to himself (U 72-73).

The reaction of Bakha's father, brother and sister was evident in that they would do nothing to raise their status and kept watching the traditional wall or kept themselves busy with working for the twice-born. Bakha did not follow them (like the folks of sheep) but he becomes a master of his destiny by choosing his lot, future, or freedom against the traditional curse. People like Bakha "make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past" (Marx, TEBLB 1). Bakha has a dream to be a *sahib*, in a stream of consciousness he "...saw himself getting onto the top... and sitting there...an umbrella with a carved silver handle in his hand, a sola *topi* on his head and the

tube of his father's *hookah* in his mouth" (U 78). A similar type of dream was possessed by Anand as noted in his autobiography *Pilpali Saheb* (71). It raised him up to a level of a true progressive representative who unknowingly created something against the ethical history of *Manusamrti*.

On the very first page of *Untouchable*, the reader could find the business of Bakha, whose father, Lakha, was a *Jemadar* of sweepers and in-charge of three public rows of latrines in the town of Bulashahar, Punjab, India. In portraying the real life of untouchables, Anand did not survey the whole geography or topography of India, as Gandhi and Ambedkar did. He took only one "Tuesday" (U 81) from the life of Bakha to define the existence of one untouchable who represented, more or less, all of his community. Anand predicted in *Seven Summers*, "I can imagine that I had big eyes and that these big eyes of mine never closed, because of [which I] can see everything, everything..." (233). Correctly enough, Anand's big eyes imprisoned Bakha's social status as well as his helplessness in raising the pitch of his voice in rebellion. Using the words of Nur from *The Lament on the death of Master of Arts*, "We knew what was wrong with India and with ourselves, but couldn't do anything, and only sank deeper and deeper into despair" (37). Anand wanted to highlight the "problem" of "couldn't do anything" through his progressive outlook.

The central argument of Anand was to bring into the light the hidden nightmares of *dalit* life in literature. Bakha was gifted the job of his ancestors not because it was, as he himself considered, "easy work" (22) but because of some customs which were imposed on the *Sudras* due to their birth in the lower hierarchy of Hindu religion. Due to these illegal customs, the modern scavengers were not allowed to change their profession as society believed that their fate is written in *Manusmrti*. It was wrong, as in the old text of *Manusmrti*, they were allowed to change their profession, though they are not permitted to leave their duty to serve the *Brahman* yet the change of profession was there:

अशक्नुवंस्तु शुजूषां शुद्रः कर्तुं द्विजन्नाम् ।
पुजदारात्ययं प्राप्तो जीवेत्कारुकर्मभि ॥ ⁴⁰
यैः कर्मभिः प्रचरितेः शुजष्यन्ते द्विजातयः ।
तानि कारुककर्माणि शिल्पानि विविधानि च ॥ ⁴¹

⁴⁰ This *sloka* no 99 of chapter ten must be translated as, "A *Surda* incapable of securing the services of *Brahmans*, shall live as an artisan to prevent the death of his wife and children by starvation" (Manu 471).

⁴¹ This *sloka* no 100 of Chapter ten in English stated, "Let him (i.e., *Sudra*) do such varied works of artisanship (such as painting, carpentry etc.) by which the *Brahmanas* are best served (i.e., which are of daily use to *Brahmanas*) (Manu 471).

As per this option, Bakha wanted to change his profession and dream of becoming a *sahib* but he was unable to do it. The reason was:

...the majority of [*Sudras*] ... preferred to concentrate on persuading the *de facto* rule...to do his duty towards [*Hinduism*] no matter how he gained his position, thereby enabling pious [*Sudras*] to obey the “power that be” with a good conscience. In this they were doubtless impelled by the desire to avoid a political chaos in which the practice of good [*Sudra*] life might become impossible, and by human reluctance to believe that, in accepting a particular rule... they had sinned against god (Bary 463).

In the forties, the *Sudras* were slaves to duty which did not even allow them to revolt⁴² against the ethics as Bakha and his father were unable to pose any resistance. Due to the moral code, Bakha’s life, like Sisyphus, became totally “absurd” by just following his duty day by day—Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday—without taking rest. If the rest came (like Bakha for one day) then the chain began after the rest (as Bakha had to start the job the day next to follow), as a result, the loss of individuality. Thus, Bakha, as Forster articulated, “is so degraded that he doesn’t mind, but this is not the opinion of those who have studied his case” (Preface 9). In criticizing this type of life, Bakha questioned, “Why was all this?” (U 58) and he started to dream about, as Anand placed in the novel that “the serfdom of thousands of years had humbled him” (U 72-73). Whatever would be the meaning of life for Bakha but his nihilistic life was the life of all Ambedkars (who were willing to revolt or have already revolted) of India from two thousand years to till... (?).

On the base of above two *Sanskrit slokas* (99 and 100) from *Manusmṛiti*, the questions are: will the religion or the society allow Bakha the change he wanted? Did the modern sweepers have a die-hard will to improve their conditions? Did Bakha have the root of orthodoxies in himself like his ancestors? What was the reason for his change? What way will Bakha choose in order to achieve progressivism? Whom did he follow: the Europeans, Gandhi, Ambedkar, science, or wait for the day when the Hindus allowed him the equal status he desired?

⁴² The untouchables were not allowed to revolt, as Gandhi noted in *Harijan*, April 21, 1946, “There are certain matters in which strikes would be wrong. Sweepers’ grievances come in this category. My opinion against sweepers’ strikes dates back to about 1897 when I was in Durban. A general strike was mooted there, and the question arose as to whether scavengers should join in it. My vote was registered against the proposal. Just as man cannot live without air, so too he cannot exist for long if his home and surroundings are not clean. One or other epidemic is bound to break out, especially when modern drainage is put out of action.... A *Bhangi* may not give up his work even for a day. And there are many other ways open to him for securing justice.

Let us take an odyssey of progressive Bakha from *Bhangihood* to *sahibhood* to find the answer. The *Bhangis* of the past did not choose the profession of *Jemadar* by their wish but it was imposed on them in the name of religion and by the imperial politics. The rules of *Manusmrti* were abbreviated time to time by the *Brahmins* for the establishment of their authority over the untouchables. Therefore, they did not allow any equal status to the *Sudras*, especially to Bakha, as the Sanskrit sloka read:

तस्य कर्मविवेकार्थं शेषाणामनुपूर्वशः ।
स्वायंभुवो मनुर्धीमानिदं शास्त्रमकल्पयत् ॥⁴³

As per the translation of the above *sloka* in the footnote, not just the Brahmins, the whole of society including Muslims, European, other Indian *Varnas* (castes of *Kshatriyas* and *Vaishyas*), and even the lower classes (as mentioned in the novel) needed these poor untouchables to do menial jobs for them in the name of religion or ritual without posing a question. They worked for them like slaves and in return got wages if employed, like Bakha's father, or else nothing except dishonour, as Bakha witnessed. Their remunerations were decided by the colonial authority who gave them a kind of government job, whether they intended to do or not. Critically, it was not a government job but a "forced labour," as Ambedkar called it.

Social or religious elimination was not the only a reason for the tarnished existence of sweepers, the colonial politics of India were also equally responsible for their life of exclusion. In the case of politics, in 1892, the Governor General of India had regulated the "quota system" (Jafferlot 91) for the first time in India for the depressed classes. As per the quota, the fourth class jobs were reserved for the Scheduled Caste people, in which the job of cleaning and sweeping was assigned to "the *Bhangi* caste" (Jafferlot 91), the caste to which Bakha belonged. Religion and colonial policy came together to suppress the *Sudras* like Bakha.⁴⁴ Indeed, in the colonial, as well as, in the *Varna/Jati* system, there was much "forced" labour for untouchables, including indentured labour. Ambedkar brought the frog of forced labour out of the colonial well and let the information into the public domain:

⁴³ Literal translation of the *sloka* is: "For the classification of the works (duties) of the *Brahman* and other castes of the society in the order of their enumeration, the wise Manu, the grandson of the self-originated one, framed this code" (Ch 1, *Sloka* 102).

⁴⁴ The British tried to show that they were clean and superior as compared to the Indians. So they regulated the quota system to use the lower strata as their servant. If we read Mulk Raj Anand's novel *Coolie* we can conclude with Munoo who proclaimed, "India was the one place in the world where servants still were servants" (267).

In some provinces the refusal to do this dirty work is a breach of contract. In other provinces it is a criminal offence involving fines. In provinces like Bombay the Untouchables are village servants. In their capacity as village servants they have to serve the Government as well as the Hindu public (TRU 256-57).

Similarly in the United Provinces⁴⁵ and in the Punjab,⁴⁶ the refusal to scavenging by sweepers was an offence during 1920s. Ambedkar raised his voice against it and noted:

People may be shocked to read that there exists legal provision which sanctions forced labour. Beyond doubt, this is slavery. The difference between slavery and free labour lies in this. Under slavery a breach of contract of service is an offence which is punishable with fine or imprisonment. Under free labour a breach of contract of service is only a civil wrong for which the labourer is liable only for damages. Judged in the light of this criterion, scavenging is a legal obligation imposed upon the Untouchables which they cannot escape (TRU 258).

The Brahmin found no objection in regulation of the quota—it made the life of untouchables worse than the sufferings of hell. The religious aspects were known to the people but the political dimensions of the subjugated *jatis* were laying in social dungeon protected by high priests. The untouchables were lacking *Dalit* leaders, hence, the words of Marx are appropriate here “They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented” (Marx, TEBLB 124). The representation of the lower strata by the higher one could be nicely seen in Flaubert’s representation of the Egyptian women who, in the past as well in the present, never

⁴⁵ The United Provinces Municipalities Act II of 1916 contains the following provisions:

Section 201(1).— “Should a sweeper who has a customary right to do the house-scavenging of a house or building (hereinafter called the customary sweeper) fail to perform such scavenging in a proper way, the occupier of the house or building or the board may complain to a Magistrate.”

(2) “The Magistrate receiving such complaint shall hold an inquiry and should it appear to him that the customary sweeper has failed to perform the house-scavenging of the house or building in a proper way or at a reasonable intervals, he may impose upon such a sweeper a fine which may extend to ten rupees, and upon a second or any later conviction in regard to the same house or building, may also direct, the right of the customary sweeper to do the house-scavenging of the house or building to be forfeited and thereupon such right shall be forfeited” (Ambedkar, TRU 257).

⁴⁶ Exactly similar provision is to be found in Section 165 of the Punjab Municipalities Act of 1911. The Punjab Act is an advance over the U.P. Act, in as much as it provides for punishment of a sweeper who is not a customary sweeper but a contract-sweeper. The Punjab Act adds:

“(3) Should any sweeper (other than a customary sweeper), who is under a contract to do house-scavenging of a house or a building, discontinue to do such house-scavenging without fourteen days’ notice to his employer or without reasonable cause, he shall on conviction be punishable with a fine which may extend to Rs. ten.”

“227. Every order of forfeiture under Section 165 shall be subject to an appeal to the next superior court, but shall not be otherwise open to appeal” (Ambedkar, TRU 257).

spoke for her emotional experiences or of her absence in Egyptian historiography. Anand attempted to do something similar to Flaubert. Like Flaubert and Gandhi, Anand was educated abroad, comparatively wealthier than the untouchables, elite class of *Kshatriya*—these strong historical foundations helped him to recollect his emotions in *Untouchable*, wherein he spoke for the *Bhangis* through Bakha. To put it differently, Anand’s heart melted at the sight of the position of the untouchables and, hence, he came forward for the sake of the cultural progress of these socially disabled creatures and his humanistic progressive outlook is recorded in *Untouchable*. If one accepted this view than grass are greener on the other side of the river (the question which begs for an answer is that who cleaned the house of Anand?). In *Pilpali Sahib*, Anand accepted that Bakha was his friend and the attitude of his parents was rigid towards him. Only writing was not solution to the problem, hence, indictment of Gandhi was comprehensive in raising the level of *Harijans*. In the end, Gandhi wanted that all the Hindus, including Brahmins, Sanatani and other higher races, should take the direct responsibility for the injustice that they had done to the *achoots*. Anand’s experiences at Sabarmati Ashram doing all the manual work or “bread” labour himself hinted at his acknowledgement of Gandhi. The message of Gandhi is beautifully inscribed on the last pages of the novel. Undoubtedly, *Untouchable* brought out the political and religious facts to the literary stage that earned it the honour of being the first “progressive” Indian English novel. It highlighted various aspects and issues related to the lives of oppressed especially the deprivation, marginalization and exclusion of the *Bhangi/ dalits* and their peripheral position till the 1930s.

Radical Progress

The Mahar Movement of Ambedkar bore fruit and the Government passed a bill in 1929 that all the temples will remain open to untouchables and two years later, the government approved the “Untouchable Abolish Act.” The dalits, like Bakha, were happy as they had been given a chance to see their gods after a wait of around twenty centuries—the battle had been won. The untouchables started to dream about a happy life with Gandhi’s campaign against untouchability. Progress was evident in terms of the abolishment of untouchability by the colonial government, at least in the papers. Congress was happy but their happiness did not last long. The radical writer in Anand was waiting for the publication of his first novel and luckily he came out with *Untouchable* which revealed the fake promises of the Congress in the 1930s and 1940s. In 1931, the British passed Untouchable Abolition

Act through the *Census of India* but the Congress had not been able to execute it on the ground level. When one “member” (Ambedkar) of the *Dalit* caste came forward and demanded these rights from the Congress by going against not only Gandhi but also the party, they termed him a “traitor.” On one hand, the party considered untouchability a bolt on Hinduism and, on the contrary, they were not ready to give them a separate electorate. The novel articulates the thoughts of the Congress about separate electorates:

The British Government sought to pursue a policy of divide and rule in giving to our brethren of the depressed classes separate electorates in the Councils that will be created under the new constitution (U 162).

At this juncture, the words of Congress or Gandhi about the Electorate “a policy of divide and rule” could be true, semi-true or false but the fact is that the Party campaigned against untouchability at various places, some of which were highly successful while others were failures. Meanwhile, the million dollar question is: is the Party parading against untouchability with an army of *Brahmins* against *Brahmins*? Ambedkar noted in “Annihilation of Caste”:

For some time Congress and the Conference worked as two wings of one common activity as they held their annual sessions in the same *pandal*. But soon the two wings developed into two parties, a Political Reform Party and Social Party, between whom there raged a fierce controversy. The Political reform Party supported the National Congress Party and Social Reform Party supported the Social Conference. The two bodies thus became two hostile camps. The point at issue was whether social reform should precede political reform. For a decade the forces were evenly balanced and the battle fought without victory to either side” (38).

A Cold War raged between Congress *Brahmins* and social *Brahmins*, sarcastically the word “war” was there but, in reality, there was no war. Thus, a misunderstanding between the sayings of the leaders (Party) and the masses (or researchers) was beginning to take shape of a skyscraper. The Congress projected Gandhi as a scapegoat to save the Party’s image as there was no other mob-attracting face in the Party. On the other hand, Dalits were eulogizing Ambedkar as a *messiah* of the oppressed in their campaign against Gandhi. When Ambedkar raised pertinent questions, the Congress tried to divert the attention by putting the blame on Gandhi’s shoulders. The party did not attempt to silence Ambedkar by giving him the

demanded rights as Roosevelt did in America. Hypothetically, using Marx or Mao-Tse-Tung, the revolution begins from the “foot” (the deprived section) but the members of Congress were the “head” (one who exploited them). In the view of Ambedkar or other Dalit leaders, Congress was not able to achieve what it promised and they found an abyss between Party’s *Kathani* and *Karni* (saying and doing). Being more critical, one could argue that the Congress feared, especially some unique *Brahmins*, that with the Separate Electorate untouchables would be, as the novel noted, “alienate[ed] from Hinduism by giving them a separate legal and political status” (U 162). If this happened then no one would be able to perform their manual task. In fact, the Party behaved like Havildar Charat Singh, who was happy in the company of a *Bhangi*, Bakha, and his fascination towards Bakha’s “*fashun*” allowed him a reward of a hockey stick. He knowingly allowed him to enter his house but he needed of Bakha to do the manual work for him, as the opening shows, “Oh, Bakhya! Oh, Bakhya! Oh, you scoundrel of a sweeper’s son! Come and clear a latrine for me!” (U 17) and later he complains, “Why aren’t the latrines clean, you rogue of a Bakhe! There is not one fit to go near! I have walked all round! Do you know you are responsible for my piles? I caught the contagion sitting on one of those unclean latrines!” (U 18). After the gift of hockey, Bakha was too impressed by Singh’s character that he would not mind being his lifelong slave. Similarly, when Gandhi declared that he wanted to be born as an “Outcaste,” Bakha felt a kind of happiness which is recorded by the narrator as follows: “He felt he could put his life in his hands and ask him to do what he liked with it. For him he would do anything. He would like to go and be a scavenger at his ashram” (U 165). The words of Bakha clearly matched the progressive policies of Ambedkar, who recorded that under the Congress “the Untouchables are to be eternal scavengers” (TDU 295). If one talks about the novel from the *dalit’s* angle then the untouchable character Bakha has shown a mirror to the Congress which was trying “to escape from the actualities of life” (Manifesto 6). As per the manifesto of Premchand, “It is the duty of Indian writers that they should give the dress of words and form to the existent changes in Indian life and should assist in putting the country on the path of construction and progress” (HM 6) in the country. It was the novel’s literary effort that questions about the status of temple entry were being asked directly to the Congress.⁴⁷ Apart,

⁴⁷Ambedkar questions to the Congress, “On 17th August 1939 Mr. B. K. Gaikwad, a member of the Scheduled Castes in the Bombay Legislative Assembly, asked a question as to how many temples in the Bombay Presidency were thrown open to the Untouchables since 1932 when Mr. Gandhi started, his Temple-entry movement. According to the figures given by the Congress Minister the total number of temples thrown open was 142. Of these 121 were ownerless temples standing on the wayside which were under the care of nobody in particular and which nobody used as places of worship. Another fact revealed was that not a single temple was

Ambedkar and Gandhi raised questions about the sin of untouchability in domestic or in social domain of India but escaped its international sphere? This blank space was filled by Anand's *Untouchable* which landed the local Indian untouchable in the International market.

Bakha's access to the temple represented his progressive entry into a "place too heavy to breathe in" (U 64). His thoughts became more progressive when he had seen the picture of God in temple. As a progressive critic, Anand increased the volume of the loudspeaker with burning questions like: why was Bakha afraid of his God? Why did the Indian Gods have weapons in their hands? Were they destructive or peaceful? The progressives were sure that Bakha's caste, from ancient time, had not visited any temple or captured the image of their God. So, at the gate of the temple his naive mind questioned himself "What is that snake image?" (U 64). He had seen an enormous crowd in the temple and asked "what have these people came here to worship?" (U 65). When the prayer began he questioned "who was Shanti Deva? Was he in the temple? And was he kind?" (U 65). In search of his answer, he finally decided that "I shall go and look" (U 66) because "the temple stood challengingly before him" (U 67). Following the progressive desire, like Ambedkar, Bakha entered the temple like a murderer, as the following words describe:

A murderer might have advanced like that, one confident in his consummate mastery of the art of killing. But he soon lost his grace in the low stoop which the dead weight of years of habitual bending cast on him. He became the humble, oppressed underdog that he was by birth, afraid of everything, creeping slowly up, in a curiously hesitant, cringing movement (U 66).

But unlike Ambedkar, he was neither educated nor fully revolutionary hence "The temple seemed to advance towards him like a monster, and to envelop him" (U 67). Knowingly or unknowingly, Bakha solved the mystery of the past by "defiling" the temple. Like Ambedkar, Bakha did not fight for the right to "worship god" but instead he was happy with the sight of his god and in praise "his hands joined unconsciously, and his head hung in the worship of the unknown god" (U 68). It is a fact well established that Ambedkar was fighting, as his 1936 undelivered speech "Annihilation of Caste" noted, for the complete abolition of caste but evidently he was fighting for Temple Entry Rights. If he was firmly committed to the eradication of *Jati* or so called *Varna* system, then why did he want temples to be open to

thrown open to the Untouchables in Gujarat, the district which is the home of Mr. Gandhi" (Ambedkar, WdoUS 261).

untouchables? In a classless or casteless society, there will be no need of temples or any worshipping place. Why was he not able to choose another form of resistance by boycotting the temple, as he did with Gandhi and his movements earlier? Once more, Ambedkar rejected his Annihilation doctrine by deciding to convert into another religion (two times) first in 1935 (which failed) and next in 1956 when he adopted Buddhism. Bakha was not able to understand these kind of ideologies whether Gandhist or Ambedkarists. In the lack of simple principles, he was confused and hence, he went on his own way and gave a criticism of Indian rituals wherein animals have more importance than *Bhangis*.

Bakha's next criticism of religion was of a "Brahminee Bull" (U 60) with an old but well dressed Hindu *Sadhu*. The Hindus fed the bulls with the desire that their alms would help them to gain a place in heaven. The irony was at its height when one saw the bull well dressed but the *Bhangis* being criticized for wearing new or British clothes. The words of Omprakash Valmiki's *Joothan* are apt in this context:

If we [*Churas*, another synonym for *Bhangi* caste] ever went out wearing neat and clean clothes, we had to hear their [elite class] taunts that pierced deep inside like poisoned arrows. If we went to the school in neat and clean clothes, then our class fellows said, 'Abey Chure ka, he has come dressed in new clothes.' If one went wearing old and shabby clothes, then they said, 'Abey, Chuhre ke, get away from me, you stink.'

This was our no-win situation. We were humiliated whichever way we dressed (3).

Same was the condition of *Bhangis* or *Churas* of India. Hypothetically, the Hindu animals enjoyed more prestige as compared to the *Bhangis*. The shopkeepers apparently cared less for Hinduism when wandering bulls other than their own ate their vegetables, fruits or carrots. Bakha immature consciousness questioned to him, "How queer, the Hindus don't feed their cows although they call the cow 'mother!'" (U 61). Suddenly, another thought entered his mind that the *Hindus* were kind to the cows because they "feed their cows on the reminders of the food and even on the grain" (U 62) whereas the bull of a *Sadhu* had to eat only the "onions" as Bakha exclaimed. While asking himself such simple questions, Bakha ironically criticized orthodoxical society, which Anand was projecting on the pages of the novel.

Throughout the day, the torture and sufferings of Bakha took place in the open, i.e., disrespected by the shopkeepers of the market, slapped by the Brahmin in the city, being called “polluted” in the temple by the priest, abused and cursed by the Brahmin lady at whose gate he was sleeping, a fight during the game of hockey and mistreatment by the mother of a boy whom Bakha touched while helping him. Moving forward Bakha reached the temple, a place where “he was impressed by some unknown force that seemed to lurk there” (U 64). The misbehaviour of the priest against an untouchable female was not acceptable to Bakha, hence, he got angry and cried, “I will go and kill him!” (U 71). The anger, which was only in his mind in the previous scene, came to his lips. With the hot words against the higher class, he was ready for a direct combat with the priest. The effect of this revolution was so strong that “there was not a soul to be seen out of doors” (U 72) of the temple. The progress of untouchables was evident in the curses hurled by a lady to Bakha “You sweepers have lifted your heads to the sky, nowadays” (U 81). At this point, Bakha was doing the “unthinkable” by his radical decision which brought other with “Altogether-Others.” It was impossible not only for the subject but also for the object to revolt, as the need of the hour was the replacement of formless ethics. Thus, Bakha was not only accepted by the European readership but even admired as a good and masculine colonial character built along the lines that the colonial project decreed. Anand showed Bakha’s revolutionary nature in scenes with a high-class man and with the priest who goes out of the sight just when Bakha was ready to hit him. The scene flashed a light upon the contradictory nature of Anand. On one side, he was preparing his hero to have a direct combat with the high-class man but, on the other hand, he did not allocate him the position to fight with. The novel lacking in real access which could be achieved only through the essential encounter of the oppressor and the oppressed but here comes noting. The models of Marxism or socialism were put aside. Bakha brought no fruit to his home except some false hopes offered by Gandhi and the poet. Thus, Bakha’s romance largely remained a “platonic” version, an idle mind’s imagination.

Till now the reader had seen the spark of Bakha’s progress: some might be successful while others were failure, some either had negative effect or positive outcome but the worst was yet to come that was begging, “The sweeper has come for bread, mother! The sweeper has come for the bread” (U 76). Though Bakha hated begging yet he went door to door for it, why? It was because of his acute hunger which made a man “as good as dead, a putrefying corpse like that of a stray dog or cat on the rubbish heap” (U 94). This was a kind of progress that melted into dust and no one wanted to buy it. In the city, Bakha had found himself at the

doorstep of a woman who was “not a woman but a collection of blandishments” (C 12) and the one who abused him more than Bakha’s craziest desire for *sahibhood*. The woman ordered him to “clean the drain a bit and then you can have the bread,” (U 82) and adds that only after the work which he could eat the bread. As a further mark of humiliation “she called to Bakha while he was in the middle of his job” (U 83) and threw the *roti* (the bread) towards him “Bakha laid aside the broom and tried hard to be the good cricketer he usually was, but the thin, paper-like pancake floated in the air and fell like a kite on to the brick pavement of the gully. He picked it up quietly and wrapped it in a duster” (U 83). The most radical moment came when Bakha denied the job of cleaning the drain “especially as the little boy sat relieving before him. He threw the little broom aside and make off” (U 83). The progress of Bakha was captured by the lady’s words, “Aren’t they a superior lot these days! ... They are getting more and more uppish,” (U 83) and another thought also came to Bakha’s mind “I shouldn’t have picked up that bread from the pavement” (U 84). Both the statements were contradictory in their nature but whether it was true or semi-true, the novel is “Like a ray of light shooting through the darkness, the recognition of his position, the significance of his lot dawned upon him. It illuminated the inner chambers of his mind” (U 59). Till the first half of novel, the readers could feel, as per the first Hindi manifesto of the PWA that “Great changes are taking place in Indian society” (6) but these “changes” turned into chaos by the end, resulting in so-called anti-climax or Bakha’s desire to be a mimic man.

The post-modern critics questioned, what is “new” in Anand’s *Untouchable*. The answer could be, the older social movements led by the elite or middle class were primarily class oriented—their sole goal was the desire for power in their hands. The PWA frontiers, like Anand, were not concerned merely with the “transfer of power” from the “White” *sahibs* to the “Brown” *sahibs* but their motto was the improvement of life standards of excluded people like Bakha. While judging *Untouchable* through the lens of PWA, it could be criticized on the charge of not allowing the spark of revolution in Bakha. Anand was fully aware of the weakness but he highlighted the reason in a letter to Cowasjee, “my unheroic-heroes represent many millions who are the victim of ‘Civilisation’ (5). One may add, Anand dreamed of a middle-class civil society wherein bourgeoisie people like the *Havildar*, *Hakim*, *Hutchinson*, and the younger generation of the 1940s were ready to accept the *Bhangis* without any ill-will. To counter this claim, Anand did not write this novel from the *dalits* point of view because the novel was written for the future generations not for the present one. Anand’s futuristic utopia reminded us of Aesop fable which said, “After all that is said and

done, more is said than done.” The readers of *Untouchable* often asked themselves, in Anand’s civil society, who had more morals?

By the end of the novel, the reader easily came out with the vision that the untouchable people had more morals than the high class. All four categories of the *Sudras* followed the older ethics in whose name their life became a living inferno. Bakha did not hit the man high-class man who slapped him and he never took his revenge upon the man who molested his sister. The untouchables were morally strong (in term of caste) and had faith in religion and peace. Hence, they never followed the path of physical violence, like revolution. Bakha followed the ethics and did not convert his religion. Though untouchables were living in worse condition yet Hutchinson, in his entire life, was not able to convert more than “five” untouchables to Christianity. This point has enough strength to establish the untouchables as the strict followers of ethics and morality in Indian society and it also diverted them from the route of progressiveness. On the contrary, the Brahmins like *Pandit* Kali Nath, Lachman and the lover of Gulabo were not the portrayal of morality—all were loose in morals. The females were also not different from the males, in fact, they were the other side of the same coin, i.e., the case of the woman on whose gate Bakha slept for some time and mother of *Babu’s* son. Chota’s mother also abused Bakha as he defiled her son by his touch. The shopkeepers, the *Sadhu* leading with bull and lastly, the crowd in the city stands for the false morals of orthodoxy and conservative Indian traditional society.

Due to some methodological problems, it was difficult for Bakha to establish the Egalitarian concept over the traditional thoughts in one day or with one/two fights in the India of 1940s. His “organic intellectualism”—term of Gramsci—did not stand in the conscious part of Western epistemology which Bakha and Anand were practicing, nor lies in the courtesy of “*desi*” hegemonies created by the *dvija* in which only Bakha suffered. In fact, Anand’s *Untouchable* talked about the status of *sudrahood* which was the result of his “authentic” experience that enabled him the strength to counter the *Brahmanical* domination of society. For the establishment of civil society, in Gramsci’s theory, the “hegemony” (cultural leadership over others) of ruling class must be challenged by the “subaltern.” In this sense, Bakha, as Ranajit Guha recorded in *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*, “revolt against that authority, when the hour struck, derived much of its strength from the same awareness” (19). Bakha was countering hierarchy, not directly, but in the name of “*fashun*” by which he means the wearing of foreign dress, education in English,

introduction of flush and so on. It could be taken as the beginning of a new era for untouchables, so called *Dalit* or *Harijans*.

Bakha

Anand's *Untouchable* was not about a particular age but about the distance in which "one" was not communicating with "other" due to their fake notions. The frontrunner in the campaign was an untouchable, Bakha, who with his collaborators had enough support to form a progressive environment but he did not do so. At the end of the novel, the reader concluded that it was the Brahmin who created the untouchable but, actually, it was Untouchable who created untouchability—Bakha was creating it rather than destroying it. The message of this realistic text or Bakha was in the form of a question which Anand posed in *Is There a Contemporary Civilisation?*, "Whether we want a detain-giving routine civilisation or a creative civilisation in which man is not divided from man, culture from culture, continent from continent, but progress through genuine expression of his talent, and satisfaction of his daily needs, with mutual aid into becoming a whole man" (ix). For the establishment of a progressive society, what did the rise of Bakha correspond to? If he becomes a leader what type of India will he dream of? What can account for the rise of Bakha-ism or Bakha-logy? Bakhalogy was the view that only Bakha can "save" the untouchables from untouchability by raising voice against the *Brahmanical* order because he was the only influential, effectual, clean, prophet and judicious in "other" in the pre-independent country. He had a record in life which proved that he can "deliver" if he was given a chance. To put it in different words, Bakha was Ambedkar of the novel if not so then he was a shadow of him. Like him, Bakha was thinking about conversion to Christianity in the same year as Ambedkar decided but both of them changed their mind and stayed with their orthodox Hindu religion. Hence, they were "not" progressive and equally both were "pure" progressive.

Many high intellectuals, especially the bourgeoisie *Dalits*, will not praise Bakha as a radical social hero like Ambedkar. Practically, every claim of Bakhalogy was open to dispute and rebuttal—alienation of the middle class was behind the unpopularity of Bakhalogy. The main reason was: the critics of elite-dalit class were pinned between the "first" and the "third" world over the years, hence, they critiqued this novel in the light of *Harijan*⁴⁸ novel or

⁴⁸ Harijan novel means the novel written by the higher class on the life of the untouchables.

*Dalit*⁴⁹ novel. Over it, “I am an untouchable” was the prelude of Bakha, who was an uncivilized brute with a lack of self-consciousness. He came from the rustic village as an untouchable but he did not know which option to follow. Thus, he remains an “outsider” in his own religion, as George Samsa was in his house as seen in Franz Kafka’s *The Metamorphosis*. He was neither accepted by the higher class nor by the British or Sepoys.

The novel was written after the abolition of untouchability in the colonial India through 1931s *Census of India* (Gajjarawala 72). Quite contrary to the Census, the caste problem was effective from the first page of *Untouchable*. The dream of progress was dreamed by Bakha when he was on probation with his uncle in a British regiment barrack wherein the Tommies (Indian soldiers) “treated him as a human being and he had learnt to think himself as superior to his fellow outcastes ... otherwise, the rest of the outcastes... within their lot” (U 12) were not thinking about any progress. The man who dared to attack on the citadel of “untouchable dynasty” was none other than Lakha’s son, Bakha, the half-progressive hero. Bakha was an innocent child living nowhere and everywhere who was trying to obtain his lost identity in the British barrack with the dream that “one day” (Forster 9) he would live like the Tommies and this marked the first change in his progress towards *babuhood*. He lived in “the world where the day is dark as the night and the night pitch-dark” (U 84) as there were no drains, no light and not even water to drink. Apparently, he was consciously aware of his status in the society where he was serving the *Brahmins* as a *Jemadar*. Thus, the novel became a piece of information about the history. The novelist, like Orwell, created a character searching for his lost identity in a deadly situation. Anand was not ready to impose his view of progress on Bakha rather he gave him “negative” freedom which was free from “ideal unity” as restricted by Aristotle. He left him in a state where he could decide his destiny as he was fully aware of the atmosphere around him (life, class, caste, rituals) and to the milieu to which he belongs. In this addition, the moral law did not explain to Bakha what was his duty?—it merely told him that he should accomplished his duty.

Bakha’s cause of ill-treatment was his profession so he changed his career and became a sweeper in place of his father in town—this change happened only for one day. Here progress in the profession is easily noticed by the reader. Aim of the progress was to remove sub-human status with which he was born. Here the reader imagined that only Bakha

⁴⁹ The Dalit novels are written by the untouchables themselves and all these are based on their personal experience not on the imaginary experience as in case of Anand’s novel.

did this in all untouchables. Bakha's brother, Rakha, did not have the courage for the progressive ideas so he ran away from the problems most of the time, as Sohini explained to him "Rakha having slipped to the play" (36). His father, Lakha, was lazy—the reason might be old age—so he lay down on his bed most of the time, hence, he "could never entertain the prospect of retaliation against the high caste men" (89). Besides it, "sanitation, cleanliness and hygiene had lost all meanings" (85) for the untouchables, on the contrary, only Bakha desired for the progress, indeed. The progress came when he was presented as a champion at all kind of games: *khutti*, hockey and cricket and so on. He was one of the eleven untouchable boys who composed the 38th Dogra Boys' Hockey Team. The *Bhangi* Bakha who started his job as a latrine cleaner, then became a sweeper, later changed his style and metamorphosed into a "*gentleman*" and finally is seen as a hockey player who scored a goal in a match with '31st Punjabi Team.' His goal must be taken as his moral victory over the *Dvija*. Bakha was victorious at some events but he presented the lewd characters of the generation, both male and female, whether high, low, *Sudra* or even the European.

Bakha wandered and lived through life for his endless search: he crossed the village, town and railway station and passed small amount of time with English man and Indian Colonel but all his moves were objected by the "First" who were showering the arrow of hatred upon him due to his status as an untouchable. In his passage, the mask of suffering renewed as he was continuously placed into the worse circumstances but he kept enjoying it without any complain. To justify it, he was living the life that "Others" had chosen for him, not the one that he himself had dreamed of but he took no pleasure in the administration of others. Every phase of his life made him to feel that the previous one was better. He never let himself lose the twinkle that he had in his eye, above all, he never complained to anyone, why me? He had a hidden treasure of thoughts inside his heart but had not been able to dig it out. What was the reason? The cause was capitalism or he did not have the key (money) or the lack of sources could be the answers. For the same token, he was attracted towards the British way of life by mimicking them in their style.

The Mimic Man

Untouchable had exposed that none of the Western theoretical models of attaining social justice, including Egalitarian, Rousseauistic, Hegelian or even the Marxist, had fitted in the Indian domain. Anand preferred all these thematic doctrines, still the progress of Bakha

was extremely slow in the age of airplane, it was speeding as fast as a sloth. The India of 1940s, through the testimony of Swami Vivekananda, could be divided into two parts:

On one side New India is saying: “If we only adopt Western ideas, Western language, Western food, Western dress and Western manners we shall be as strong and powerful as the Western nations”; on the other, Old India is saying: “Fools! By imitation, other’s ideas never become one’s own—nothing, unless earned, is your own. Does the ass in the lion’s skin become the lion?”

On one side, New India is saying: “What the Western nations do are surely good, otherwise how did they become so great?” On the other side, Old India is saying, “the flash of lightening is intensely bright, but only for a moment; look out, boys, it is dazzling your eyes. Beware!” (477).

It seemed that “The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brains of the living. And just as they seem to be occupied with revolutionizing themselves and things” (Marx, TEBLB 1). According to Marx, the British had been destroying India culture India by killing their traditional ways of looking at things, in this sense, “England, it is true, in causing a social revolution in *Hindustan*... whatever may have been the crimes of England she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution” (Marx, On India 16-17). Similarly, as per Macaulay’s “Minute on Education,” the main aim of the British rule was to do their “best to form a class who may be interpreters between us [British] and the millions whom we govern” (601). The second page of Anand’s *Untouchable* hinted at this. Bakha had been stroked by the vision of “White-man’s life” (U 12). He was suffering from the fever of “*fashun*”:

by which he understood the art of wearing trousers, breeches, coat, puttees, boots, etc., as worn by the British and Indian soldiers in India... He had felt that to put on their clothes made one sahib too. So, he tried to copy them in everything (U 12-13).

Bakha was not longing only for *fashun* but also had a wild desire for learning English, and as per Macaulay, “it is possible to make natives of this country [India] thoroughly good English scholars, and that to this end our efforts ought to be directed” (601). In the past too, they had offered many British scholarships to the Indians, including, Gandhi, Nehru, Tilak and Ambedkar. The British or Anand injected the same virus of British’s superiority in the

subcutaneous layers of Bakha's mind, hence, he was attracted towards the European culture. He was criticizing the Indian tradition and feeling euphoric when the *dhoti* a Brahmin loosened. Here, Bakha could be the "link" between India (*Sudra*) and Europe (*Dvija*). To be more critically, "he was trying to be Ambedkar." As per Homi K. Bhabha's theory, he was a perfect symbol of "mimic man" (Bhabha 86-92), as he was imitating the alien culture of Britain against his religion for the sake of its criticism, as Ambedkar did.

The early pages of the novel fully proved the statement when, following Ambedkar's footsteps, Bakha "tried to copy them in everything, to copy them as well as he could in the exigencies of his peculiarly Indian circumstances" (U 13). The PWA's theory came effectively to show the reality to Bakha "that he was a sweeper-boy" (U 14). He came back to the world of flesh and blood with the self-realization that the word *fashun* was not made for him in this conservative society. To put in different words, by imitating the British style Bakha was challenging the orthodox Hindu society. The thrust of becoming a *babu* had played havoc on him so much that he "sat down on the edge of a broken chair, the only article of furniture of European design which he had been able to acquire in pursuance of his ambition to live like an Englishman" (U 25). Bakha was so possessed with *Angrezi fashun* that "he slept with his day clothes on" (U 12). This kind of progress was a parallel to the American Dream which could be substituted here as the Progressive Dream. For the first time, Bakha enjoyed the nectar of progress when *Havildar* called him "*gentleman*" and the reward of progress was a "hockey stick." With this progress:

the weakness of downtrodden, the helplessness of the poor and the indigent suddenly receiving help, the passive contentment of the bottom dog suddenly illuminated by the prospect of fulfilment of a secret and a long-cherished desire (U 20).

Under the magical spell of progress, a lower boy had been seen as a *gentleman* but the Hindus were naked, except for the loin cloth on their body with brass-jug in hand which turned them "'*Kala admi zamin par hagne wala*' (black man, you who relieve himself on the ground)" (U 21-22). Here Bakha was following Macaulay, unknowingly, and preparing himself to speak from the side of British, as they laugh at traditional Indian people and their way of dressing and Bakha was doing the same under the charm of Europeanism.

The talk of critics was: whether Bakha was "imitating" the European standards or not? If we look at it from the views of Bakha, Macaulay or Marx then its answer will be

positive. In this sense, Bakha was an imitator but if we peep into the heart of history through the modern glass then the answer must be the negative one. To counter them, all the above-mentioned evolutions, in the words of Sigmund Freud, were “the dream” for Bakha. Using the words of Roland Barthes, it was an “answer to the detractors” of untouchability. It could also be taken as the theory of progress:

The vagaries of Bakha’s naive tastes can be both explained and excused. He didn’t like his home, his street, his town, because he had been to work at the Tommies’ barracks, and obtained glimpses of another world, strange and beautiful; he had grown out of his native shoes into the ammunition boots that he had secured as a gift. And with this and other strange and exotic items of dress he had built up a new world, which was commendable, if for nothing else, because it represented a change from the old ossified order and the stagnating conventions of the life to which he was born (U 88).

With his modern “dream,” a new and revolutionary brand of character was entering into the Indian literary sphere. By doing this, as Raymond Williams noted, he became the “projections of the common interests of ‘the people’ or ‘a people’ have been decisively broken down” (242). Marx also had a similar kind of view in “Thesis on Feuerbach” on the status of imitation, “The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-changing can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice” (156). This was what the PWA wanted to awaken in Indian residence, the “revolutionary practice,” which allowed them to think about their future—if not about their own then at least about the future of their children. If we followed the PWA manifesto then the novel has been representing “the changes taking place in Indian life and to assist in the spirit of progress in the country?” (6). India was in the line of modernism. In the views of W. Theodore de Bary, if “the Muslim conquest had injected a fresh stream of religious thought in the veins of Hindu society, so the British Conquest brought with it new views on the world, man and God” (602). The wearing of foreign dresses symbolized modernity in the Indian society of 1940s. This kind of modernism was practiced by Bakha’s leader, Ambedkar, who preferred to wear “coat and tie” rather than loin clothes or Indian traditional dresses. Like him, Bakha was willing to achieve this symbol of modernism because he “was a child of modern India” (U 13). Due to this modernism, his friends as well as the critics:

...cut jokes with him on account of his new rigout, calling him 'Pilpali' Sahib. And he know, of course, that except for his English clothes there was nothing English in his life. But he kept up his new form, rigidly adhering to his clothes day and night and guarding them from all base taint of Indianness, not even risking the formlessness of an Indian quilt (U 14).

The PWA theory not only gave dreams to Bakha but it also enabled him to find his status "except for his English clothes there was nothing English in his life" (U 14) if he went beyond the desired level.

Bakha was not imitating the Europeans because he was fully aware of his status as "an untouchable" (U 59) in the society but he wanted respect because "the soul of man cannot bear the sufferings. Everyone wants salvation though the real salvation is here-in spite of the pain... if only one learns to understand," said Nur to Gama in *Lament of the Death of Master of Arts* (35). Nur goes on saying, "The whole world is in search of happiness" (35) but the notion of "respect" (U 15) had no meaning for Bakha's father, Lakha, who was happy with the idea when people called him "*Jemadar*," on the other side, Bakha wanted to earn respect by becoming the *sahib*. Bakha lived in "the world where the day is dark as the night and the night pitch-dark" (U 84) as there was "no drains, no light, no water" (U 84). Thus, the dynasty of untouchability was like a labyrinth out of which no one could escape—if one wanted to do so, he had to be Icarus, of which there was no sign. Henceforth, Bakha gathered his guts or took courage into his hands and visited "abyss" (temple) in order to destroy the myth of thousand years. Bakha knew how to get work out of the higher class: he had chosen the easy way: the bribe. Due to greed, the higher class was ready to serve the lower despite the existing class order. In this sense, "He was a pioneer in his own way, although he had never heard of that word, and was completely unconscious that it could be applied to him" (U 88). This was the progress that the critics (Narasimahiah, Cowasjee, Niven) failed to catch as most of them criticized the end of the novel. It was really progressive that youth were ready to help each other but the old Hindus had problems in accepting them.

For Bakha religion was like a stamp on his caste or "It was a discord between person and circumstance by which a lion like him lay enmeshed in a net, while many a common criminal wore a rajah's crown" (U 105). He strongly fought against it but "like the beggar-singer who recites an epic from door to door. But it wanted the force and vivacity of thought to transmute his vague sense into the superior instinct of the self-conscious man" (U 106).

The only fault of Bakha, like Ambedkar, was that he was trying to be a *sahib* when, “he was a sweeper, he knew, but he could not consciously accept that fact” (U 44). He had been hoping for the day when high-class people, like *Pandit* Kali Nath, will take call of their consciousness, when principled ethics will not be more important than humanity, only then he will be a free bird. Bakha was able to think all this because he was a “progressive” character. The other family members of Bakha, even his friends, were not successful in achieving the “progress” throughout the novel.

Another progressive feature of Bakha was his burning thrust to read and study, especially “*tish-mish, tish-mish*” (U 44) which the Tommies spoke. He wanted to go to school like the sons of *Babus* and his only wish, at this point, was to read Waris Shah’s *Heer Ranja*. He knew the *bhangis* are not allowed in the schools so he tried to study on his own as “he often sat in his spare time and tried to feel how it felt to read” (U 45). He also purchased the primer of English but his progress failed as he did not move beyond learning of the alphabets. To convert it into a success, he was ready to bribe the *babu’s* son who later accepted his proposal and promise to give him a lesson in the afternoon. What did Bakha crave for, here? In fact, he wanted to become a learned Englishman and read enthusiastically “the literature of classics” in order to emerge as an “Anglicized Indian” that Macaulay had intended the untouchables to become with the English learning. Due to this desire, his friends chide him as “‘*Pilpali sahib*’ (imitation sahib)” (U 14). A missionary educationist wrote in 1819, “a mimic man raised ‘through our English school... to form a corps of translators and be employed in different departments of Labour’” (Bhabha 87). Bhabha was true here but if Bakha had to read *The Vedas* or *Manusmrti* he will not be able to live his dream of a *Babu*—it was necessary for him to learn English if he wanted to be a pseudo-*sahib* like Ambedkar. In order to emerge as a progressive character, the need of the hour was to read and learn the British education, and he was doing the same.

Unlike other outcaste boys, Bakha valued knowledge and English education. Thus, after Mahatma’s speech he thought, “he must be very educated” (U 159). Though poverty had incapacitated him to learn yet his craving to learn the new language, English, enabled him to pay the bribe of “an *anna* per lesson” (U 45) to the son of *babu*. This action of Bakha abundantly demonstrated his wholeheartedness to learn against the ethics. Bakha’s supremacy in terms of his yearning to be “better” through the information transported the reader into another colonialist myth. Ashis Nandy illustrates this binary between the “good

and bad androgynes and its ideas about valuable and despicable androgyny” (TIE 8). The characters like Bakha represented, in using the words of Nandy, “The childlike Indian: innocent, ignorant but willing to learn, masculine, loyal and, thus, “corrigible” (16). In contrast to Bakha, his friends (Chota, Ram Charan) as well as his brother (Rakha) and sister (Sohini) were at ease to hang about in ignorance and squalor into which they were born.

Bakha’s journey from his colony to city was his moral odyssey from old to a new and unknown land—as he reached the world of his heart’s desire but in the excess of joy he forgot that the city had no place for an untouchable like him. Herein, he felt insecure and low, oppressed and overcast, insignificant and small as the bad omen crossed his way, i.e., dead body of a man which was a hint that everything would taken out of his mouth even his soul. The dead body could also be seen as the death of old established code. Bakha remained a “third man” whose ambitions ceaselessly remained unfulfilled and the command of his fate dragged him towards the unknown, and what he got was nothing, nothing but an illusion. The novel pretended to show the difference between the life of a manual scavenger who cleans the shit in beginning and the one who was preparing himself for an unsuccessful revolt against this job. As per the PWA manifesto, all this was to “register the actualities of life” (7). With Bakha’s dream of wearing the British clothes mind, without a doubt, capture the image of Ambedkar wearing a suit and tie that was a symptom of the flourishing invasion of high-caste stronghold on untouchables. In opposition, the Hindus in loin-cloth denote surrender to the orthodox view as the case of Gandhi and the *Brahmin* characters in the novel.

High Class Man

In the novel, Bakha’s freedom was threatened, his independent voice was bludgeoned and terrorized into silence by the threats of high class, though he tried to shock up against it yet he remained silent till the end. He knew very well, “...for in the lives of this rif-raff, these dregs of humanity, only silence, the silence of death fighting for life, prevailed” (U 41). In this kind of a reverse atmosphere, Bakha had the herculean task of not only winning the mind of readers on the practical issues of caste and infrastructure of society but he also had to win their hearts. Over the span of one day, Bakha had visited over seven characters. In canvassing them into a portrait from head to foot, his ancestors had spent two thousand years of nights in some of these hamlets but now the progressive thought was gearing them up for the rights of the future generations. The untouchables were hoping that they could gain some traction through the people like Anand in fielding Bakha, who was so serious about untouchability. In

representing them, he wanted to play a much more visible and global role as he desired a worldwide change: how do you see the world? During his time, an evil was out there which was stamping out all the freedom of untouchability in the name of customs. He never advocated any philosophy to solve the different social problems like the immediate revolution—lacking it, the novel gradually shifted towards the *Nehruvian* democracy or socialism. Why did he not revolt was the main question?

Introduced by Forster, *Untouchable* had registered its silent protest against the pride and prejudices of the upper section of Hindu caste system against the worms of inferior tier, untouchables. Bakha was, no doubt, a cleaner who had more authentic consciousness than the *Brahmins* but the irony is that he was “powerless” to enlarge any theory of individuality. However, Bakha had witnessed the unbridgeable gap between the two worlds—his own world of servitude and the exalted world of the masters. He was looking for some progressive plan of restructuring a new social order suggested by the “first” (Gandhi) and dreaming that he (first) will recognized the need of uniting the two worlds but currently he was living on the wasteland. All social doctrines of the time were based on the ethical structure, and:

The ethical ideology conceives ‘man’ as a fundamentally passive, fragile and mortal entity most often, as a ‘marginalized,’ “excluded,” or “Third World” victim to be protected by a dutiful, efficient, and invariably, “western: benefactor/ exploiter (Badiou xiiii).

If the reader tries to find out Bakha’s progress in the city then they come to the conclusion of Bakha as passive in the concern of progress or there was a little spark of it, thus, in the city critics finds no progress or semi-progress in Bakha.

The claims of the readers are not absolutely true. Bakha, in the city, was smoking like rich people, especially the way Tommies smoke. This progress created problems for him because in trying to read the words of big-sign boards he forgets to announce his approach and collide with a man of high caste, which was a crime-like situation in pre-independence India. There came gathering all around him and Bakha was in the centre and he thought “this crowd was much more orthodox” (U 65). His first impulse was to run but he rejected the idea. Later, the revolutionary thought of pushing the man came in his mind because:

...his hefty shoulders would have enough to unbalance the skeleton-like bodies of the onlookers... but ... he knew that contact with him, if he pushed through, would defile a great many more of these men, and he could already hear in his ears the abuse that he would thus draw on himself (U 54).

After this lethal accident, Bakha's mouth was open but he could not utter a single word, hence, he finally apologized "I beg your forgiveness. It won't happen again" (U 55). The first class had other intentions as:

the *tonga-wallah* heard a sharp, clear slap ring through the air... [As a result] ...Bakha's turban fell off and the *jalebies* in the paper bag in his hands were scattered in the dust (U 57).

In the Indian scenario, it resembled the story of "The Wolf and the Lamb" in *Aesop's Fable*, "If it was not you," said the Wolf, "then it was your father," (127) and the wolf proceeded to gobble up the Lamb. Speaking symbolically, here, the lamb was Bakha and the other man was the wolf. Bakha, by using Anand's statement from *Is There a Contemporary Civilisation*, was "comparatively innocent lamb bleating in a den of roaring lions," (x) not between the wolves. In the case of lamb as well as of Bakha, the fundamental law had been forgotten that none should be punished for the supposed or actual sins of their ancestors. Bakha did not remain silent like the lamb, and for the second time during the scene, he showed a revolutionary flash of revenge upon the high class man and "In a moment he had lost all his humanity, and he would have lost his temper too, but the man who had struck him the blow had slipped beyond reach into the street" (U 57). Thus, Bakha of early chapters only imagined the radicalism but after the fight, he was ready to go beyond the imagination of an ordinary *Bhangi*, especially his father. He gathered his guts together into his hand for the combat with that man (the *Brahmin*) but he was late as the man was out his reach. Bakha preferred "masculine" type for awhile. He was physically strong and "manly" in appearance but he was not a "savage" who was designed for unpredictable violence upon the high class. Accordingly, Bakha rises in rage of mountain only when his manhood was threatened as high-class man, the *pandit* and the woman in the novel did. With the "slap" of high-class Hindu, the presence of untouchables in society is witnessed as earlier they were alien to the Hindus who never touched them.

The progressive writer in Anand asked a strong question regarding the fake notions of the *Brahmins*: if Bakha defiled him, what was the high-class man doing? In fact, he was defiling himself by his own wish—the silent demand of rights had been accepted with anger and reward was the slap. But with this cuff, the stratagem was gained by Bakha as high class man touched him. Here the subalterns are heard and, indisputably, they were audible now, as Bakha hunting for answers:

Why was all this? ... Why was all this fuss? Why I was so humble? ... Why didn't I shout to warn the people of my approach? Why couldn't I say something? Couldn't I have joined my hands to him and the gone away? ... How he run away like a dog with the tail between his legs. ... Why are we always abused? (U 57).

It never occurred in Bakha's mind to ask to the man what had happened to his God or religion or the myth on whose name they called them/him "outcastes." A kind of revolution or a progress was in beginning with these questions. The "touch scene" (U 52-57) of Bakha with the high class man was quite disturbing. As Bakha won the battle and the high-class man had to run away from the scene to save him from the wrath of "low caste vermin." In rage, Bakha rebuked himself and came to a conclusion that the notion of superiority was so high in the Hindus that they considered Muslims and the British as outcastes and they stayed aloof from them. The problem of Bakha was the same as of Eklavya—he believed in tradition. Like Eklavya, Bakha did not try to revolt against it but unlike Eklavya he was thinking about it. Why did he not revolt? The answer was: the religion or caste of Bakha did not allow him to revolt against the *Dvija*. The same kind of lesson had been taught to him by his parents in childhood—in fact to all untouchables but Bakha wanted to change the chapter of the older generations. After the slap, Bakha's hands were no more joined. All this happened because of the lust for power which means only exploiting the lower dogs, particularly, the outcastes.

Here Bakha did not start revolution rather he waited patiently for the eventual emancipation. The biggest crime of Bakha was that he drank the poison alone without blaming anyone but the uppermost criminals were those who were responsible for it. Above all, the supreme immorality was done by those who were witnessing it silently around him without a shadow of pity for the boy for whom every second seemed to be an endless age of anguish and misery. Though he had the courage to revolt yet he did not do this for he knew that the problem of two thousand years cannot be solved in one/two fight(s). Here one can see the open war like situation of the youth against the prevailing political, social, religious and

cultural backwardness. The novel makes fun of the older beliefs, in this sense, the main object of PWA was to rescue, “from the monopolistic control of the priests, pundits and other conservatives” (7). Rebellious and revolutionary ideas had burst in Bakha’s hot blood but he became calm like the season around him. Anand was greatly saddened by Bakha’s unjust ejection from a civilization of which he was a component from his birth. Why were rights denied to this old chap? Bakha did not know where to go so he articulated his problems via pen of Anand and both (Bakha and Anand) became synonymous to each other.

Most of the time, the novel was criticized on the basis of not showing the revolutionary nature of Bakha. Why Bakha did not hit the priest who molested his sister? Why did not he hit back the high-class man who slapped him? To find its answer, the need of the hour was to go back to *Manusmrti*:

ब्राह्मणान्बाधमानं तु कामादवरवर्णजम् ।
हन्याच्चिजैर्वधोपायैरुद्वेजनकरैर्नुप ॥⁵⁰

Anand did not want a worse ending of his novel in the death of his semi-hero so he did not allow Bakha to hit back to anyone. Apart from this, it was a kind of propaganda if he hit someone back. Anand saved the hero from the death and the novel from being a piece of propaganda. Thus, Anand’s novel was the “overstatement of the humanist point of view, in a society which still tends to pose every question simply in terms of popular, religion, money, caste, and language or as issue between the yogi and the commissioner” (ITaCC ix). Anand did not prefer “classless” society of Marx to attain individuality as Bakha wanted “touchability” within the caste. He wanted to use the temple and well for the untouchables. Here, Bakha was against Ambedkar’s concept of “Annihilation of Caste,” and preferred a society that gives importance to individuals, like him. The religion must not be the “opium of the people” as Marx said, instead of it, one should “let oneself go” and one’s identity must not be threatened by the return of repressed. A false appearance should be avoided to attain individuality. The false individuality brought nothing but individual’s destruction. How individuality could bring individual’s destruction? The answer surely is, the society generated its own myth and those who go against it will have to suffer, like Hitler, Mussolini and others. The older generations had not been able to cope with the social changes, hence, the present shocked them which turned one fragile in cognitive mapping of future. Here, the theory became a complicated battle between “revolutionary fool” and “conservative naive”

⁵⁰ The translation of *sloka* no 248 from Chapter ten as followed: “A *Sudra*, guilty of wilfully tormenting a *Brahmana*, let the king put to death by the painful mutilation of his limbs and organs” (Manu 438).

(case of Ambedkar and Gandhi). At this stage, the individual became a prostitute of the mind—all this was sad experience, like the case of Bakha, which was similar to a “suicidal heroic act” in the horrifying abyss of thing. An individual had been a “being un-canniness” who craved for selfhood or worldliness of the world or desired to be a Universal-Being. Bakha had been yearning for the experience of being in the world because he was nothing within the world. This feeling entered in his mind due to everyday attitude of people towards him which made him inauthentic being and all this changed his experience into the experience of nothingness. Thus, he was the Indian Sisyphus. Hence, he was ready to collide with the world of Brahmanism as he found there was nothing permanent. Moreover, this earthly land was a place where “God is dead” (Nietzsche) before the deity of humanity was born—if it was born then its rule were only for the higher classes. Solution of the existing problem had been suggested by Colonel Hutchinson in the form of conversion.

First Solution

The conversion from one caste (religion, inter/intra) into another *jati* for upward mobility was not a new concept that emerged in 1930s. The Muslim *Sultans* (emperors) like Babar, Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir, Shah Jehan, Aurangzeb and others converted many Hindus into Muslim religion forcefully. Jodha Bai became the empress of the Mughal Empire by intra-caste marriage (conversion) with Akbar, father of Jahangir. Intra-caste conversion was also adopted by Harilal Gandhi (son of Mahatma Gandhi) while inter-caste method practiced by Ambedkar. But the question of conversion became more problematic when it took place because of the faulty policies of one *Jati* against the other within the same religion. The conversion occurred due to the loss of people’s faith towards their religion and stronghold of faith in the Other. The world has seen several “Holy Wars” (the Muslim Conquests, Christian Crusades and Wars of Religion) and each war brought home only “one idea,” as noted by Marx:

Religion is the general theory of this world, its encyclopaedic compendium, its logic in popular form, its spiritual point *d'honneur*, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement, and its universal basis of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realization of the human essence since the human essence has not acquired any true reality. The struggle against religion is, therefore, indirectly the struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion.

Religious suffering is, at one and the same time, the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people (Critique of Hegel 43-44).

Whatever be the theory of religion, the main argument is: why people o convert? Is it possible that the other religion has high notion of equality so the people attracted towards it, as the case of Bakha, Ambedkar or Harilal Gandhi.

The general answer is: one could escape his caste by leaving the religion in which he was born, as Ambedkar did. An extremely conservative society of the fundamentalist Hindus treated the untouchables in most inhuman way. They had no other options except a new religion—the religion will make their sufferings less as compared to the present. All this, in the views of Gandhi, resulted due to the lure of materialism—as we see how Hutchinson try to greed Bakha but the only motif behind Bakha’s conversion was his personal profit which he could, surely, gain from the British regiment. When we talk about the conversion from one religion to another, we must not forget that “some are [converted] for the status quo to continue and some others are for radical changes” (M. A. Khan 24). All the conversions took place because of the thrust of monopoly of one caste over the other—in India it is based on religion.

Did *Untouchable* follow the conversion program for the progress with its first solution? Will Bakha shake hands with the Christianity? Was Anand violating one of the most important tenets of PWA manifesto? Let’s try to find our answer which will become the answer of/for Bakha. The theory of “West” entered in the character of Colonel Hutchinson, who had converted “five” people to the Christianity but “those five mainly from among the dirty black Untouchables” (U 136). He also approached Bakha’s father as seen by Bakha, “...old sahib had wanted to convert them to the religion of *Yessuh Messih* and to make them sahib himself” (138). Lakha, Bakha’s father, was bound to respect his religious customs and social practices, hence, he was not agreeing for the change. Why did his father not convert to Christianity and the answer could be, as Anand noted that “a large number of people really believe in them [old faiths] and practise them, because of the rigorous of over two hundred years of the imperialist rule through which we passed” (ITaCC x). After many years, the same *padri* visits Bakha for conversion but he “did not know who *Yessuh Messih* was. The sahib probably wanted to convert him to his religion. He didn’t want to be converted” (U

143). Bakha, at this stage, representing the orthodoxical phase of development by following his father, hence, he was not progressive at this point. The first solution will give him instant success as the gates of the European world would be opened to him—at least he can come close to the English class. Like Martin Luther King Jr., Bakha too “have a dream” (King 229) of coming close to the British class and the conversion means his dream may come true—but he did not have the courage to grab this opportunity, like the wolf in *Aesop's Fables*. Apart from this zigzag puzzle of up and down, the point, Bakha did not give into Christianity, is enough to prove that he was not imitating the West but his mental conversation could be taken as a calculated imitation of the British, especially of the Sepoys. All these are clearly indicating or establishing Bakha as a real progressive character.

What was the motive behind Bakha's conversion? To get to the answer one must go to Lord Macaulay's “Minute on Education” (1835) which noted, the British could: “reasonably or decently bribe [untouchable] men, out of the revenues of the State, to waste their youth in learning how they are to purify themselves after touching an ass or what texts of the Vedas they are to repeat to expiate the crime of killing a goat?” (Macaulay 600). Here the main motto was to prepare some Indians who can speak on behalf of Europe. If this was their only plan, then they were fully successful in achieving this as some of the major personalities of the time—Anand, Zaheer, Jahan and Ambedkar—were talking on their lines. But if we follow this road then we have travelled the wrong direction. No doubt, all these personalities were part of Europe for some time and they were influenced by their thoughts but their subjects were emotive and totally Indian. In the midst of European and Indian problem, the readers have following questions.

Why, like Ambedkar of 1935, Bakha did not convert into the religion of the Other? Was Bakha representing the orthodoxical Hindu views, like his father? Was Bakha neglecting the progressive outlook? Did he believe that one day the Hindus will give him equal status as projected by Gandhi? If Bakha did not want to be converted then why did he follow Hutchinson blindly?

If one criticizes the novel from the British point of view then, at some level, (only in the first solution) Bakha represented orthodox outlook which were inherited from his parents. Like them, Bakha “had refused to leave the Hindu fold, saying that the religion which was good enough for his forefathers was good enough for him” (U 138). In praising Gandhi's speech later and by embracing Flush system, Bakha wanted to gain “touchability” by staying

into in his own caste and hope that the higher tier will be changed one day from “within.” Here too was Bakha was progressive, like Ambedkar. Theoretically, like Ambedkar, Bakha “terrorising caste-Hindus” by the hope of conversion into other religion. This episode provided no solution, hence, it becomes a mere failure in the structure of the novel. Here the Christianity became a synonym for modernity and in order to achieve it one had to shed old established religion. Why did not Bakha choose the simple option of conversion? The answer may be: like his father and leader Bakha was not a young man or he was a child.⁵¹ One could easily found his “innocent” views on religion or conversion. Bakha preferred to be like an Englishman because they never practiced any hierarchical order, “I will look like a sahib,” “And I shall walk like them” (U 14). Like Ambedkar, he wanted to be a part of his old religion. He wanted to remain inside the caste system to achieve the “touchability” in the most civilized way, as recommended by Ambedkar. Like Ambedkar, he was not crazy about a complete “abolition of the Caste system” (Annihilation of Caste 41) or had a desire of burning *Manusmrti* publically. More or less, he was not ready and furthermore he did not want his happiness should be based on the opinions of others. At this point, the words of Rousseau’s *Social Contract and Social Discourse* fully fit:

Why should we build our happiness on the opinions of others, when we can find it in our own hearts? Let us leave to others the task of instructing mankind in their duty, and confine ourselves to the discharge of our own. We have no occasion for greater knowledge than this (SC&SD 153).

The second answer is: he was not rejecting the progressive outlook. The only problem for Bakha was his inability to understand Christianity “But he wouldn’t mind being converted if he knew who *Yessuh Messih* was” (U 143). Hence, “He was afraid of the thought of conversion” (U 145) because:

Christianity has its own history in [India]. Conversions of the Scheduled Castes into Christianity right from the seventeenth century had already been briefly discusses earlier. With a well-established history and network of organisations also with its great philosophy of equality and service to the poor and so on, Christianity should have been and immediate choice before the Scheduled Castes. But...he...decided not to embrace Christianity. The most important reason which went against Christianity, according to

⁵¹ Ambedkar says, “Conversion is not a children’s game. It is not a subject of entertainment.”

the Scheduled Caste youths, is that the *Harijans* who became Christians did not achieve what they wanted. The social stigma of untouchability or social discrimination was still practised. There was a strong feeling of superiority and inferiority between those Christians who converted from the higher caste-Hindus and those Christians from the lower caste Hindus (M. A. Khan 39-40).

And the last answer must be: “He followed the sahib because the Sahib wore trousers. Trousers had been the dream of his life” (U 143). This could be taken as a silent resistance of Bakha or must be seen as mental conversion.

Whatever be the reason of Bakha to stay with his religion, need of the century was to give “economic-self betterment” to the untouchables which the colonel Hutchinson had promised to Bakha. If they were not given any betterment then they have no option except to quit their “dirty” religion and embraced another. The untouchable were/are been untouchables because of their illiteracy. The route to school surely offered them new-outlook⁵²—as Ambedkar becomes a model in the suit due to his education. The modern education allowed them to reach the unreachable position in society. If they become successful then there will be no need of conversion. The untouchable of today knows very well that a new religion will not solve the economic problems or the way people behave with them. By just changing a religion, they cannot achieve everything—except changing their names and castes but not the position.

At the bottom of it, Ambedkar,⁵³ who must be crowned as the Jesus of Untouchables, announced that he would convert himself into another religion (as the members of Muslim, Sikh, Christian and Punjabi community had approached him) in 1935, the same year *Untouchable* gets published and finally converted to the Buddhism on October 14, 1956. Gandhi was also advising untouchables not to convert their religion but his advice had no effect on his son, Hiralal (Abdullah) Gandhi, who converted to Islam as a rebel against his

⁵² No one could escape from the magical spell of modern clothes. The money and good dresses could transform you into a gentleman—whatever your caste is. If you had these two things then nobody will dare to bother you. As Munoo in the novel *Coolie* cried: “Caste did not matter. I am a *Kshatriya* and I am poor, and Verma, a Brahmin, is a servant boy, a menial because he is poor. No, caste does not matter” (C 69).

⁵³ Ambedkar says: “I have decided once for all to give up this religion. My religious conversion is not inspired by any material motive.... I tell you, religion is for man and not man for religion. If you want to organise, consolidate and be successful in this world, change this religion. The religion that does not recognize you as human beings, or give you water to drink, or allow you to enter the temples is not worthy to be called a religion. The religion that forbids you to receive education and come in the way of your material advancement is not worthy to the appellation ‘religion’” (Keer 273).

father. The conversion during 1930s offers a change in social, economical and historical background of a person and it allow him self-expressive freedom to achieve everything what the higher can. The conversion guaranteed the converter equal rights of education, health, job and religion without harassment. The conversions become a kind of “theological” movement in which the subject could achieve peace and salvation, as Buddha offers it in the past. It is some sort of “silent” revolt against the Hindu fundamentalists who were not allowing freedom to the “lower dogs” (*sudras*) even in the twentieth century. In India, the *Sudra* were bound in cultural pluralism—they were part of Hinduism as a whole and they were part of religious cultural system of the social group. A third statement could be added by the force of colonial policy. In one line, the untouchables wanted to be free from the stigma of untouchability, hence, they preferred the conversion but Bakha rejected them by giving preference to Gandhi and his concept of *Harijan*.

Second Solution

The second solution has been offered by Mahatma Gandhi for the abolishment of untouchability but when the thought of this action as a “progressive” resolution come, it “failed” because it was rumoured in the novel:

...that Gandhi was very keen on uplifting the Untouchables. Hadn't it been rumoured in the outcastes' colony, lately, that Gandhi was fasting⁵⁴ for the sake of the *bhangis* and *chamars*? Bakha could not quite understand what fasting⁵⁵ had to do with helping the low-castes. ‘Probably he thinks we are poor and can't get food,’ he vaguely surmised, ‘so he tries to show that even he doesn't have food for days’ (U 156-57).

Knowingly or unknowingly, Bakha was radically criticizing Gandhi and his fasting tactics as Ambedkar was doing in the real time and which is highlighted by the dalit critics in flashback of collision of thoughts of progress between the two. Similar to Hutchinson's episode, Bakha was impressed by Gandhi's speech in the beginning but when he advised them, “They have,

⁵⁴ Though Gandhi was campaign for the vilification of untouchability yet he was against the “MacDonald Award” (on 16 August 1932 awarded by the British Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald) which was granting a separate electorate for the untouchables. He has a clash with Ambedkar over the issue. He takes a fast and finally Ambedkar has to drop his ideas. The quarrel ended with the peace of the “Poona Pact.”

⁵⁵ Bakha's views are clearly matched with Ambedkar's view, who writes: “There was nothing noble in the fast. It was a foul and filthy act. The Fast was not for the benefit of the Untouchables. It was against them and was the worst form of coercion against a helpless people to give up the constitutional safeguards of which they had become possessed under the Prime Minister's Award and agree to live on the mercy of the Hindus. It was a vile and wicked act. How can the Untouchables regard such a man as honest and sincere?” (Ambedkar, WdoUS 259).

therefore, to purify their lives.” [Bakha reacted,] “But now, now the Mahatma is blaming us ... That is not fair” (U 164-65). With Gandhi’s advice, untouchables “have to rid themselves of evil habits, like drinking liquor and eating carrion,” (U 165) Bakha’s earlier statement could be proved right wherein he thinks, “They [*Brahmin*] think we are mere dirt because we clean their dirt” (U 89). Here, the irony clearly reflected by the words of Gandhi, who was a *Sanatani*, and Bakha on the same subject but Teresa Hubel suggested the answer which is “privilege.” She defines, “privilege is never sacrificed to the cause of untouchability uplift, not by Anand and certainly not by Gandhi” (Hubel 177) and the “Systemic change is possible when Bakha begins to write himself, instead of having subjectivity exclusively written by others” (Hubel 175). The same problem (Gandhi/Anand as a friend of untouchables or politically using them) of Bakha’s mind was mentioned in the “conversation” (11) between Nikhil and Bonamy Dobree in the first chapter of *Conversations in Bloomsbury*.

This episode of Gandhi, recommended Hubel, must be seen as a clash between the progressive ideas of “Ambedkar” (the *Dalit* Literature) and the views of “Gandhi” (the *Harijan* Literature). In *Untouchable*, Anand quoted Gandhi’s article, which was published in the journal *Young India* on April 27, 1921 but when we interrogate the speech through the acid test of radical grounds, we find that Gandhi cared for untouchables but the “Left” leaders or Europeans claimed that he was befooling them. After the claim of the poet, the conflict between Gandhian ideology and Left theory became visible. Romain Rolland was surprised to find this gap and writes that on 15 October 1937, he was “visited by Jawaharlal Nehru’s secretary,” Zafar and his wife Jahan. At that time, both of them were the permanent members of CPI, CSP as well as of the PWA but in their socio-political connection, Rolland added, they were:

...elite Indian who are, in a sense, Nehru’s right arm, give evidence of a sharp distance for Gandhi, Mahmoud at least is prudent, and watches his words. But his wife speaks without restraint, and he does nothing to correct her.... I cannot believe that Nehru, so respectful and affectionate towards Gandhi, would approve of what they say, but he cannot be unaware of their opinions, and if he allows them to be present at his side, it must mean that they express in disrespectful from something fundamental to his thought (1).

Rolland was shocked to discover that Rashid and Zafar:

... present Gandhi as being hostile at heart to the Mohammedans, putting them in disadvantageous positions, secretly opposing their legitimate claims (as in the debate about a single national language, in which he did not want to take any account of Urdu). They present him as a Hindu bigot, anchored in his backward piety, blessing God for the earthquakes which are due to the sins of the Hindus, as a petit bourgeois allied with the upper Hindu bourgeoisie and applying himself to maintaining their pact of alliance with England, reading nothing, not even the new Constitution (1).

Rolland was sad to find that “Mahmoud says with a smile: ‘Mr. Gandhi is the typical Hindu’” (Rolland 1). Apart from this, there was an enormous gap between ideologies of “peace” (Gandhi) and “revolution” (CPI) and this was clearly reflected in Y. Roslavlev’s article on Gandhi entitled, “The Fundamental Paths of Socio-Economic Development of Colonial India and the Class Roots of Gandhism,” (1931) wherein Gandhi has been criticized for misguiding the Indian masses. As per the Left theory, Gandhi gave “masses” (untouchables) his gospel to “purify” themselves in order to be a part of civilized life. The Left need answer, why was Gandhi asking them for “purification?” Its answer, for them, located in the last stanza of Gandhi’s speech which begins with, “I am an orthodox Hindu” (U 160).⁵⁶ By following the words of the Leftist poet in the novel, Gandhian preaching was a “failure” not only in views of the progressives, especially Ambedkar, but also in the eyes of Bakha, who thought:

The Mahatma had talked of a Brahmin who did the scavenging in his ashram. ‘Did he mean, then, that I should go on scavenging?’ Bakha asked himself. ‘Yes,’ came the forceful answer. ‘Yes,’ said Bakha, ‘I shall go on doing what Gandhi says.’ ‘But shall I never be able to leave the latrines?’ came the disturbing thought (U 175).

The above words of Bakha clearly reflected the progressive policies of Ambedkar. At this place, Bakha rejected Gandhi’s ideas and willing to follow the socialist poet:

‘But I can. Did not that poet say there is a machine which can do my work?’ The prospect of never being able to wear the clothes that the sahibs wore, of never being able to become a sahib, was horrible. ‘But it doesn’t matter,’ he said to console

⁵⁶ The “Orthodox” means Gandhi was following the strict form of Hindusim, that was “*Sanatan Dharam*: “A *Sanatanist* is one who follows the *Sanatana Dharma*. According to the “*Mahabhart*” it means observance of *Ahimsa*, *Satya*, non-stealing, cleanliness and self-restraint. As I have been endeavouring to follow these to the best of my ability, I have not hesitated to describe myself as a *Sanatanist*” (Parekh 248).

himself, and pictured in his mind the English policeman, whom he had seen before the meeting, standing there, ignored by everybody (U 175).

The CPI was putting in Bakha's mind that if he wanted to be a *sahib* then he had to leave the "orthodoxy" (Gandhi). His passion was to be a part of "the English police" (U 175) though he knew that no one will pay attention to him yet he desired it. All these were nothing but the indicating factor of progressivism. During 1935, when the novel published, Anand was alarming Indian problems through Stalin-led parties or groups, who were criticizing Gandhi in order to make their feet strong in Indian politics. Following their footsteps, Anand became too "progressive" to accept Gandhi but he did not note his direct resistance against Gandhi and escape to call mahatma an orthodox. Gandhian critics strongly came forward to defend Gandhi, who was, accordingly, not simply or superficially orthodox' either. Bakha's naive mind misunderstood Gandhi because of Gandhi's self-made declaration "I am orthodox Hindu." In understanding Gandhi, Bakha's mind might be false, semi-false, or true or semi-true, but for him, Gandhi was "was a saint, that he was an *avatar* (incarnation) of the gods Vishnu and Krishna" (U 153) and believed that "Gandhi was to be the Maharajaha of the whole of Hindustan...no sword could cut his body, no bullet could pierce his skin, no fire could scorch him!.... 'The *Sarkar* (Government) is afraid of him,'.... [and] 'He has the *shakti* (power) to change the whole world'.... Gandhi was a legend, a tradition, an oracle" (U 154-55). In the view of Hubel, Anand did "not openly criticize him [Gandhi], but gives us the leedway to do so" (171). Anand or Bakha were more than a worshipper of Gandhi and full devotion towards the each word of Gandhi, even when he called himself "orthodox."

In the second solution, some questions puzzled the progressives: can the manual scavenging or cleaning of gutters be considered a "spiritual experience?" Were they doing this job just to sustain their livelihood? Had this been so that they have continued to do this "type" generation after generation? Was it their duty to work for the happiness of the entire society? Gandhi advised them that a priest cleans a temple every day before prayers, so, "they" (U 165) were too cleaning the city like a temple. Was the business of the untouchables and the temple priest work alike? If we put this question in the progressive pot then one will get only "no" in the pitcher. According to their strict criticism, the untouchables have to do this job as it was bestowed upon them forcefully by the society in the name of customs or the Gods. The job of "cleaning up" continued as an internal spiritual activity for centuries. A section of the old scavengers, like Bakha's father, did protest but they drowned in the

cacophony of voices of the religious supporters that was the *raison d'être* (reason) that their ancestors did not have the option of adopting any second work or business. On one hand, Gandhi was advising them to “read the scriptures,” (U 165) but, on the other hand, the Hindu religion, as per the *Manusmṛiti* had denied them the right to read. Gandhi again consoling by suggesting them “they should realised that they were cleaning the Hindu society” (U 165) but he forget that they were living in the most “uncongenial”⁵⁷ conditions. The zest of Gandhi’s speech was: “All public wells, temples, roads, schools, sanatoriums, must be declared open to the Untouchables” (U 166). According to Sarashar, the poet, the speech of Gandhi was “politically”⁵⁸ inspired. On one side, he was in twentieth century when he demanded to abolish the untouchability, on the other side, he conventionally, as shown in the novel, moved back to the third century by calling himself an “orthodox” and again by advising untouchables to “purify” themselves:

‘Gandhi is a humbug,’ it was saying. ‘He is a fool. He is a hypocrite. In one breath he says he wants to abolish untouchability, in the other he asserts that he is an orthodox Hindu. He is running counter to the spirit of our age, which is democracy. He is in the fourth century B.C. with his *swadeshi* and his spinning-wheel. We live in the twentieth (U 167-68).

These words of Sarashar could be Eliot’s views about Gandhi to be found in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*. Here, Poet is Eliot, who represented the West in general and the British in particular. To prove the orthodoxical nature of Indian people, the thoughts of *Upanishads*, Shankaracharya and Coomaraswamy are set in contrast with the views of Victorians and the pet scientists like Eddington and Jeans. The same trick of purification is practiced by Hutchinson in the first solution. In the line of progressives, the speech is “failure” as per the views of Leftist poet, Sarashar, who “have read Rousseau, Hobbes, Bentham, and John Stuart Mill...” (U 168). He found fault with Gandhi who hated “machine” (U 169) but for him the

⁵⁷ The opening stanza is the hint of this: “The absence of a drainage system had, through the rains of various seasons, made of the quarter a marsh which gave out the most offensive stink. And altogether the ramparts of human and animal refuse that lay on the outskirts of this little colony, and the ugliness, the squalor and the misery which lay within it, made it an ‘uncongenial’ place to live in” (U 9)

⁵⁸ Poet’s words are equal to the words of Kashi Ram, a leader of the Harijan Party, the Bahujan Samaj Party. He says: “What has Gandhi done? He has fought tooth and nail against the interests of the downtrodden people. In September 1932, he went on fast against reservations. Later it was propagated that Gandhi was responsible for reservations. He was a great hypocrite, to my mind. He lived in a sweepers’ colony and he told them: ‘your job is very good job, you are doing a very good job. If I am to be born again I would like to be born as a sweeper.’ He was told: ‘if you want to be a sweeper, we can fulfil your desire in this life. Come on.’ But he never came. He was a hypocrite just fooling innocent people” (Parekh 230).

“Flush” was the ultimate solution to eradicate the poverty and “untouchability” of India. Gandhi wanted to replace the machine with “the revival of the spinning wheel” (U 165) which was against progressive theory as well as of science.

Following the PWA manifesto, Gandhi’s speech was a failure because Bakha could not make up his mind. Camus referred to this position, as “refusal to acknowledge,” whereas Jameson termed it the “absent cause.” Though Bakha was not fully satisfied with Gandhi’s speech but his heart was at peace, thus, “there was a terror in this devotion, half expressed, half-suppressed, of the panting swarms that pressed round” (U 153). The progressive thoughts of Sarashar are reflected fully when he was ready to accept machine over Gandhism. He knew very well the consequences of his action but he was “not afraid of prison. I [Sarashar] have already been a guest at His Majesty’s boarding-house with a hundred thousand others who were imprisoned last year” (U 169-70). Here the machine is partly seen as the only god to eradicate the curse of untouchability which is clearly noted in the third solution.

Third Solution

The confusion was added by the conversation between Sarashar, editor of *Nawan Jug* (U 171) and Mr. R.N. Bashir, B.A. (Oxon), Barrister-at-Law. Bashir was talking to Bakha. While commenting on Indian poverty he brought up the idea of “machine” in the novel, there came the tensest paragraph:

Well, we must destroy caste, we must destroy the inequalities of birth and unalterable vocations. We must recognise an equality of rights, privileges and opportunities for everyone. The Mahatma didn’t say so, but the legal and social basis of caste have been broken down by the British Indian penal code, which recognises the rights of every man before the court, caste is now mainly governed by profession. When the sweepers change their profession, they will no longer remain untouchables. And they can do that soon, for the first thing we will do when we accept the machine, will be to introduce the machine which clears dung without anyone having to handle it—the flush system (U 173).

The essence of the novel lay in above paragraph. It might be called the thesis statement as the “flush” system would enable Bakha to fulfil his dream of becoming a *sahib*, whereas, without

it, he would not be able to leave the latrines. Thus, by the end, Anand proved, all the utopians imaginations were wrong. Using Forster's words from the Preface:

No god is needed to rescue the Untouchables, no vows of self-sacrifice and abnegation on the part of more fortunate Indians, but simply and solely—the flush system. Introduce water-closets and main-drainage throughout India, and all this wicked rubbish about untouchability will disappear (10).

Here, the conversion and purification are rejected and full faith is dedicated to the machine. The novel never received healthy criticism because in India every literary work had been judged from the political perspective. For Gandhi, introduction of machine was the impact of “industrialism,” whereas, for reactionists, its aim was to establish “capitalism” in India. They rejected the European renaissance, their struggle and the machine on the excuse that it would invite only the destructive power in the state. With this wrong notion, following the words of Anand, “they have made mistakes, giving less thought to the problems of integration of machines to man than was necessary” (ITaCC 7). Hence, Bakha remained silent in the final chapter and quite parallel to “a mark of distinction among intellectuals to prefer the aristocratic privilege of saying neither ‘yes’ nor ‘no,’ in order to avoid the necessity of action” (ITaCC 5). Whatever be the aim of writing novel but it did not produce fruit for Bakha. Hence, in the hope of a bright future he “proceeded homewards” (U 176) in the end. His return to the “home” symbolized as his sad return to the orthodox world with a pseudo-hope offered by the poet. Though the progressivism remained contended in the pages yet reality was totally different till 2012, nearly eight decades after publishing of the novel. The theory of “Marxism” (U 173) had failed badly in Indian society and the “flush system” did not mean the end of Bakha's job because in 2012, as the historian Guha asserted in the “Introduction to *Untouchable*,” only “40 per cent of Indians have access to modern flush toilets” (16) and rest of the people still answers nature's call in open and then manual scavengers like Bakha go there to clean up after them. Nothing has changed for the new India and the manual scavengers.

Now let's examine the progressive structure of the novel from very last page. The third solution is set for the future, it could not help Bakha to be a *gentleman* or his son but it was assured that his grandson would get benefit from the flush system. Thus, it had nothing to do with Bakha, he was a latrine cleaner till the end. Hence, as far as the third solution concerned, the novel may not be termed as progressive. In the second solution, Bakha could

purify himself but the purification did not mean that the high-class would accept him. The *Brahmins* and the *Sudra* were the two shores of a river, of which there was no connection, and purification would not set any harmony in between them. When this river meets in the “Ocean” (Congress) then both the shores worked side by side and undivided by any social river. The formulation was based on “caste and class,” however, the two shores were not analogous to one-another but homologous as the spiritual edict managed through the manoeuvre of *Varna* and accordingly the contemporaneously *Sudra* caste was submissive to the *Dvija* class. In a word, they were “others.” In the second solution, too, the novel can not be enlisted under the head of progressive novel. The first solution will give him instant success as the gate of European world would be opened to him—at least he could come close to the English class which mean that his dream may come true—but he failed to get the profit out of this chance. Finally, out of the three solutions, as per the desire of Bakha, only the first solution could give him the progress that he had deep in his heart.

Despite the solutions, what is progressive in the novel and the answer is “the game.” The match of Hockey could be an eventual solution as it had been enjoyed by mature Bakha. There was a revolutionary group of players which included Chota, Ram Charan, two sons of Babu and others. The entire group was ready to help Bakha: one was available to teach him the schooling, whereas, the second was willing to fight for him with the *dvija*, and the third was sharing his food with him. In this young group, Bakha could imagine a bright future for him, as well as an enjoyable present time, thus, the rest of the solutions are “waste” in comparison with/to the game. All members of the group belonged to the higher class as compared to Bakha’s *jati* but Anand was able to set harmony between the two “shore” which was clearly a relief for Bakha. He had begun to feel the goodness of heart of the high-class who were not totally bad as they took care of him—at least the young and educated people like *Havildar*, Hutchinson, the Sepoys, his friends, and the Muslims also had sympathy for him but all were elite by their class.

In this sense, following the words of Hubel, the novels “promotes elite leadership,” as Gandhi is presented as untouchable’s leader and no voice is “allocated in any one character or in the narrator, nor can it be unproblematically identified as belonging to Ambedkar” (162). The main focus of Anand, here, was to present the real lowest and coarse common untouchable man who was challenging the animal-man of the Stone Age. Despite her charge, Hubel certified that the novel is “creating a place where an oppressed subject can speak and

be heard” (170). As a progressive work, *Untouchable* failed to destroy the social barriers though Bakha was ready to “repudiate the Hindu authority” but unluckily, he failed to “go so far as” against “authority.” Instead of self-revolt, like Ambedkar, he seeks patronage in Gandhi or the poet. In the end, “Bakha will continue to serve someone else’s interests rather than his own and, consequently, will perpetuate the system that dictates his or another’s oppression” (Hubel 175). This was the situation to which Lacan termed “ego-ideal” that is a stage when the subject watches-over/ follows “others” for the fulfillment of his desire. In this sense, imagining an untouchable leader may have been more problematic, moreover, the reader could quarrel on the romantic possibilities which were not explored by Bakha but he highlighted the problem of untouchables in the most realistic way. In this sense, Anand was like the Greek Titan legend, Prometheus, who had stolen fire from the Olympus for the humanity but as per the law of God, it was against the principles, hence, he was penalized for not following their ethics. Similarly, Anand was writing against their ethics, especially against his caste, and the result was same as that of Prometheus.

Fourth Solution

If *Untouchable* has an anti-climax so this chapter has its own in the name of “third society” or the “fourth solution.” The comparisons between the higher and lower classes were reflected in the words of Bakha when he said, they hate us “because we are sweepers. Because we touch dung. They hate dung” (U 58) or again “They would ill-treat us, even if we shouted. They think we are mere dirt, because we clean their dirt” (U 89). Another pain to Bakha came when he entered the temple and perceived the word “polluted,” articulated by Pandit Kali Nath. It was “their religion which prevents them from touching us,” (U 93) Bakha realized but suddenly another thought suggested to him by his father that the Hindus are kind hearted by giving the example of *Hakim* Bhagwan Das. The evil of religion supported the unjust social system which did not allow rights to the lower strata because the elite thought, “the act of liberation was too much for them to bear” (U 40). The novel canvassed a number of untouchable castes in even in the untouchables—Ram Charan, washerman, higher class; Chota, the leather-worker’s son came next, and lastly Bakha, the *Bhangi*, lowest in the hierarchy.

Among the trio, they had banished all thought of distinction, except when the snobbery of caste-feeling supplied the basis for putting in airs for a joke. They had eaten together, if not things in the preparation of which water had been used, at least dry things, this

being in the imitation of the line drawn by the Hindus between themselves, and the Muhammadans and Christians. Sweets they had often shared together, and they had handled soda-water bottled anyhow, at all those formal hockey matches they played with the boys' teams of various regiments in the Bulandshahr Brigade (U 108).

As per the paragraph, Bakha was untouchable within the untouchables. It also portrayed two societies but in actuality there were "three" (first high, second lower, and third was the group of young and modern boys, who preferred unity over caste). Beside it, Bakha thought, Indians attitude towards the British in general and the Muslims, in particular, were also other divisions of religion, caste, class and ethnicity. The third society was the foundation of a progressive society. The young were united, but the question is, is there anything else? Who/what is uniting them and how? The progressive answer could be the "Game." It is the Hockey match that was uniting them as a bundle of the stick. All the incidents of the match were enough to establish it as the fourth solution.

The third society was fully united. All the elite friends were geared up to do anything for each other, in case of Bakha's sister's humiliation at the hands of the priest, in the game of Hockey or even when Chota's mother abused Bakha. For the sake of union, they were ready to forget caste issues, as they all set out to eat and play with Bakha, and one had already made his mind teach him English. When Bakha narrated the incident of the slap along with the temple scene of early morning, the group consoled him:

You will wait till the illegally begotten comes to our street side.... We will skin the fellow... Let that brother-in-law of a priest come down our street, and will teach him the lesson of his life (U 108-09).

Bakha's friends gave him unmatched strength. Those who thought that there was no kind of resistance they forget this progressive group. Officially the novel was half here: Structurally there are two divisions of the novel, pre-match and post-match. The young group was presented as "revolutionary group" for the future generations. They had the courage to fight against the higher class not only for their pride but also for the honour of their family. For Bakha's help, not one but all friends came together. In doing this strange action, they formed the progressive revolution as "the spirit of modernity had worked havoc among the youth" (U 113). But still the question emerged, how does the game of Hockey become the fourth solution?

The promise of the “Hockey Stick” (U 19) made by Charat Singh in the very early pages. At a later stage, this was the spirit of this game that united all the outcastes boys into one group. The idol of boys named “Bakha occupied with a picture of himself playing hockey” (U 116). In the third society, particularly, in the company of Singh, Bakha felt so happy that he said, “I wouldn’t mind being a sweeper all my life. I would do anything for him” (U 118) because Singh never considered him unlucky and asked him to “Go and get me two pieces of coal from the kitchen” (U 118). After these words from a high-class man “for a moment he [Bakha] felt as if an electric shock had passed through him” (U 119). After having tea with Bakha, Singh presented him “an almost brand-new hockey stick, which must have been used only once” (U 122). Bakha was so stunned that he questioned to himself “What has happened to change my fate all of a sudden?” (U 121). With the gift of hockey “So many good *karma* has been rewarded” (U 123). Here, it could be clearly imagined by the reader that Bakha was coming close to the higher class. At this stage, the novel was offering a solution that was quite convincing. In the match, Bakha scored a goal which becomes his moral victory over the higher class. It was crystal clear that the rights had been won, the barricades had fallen, the untouchables had made it, and the fight for equality had largely been won by Bakha.

This game was erasing the boundaries of caste—this scene fully described the real life incident of Anand’s life as noted in his *Autobiography: Pilpali Sahib* under the chapter “I am Wounded in the head by an accidental stone” (237-266). In the game, Bakha preferred babu’s son (must be Anand in the novel) whose father had an important post just second to the Colonel *Sahib* in the regiment. The little boy was willing to join the team of outcastes but they knew that the boy did not match the age of other boys’. Bakha was trying to console Chota but he failed. It showed that the high-class youth or youngsters were willing to be the part of these lower beasts—though in name of the game. But by the end, Chota was totally, “Ignored and helpless, he sought to interest himself in the match by volunteering to be the referee. But Chota wouldn’t have him even as a referee. The little one now looked sorry for himself” (U 127). After this, little one was assigned a minor job “keep a watch over” (U 128) the overcoat of Chota. The fight began during the match when Bakha was struck on the legs by the goalkeeper of 31st Punjabis team and during the fight “you can see the ruthlessness of the savage hunters in them” (U 128). Then stoning began in which:

A bad throw from Ram Charan's hand caught him [little boy] a rap on the skull... Stream of blood were pouring from the back of his head." Bakha's sympathy towards the little boy melted his heart and mind so much that "Bakha picked him up in his arms and took him to the hall of his house (U 129).

These emotional feelings had nothing to do with the older generations as they were still orthodox or conventional in their views, i.e., like mother of the little boy who kept on abusing Bakha for defiling her son. Whether this was humanity or sympathy but due to it, we find higher class in the lap of untouchable. The future of high class was safe in the hands of Bakha. One could term it, the third society, or the fourth solution which is possible, without a shadow of doubt, because of the hockey match.

Other Progressive Characters

For the first time, aristocracy was introduced in the novel with the character of Singh, "A small, thin man, naked except for a loin-cloth, stood outside with a small brass jug in his left hand, a round white cotton skull-cap on his head, a pair of wooden sandals in his feet, and the apron of his loin-cloth lifted to his nose" (U 18). He belonged to a superior class but his two thousand years of racial pride and caste "superiority" had been challenged by a *Bhangi* boy after half an hour that he spends in latrine:

Here was a low-caste man who seemed clean! He became rather self-conscious, the prejudice of the 'twice-born' high-caste Hindu against stink, even though he saw not the slightest suspicion of it in Bakha, rising into his mind. He smiled complacently. Then, however, he forgot his high caste and the ironic smile on his face became a childlike laugh.

'You are becoming a *gentleman*,' ohe Bakhya! Where did you get that uniform?' (U 19).

The First World theory of criticizing Indian culture had been noticed with the imagination of Bakha:

Ever since he had worked in the British barracks Bakha had been ashamed of the Indian way of performing ablutions, all that gargling and spitting, because he knew the Tommies disliked it. He remembered so well the Tommies' familiar abuse of the

natives: '*Kala admi zamin par hagne wala*' (black man, you who relieve yourself on the ground). But he himself had been ashamed at the sight of Tommies running naked to their tub baths. 'Disgraceful,' he had said to himself. They were, however, sahibs. Whatever they did was '*fashun*.' But his own countrymen—they were natus (natives). He felt amused as an Englishman might be amused, to see a Hindu loosen his dhoti to pour some water first over his navel and then down his back in a flurry of ecstatic hymn-singing (U 21-22).

Now the real “progress” had been justified by Bakha after the sight of a Mohammedan at a prayer. He wondered:

‘What they say in their prayers?’ he asked himself. ‘Why do they sit, stand, bend and kneel as if they were doing exercises?’ Once, he remembered, he had asked Ali, the son of a regimental bandsman, why they did that, but Ali would not tell him and was angry, saying that Bakha was insulting his religion (U 22).

Here the intention is clear that a small boy like Ali blindly followed his religion but he was not advised by anyone, why he was following this old and traditional culture. Even more critical was the situation when Bakha asked him about his prayers and Ali replied to Bakha that he was “insulting” (U 22) his religion. The blind faith of religion was accurately castigated by the novelist with the innocent views of his protagonist. The British policy of “divide and rule” was making its room here in the character of Ali. Using the words from Anand’s novel *The Big Heart*, aim of the novelist was to “put some pity in the souls of the people. Pity, not ‘faith in God.’” Bakha’s rejection of the Hindu God and the Christian God represents a progressive outlook that demanded change from the bondage of old religion. After his comment on religion, Bakha “picked up the big broom and the basket with which his father used to go out sweeping the road” (U 37). In fact, like a progressive hero, Bakha was in the mood of changing his profession of latrine cleaner to sweeper in place of his father.

The notion of “equality” was given air with the noble relations between the *Havildar* and Bakha. He treated Bakha as a high-class man. He was ready to take “two pieces of coal from the kitchen” (U 118) with the hands of Bakha for the *hookah*. Singh was the second character in the novel affected by the thought of progressivism as he offered “tea” (U 121) to drink to an outcaste in his own house. He also gave “a brand-new hockey” (U 122) stick to

Bakha. It was clear that Gandhi gave his famous speech to abolish the “untouchability” at the end of the novel but Singh was practicing it in the very “middle” (U 115-25) or before the delivery of Gandhi’s speech. Hence, if the novel is not progressive, at least, it had many progressive characters. Hubel commented that Singh had lived between the *Angreji Logs* (British people) for a long time, hence, the British thoughts allowed him to forget the ills of religion. In this sense, he was affected by the British culture. When the novel captured the sight of *Hakim* (U 92-93) the above statement could be proved false. First Hakim reflected his traditional nature when Lakha entered in his house without permission:

‘*Bhangi!* (Sweeper) *Bhangi!*’ There was an uproar in the medicine house. People began to disperse hither and thither as the Hakim’s feet had become defiled. He was red and pale in turn, and shouted at the highest pitch of his voice: “Chandal! (low-caste) by whose orders have you come here? And then you join hands and hold my feet and say you will become my slave for ever. You have polluted hundreds of rupees worth of medicine. Will you pay for it? (U 92).

Here, the *Hakim* was purely orthodox by nature. There was no hint of this that the *Hakim* was influenced by the British way of life but he showed the correct progressive nature. To present himself as a true persona of a professional doctor, he forgot the matter of caste. After listening the story of Lakha’s son “the *Hakim* ji’s heart melted to some extent and he began to write a prescription” (U 92). Later, he went to the house of Lakha in order to save his dying son, Bakha. “In a little while there was a knock at the door. And what do you think? Your uncle goes out and finds the *Hakim* ji himself, come to grace our house. He was a good man. He felt your pulse and saved your life” (U 93). The thought of *Hakim* was fully helped one in bringing “the radical changes” (Manifesto 6). He emerged as a strong progressive elite character in all respects, without reservation, like Anand, Bakha’s friends, *Havildar*, Gandhi and the socialist poet of the anti-climax.

Bakha’s fellow friend, Ram Charan, was higher in class but he called Bakha as his “brother-in-law” (U 38). Bakha also wanted to be his brother-in-law as he finds himself in love with Charan’s sister. Here the mixing of third level (the washer man) and fourth level (the *Bhangi*) of untouchables has been reflected. Then came Bakha’s mixing up with the higher class. Bakha was a master of all sorts of games. He realized:

...most of the Hindu children touched him willingly at hockey and wouldn't mind having him at school with them. But the master wouldn't teach the outcastes lest their fingers which guided the students across the text should be touch the leaves of the outcastes' book and they be polluted. These old Hindus are cruel (U 44).

Here the PWA theory has been clearly reflected in the difference between the older and modern generations. The newer generation was ready to accept the outcastes but the older were following the traditional outlook towards them and denying them the rights to read and write they cannot even take water from the public well—they were also prohibited from the temples.

Following the footsteps of manifesto, the novel lively castigated the money-lender, Ganesh Nath from whom Lakha had borrowed money on the mortgage of his wife's trinkets to pay for the funeral. Like the evil characters of Bollywood movies, especially the movie *Mother India*, he was an angry man who charged heavy interest from the outcastes. He was not the only greedy character as the shopkeepers in the city, "always deceived the sweepers and the poor people, charging them much bigger prices, as if to compensate themselves for the pollution they courted by dealing with the outcastes" (U 51). Thus, on the base of manifesto, the novel was fully progressive not only in criticising the bourgeois societal norms and merchants but also in presenting Bakha as a progressive leader.

Bakha as Progressive Leader

The second solution was offered by Gandhi but here too the progress of Bakha was a dominant factor. He was eager to see Gandhi and "he was so much in a hurry that he didn't remember that he was an Untouchable, and actually touched a few people. But not having his broom and basket with him, and the people being all in a flurry, no one noticed that a sweeper-boy had brushed past them" (U 151). As a leader, Bakha was really a progressive character but what if he had his broom and basket with him? It means only his tools made him untouchable but without them he was acceptable in the society. Thus, the root of his problem was not in religion but in the profession into which he was born. For the first time, in the novel, Bakha was presented as a leader who was followed by other people. The incident happened this way: while going to see Gandhi:

He saw that the fort road was too long and too congested. Suddenly he swerved round to a little marsh made by the overflow of a municipal pipe in a corner of the golbagh, jumped the fence into the garden, much to the consternation of the gardener, but wholly to the satisfaction of the crowd behind him, which, once it had got the lead, followed like sheep. The beautiful garden bowers planted by the ancient Hindu kings and since then neglected were thoroughly damaged as the mob followed behind Bakha (U 152).

It looked like the leader was ready to crush the old Hindu myth of untouchability with the help of the mob that was following him blindly without knowing that he was an untouchable: “It was as if the crowd had determined to crush everything, however, ancient or beautiful, that lay in the way of their achievement” (U 152). This revolutionary progress was giving the message which flashed as “the things of the old decadence must be destroyed in order to make room for those of new” (U 153). The effect of progress was strong that a *Lalla*, and a *babu*, and the editor of newspaper *Tribune* were talking to him without the barriers of caste and class.

If Bakha was a leader then why did he prefer Gandhi? The reader was now aware of the fact that only Bakha was capable of providing leadership but the “discourse of sympathy presents the protagonist Bakha as a mere recipient of others actions and discourses” (A. P. Mukherjee 37). He was unable and incapable of assuming a leadership role, thus, he was reinforcing and confirming the case for an elite leadership from the “outside.” At this point, the words of Swami Vivekananda seemed true enough:

a time will come when there will be the rising of the *Sudra* class, with their *Sudra-hood*; that is to say, not like that as at present when the Sudras are becoming great by acquiring the characteristic qualities of the *Vaishyas* or the *Kshatriyas*, but a time will come when the *Sudras* of every country, with their inborn *Sudra* nature and habits—not becoming in essence *Vaishyas* or *Kshatriyas*, but remaining as *Sudras*—will gain absolute supremacy in every society. The first glow of the dawn of this new power has already begun to break slowly upon the Western world, and the thoughtful are at their wits' end to reflect upon the final issue of this fresh phenomenon. Socialism, Anarchism, Nihilism, and other like sects are the vanguard of the social revolution that is to follow (468-469).

Though Bakha was uneducated yet he thinks like an intellectual. His intellectualism was against the *Brahmanical* hegemony through the colonial modernity. Each stratum in the world, as Gramsci noted, had its intellectual and in the colonial India, the untouchables, during the thirties, have Bakha in literature and Ambedkar in politics.

Bakha's revolution, unlike Ambedkar's movement, was not a mass rebellion but it represented his presence in the existing society through his anger. According to Anand, "the philosophy of freedom took hold of larger number of people and became a fighting and effective philosophy" (ITaCC 4) but here Bakha was alone in the jungle of *Brahmanical* society. The appearance of Gandhi made it a political novel but the last chapter turned the wheel and led the novel towards the socio-cultural riot, which changed the fate of the protagonist from the "grass-root." He had demanded political rights after of gap of two thousand years as well as the religio-socio-cultural civil liberties for the have-nots.

Conclusion

Bakha was not a name but a movement, "a progress" that represented the hope—the hope for all untouchables. The aim of his movement was not to win state or power rather he rejected the capitalistic society with the demand of rights for the socially disabled. His revolution was not a "bloody revolution" of the socialists but he came out from social dungeon into the literary scene with a silent revolution—it seemed that in revolution he was following the ideal of Gandhi, which was non-violence and at this point, he totally discarded Marx's communist theory. He became a shield for protecting the rights of future untouchables. His progress was not the horizontal but the vertical one, in other words, it was like "the bullock went round and round revolving a wooden pestle into a wooden mortar fixed in the centre" (U 62). After walking for a long time, he reached nowhere and found himself at the same spot, thus, the novel was "the vehicle of a life-force, which could never reach its culminating point" (U 94). When the novel ended, Bakha was in doubt⁵⁹ as he did not know where did salvation lie? It seemed that Anand was hidden in the background and was singing on the tragic situation of untouchables without interpolation from any rostrum. For Brennan, in any novel, "tradition" became what Eric Hobsbawm called a "useable past" that changed into "creating a people" and *Untouchable* belonged to that category. The PWA manifesto helped Anand in searching for:

⁵⁹ The novel clearly quotes, "He didn't know what to do, where to go" (U 174).

a philosophy which would help [to] understand and solve the different social problems ... [but] ... not satisfied with the idea that humanity had always been miserable and would also remain so (6).

With the help of PWA theory:

We can feel new feelings. We can learn to be aware with a new awareness. We can envisage the possibility of creating new races from the latent heat in our dark brown bodies. Life is still an adventure for us. We are still eager to learn. We cannot go wrong. Our enslavers muddle through things. We can see things clearly. We will go the whole hog with regard to machines while they nervously fumble their way with the steam-engine. And we will keep our heads through it all. We will not become slaves to gold. We can be trusted to see life steadily and see it whole (U 171).

Indeed, *Untouchable* appears to be in perfect coalition with the manifesto and the PWA purported literary agenda.

Bakha was a progressive revolutionary who passed through the abyss invented by the social hierarchy; and to get out of this inferno he drifted from one role⁶⁰ to another in order to achieve the “aggressive posture” (not physical) which will set him in an everlasting hunt of an infinite future. He wanted to ascertain his self-identity and to get it, he fights against the social environment in order to enter into a new world of freedom. His knowledge about himself increased as he follows his depth but question comes, will Bakha achieve aggressiveness in his search? In a progressive reply, he did not do anything incredible that showed aggression but his mind grew more and more aggressive as he budged from experience to experience⁶¹—not the physical but making an aggressive mind. Though the society was worse but Bakha did not live in a motionless world, so he did not remain static as his mind grows. In the end, while returning back home in the night means that he was walking into a new future or the one prophecies of doom, while, the “third solution” opens up the new possibilities with the introduction of “flush system.”

⁶⁰ He became sweeper from the latrine cleaner, then a primary student by self. He was also a good “Cricketer,” “Hockey player,” a wrestler in physical, and dreamed to be a washerman, and wanted to be like the watchman, ready to serve as a salve to Charat Singh.

⁶¹ Bakha’s progress is psychological progress from innocence to experience that maturing him and helping him to find the new freedoms.

The fact was that neither Gandhi nor the poet became a saviour for Bakha because the PWA manifesto advocated that our literature “should be made to reflect life and reality so that ... light our future” (Premchand, HM 7). Till the end, the set book proposed that the elucidations of Bakha’s despair could only be possible through the change of feelings and heart of high class people as “Mahatma” suggested or through the enchanting scientific technology but not by the direct action on the part of Bakha. In the Preface, Forster suggested that the novel:

... could only have been written by an Indian and 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 (9).

It was true because an untouchable creator would, doubtless, not produce a hero with an “almost physical inability to revolt.” The only reason for which Anand was criticized was his *Brahmanical* point of view, not that of an untouchable. He did not allow Bakha to free his arms but one must remember:

Whether one does it through one’s own experience or through one’s intellectual theorizing, it is all about presenting a view of society from the bottom-up. Only such a point of view is privileged to be accepted as a tool for making a dream of a just society (Channa and Mencher xiv).

One more important thing is that untouchables of the villages, like Bakha, were penniless. Lacking money and resources, they were unable to represent themselves, they needed a leader from outside. Why did they require a leader from outside? Why did not they produce their own? The answer could be served that the leader from outside will have a plenty of sources—both power, sources and money—and he can help them in broader way. If they choose a leader from themselves, then it will take a long time and justice will be late. To put it differently, Bakha wished to highlight the problem inherent in the fact that there existed no promise.

The novel began with “modern India” and ended with scientific note of “flush-system” but after eighty years of publication of this novel sixty per cent of Indians in the

twenty-first century still relieve themselves in the open and labour-intensive scavengers, like Bakha, have to clean up after them. Here it is crystal clear that they are still away from the modern flush toilets. In flagging this as a societal problem, Indian Minister for Rural Development, Jairam Ramesh recorded, “toilets are more important than temples. No matter how many temples we go to, we are not going to get salvation. We need to give priority to the toilets and cleanliness” (Guha 3). The activists of *Vishwa Hindu Parishad* (VHP) and the *Bajrang Dal* protested against Jairam until he apologized as they considered statement hurt the “fine fabric of faith and religion” in the country and also filed a case under section 295 (A) and 298 of IPC. In the twentieth century, we had listened to the cacophony of untouchable sycophants mimicking the cries of rights but it was a waste of time. We had to wait and watch how the president of justice would move slowly about the abolishment of untouchability. Now-a-days scholars have had no hesitation in saying that it is much better than what it used to be in the past. Now the “untouchables” are declared as “citizens” with a full and total reorganization and complete identity within the human community.

In the year 2002, the Indian government announced that by the end of year 2020, our country will achieve the status of a developed nation like America and Japan but India cannot be a “progressive” homeland until, as noted by S. Anand, “the problem of physical removal of human excreta and sewage persists, and if a particular caste is forced to retain an occupational identity” (A Honourable Occupation?). We feel sad when the leaders dehumanized the *Bhangis* with their flattery, as Narendra Modi, the Chief Minister of Gujarat in 2007, says, “Scavenging must have been a spiritual experience for the *Balmiki* caste.... At some point in time somebody must have got enlightenment in scavenging.” (S. Anand). Here the untouchables were indirectly addressed that they should stay with their jobs—it seemed that the colonial or the mythic practice had been practiced here but withpraise. The untouchables do not crave for praise in speech but something good must be done for them by the government but not like the colonizers.

When Bakha captured people’s imagination with spiky activism during the anti-untouchable society, he was primed to give an alternative to the Indian society. The problem was due to faulty policies. Time has come for a change in policies. All is possible. During the dark ages, religion was given preference over culture which was affected by science after the passage of time. Due to science, the weakness of religion increased and this cachexia invited people towards modernity—or science was exceeding philosophy or theology. The American

newspaper *The New York Herald Tribune* criticized some Indian nationalist leaders on the charge that “their approach to industrialisation is socialist” (ITaCC 3). According to Anand, these leaders:

...have no use for the steel mills and hydro-electric works, because these are supposed to be exclusively “European products, for European use, made through European technicians,” nor do they see the effort to retain the contact of the creative hand with the making of things; and, of course, they suspect the “Socialist pattern” to be merely communism in disguise (ITaCC 6-7).

In a scientific state, there will be no more ethics in general, due this straightforward “reason” the universally human is deeply rooted in truths and configurations of dynamic thoughts in post colonial era.

If Anand makes an effort to proffer a solution then there could emerge a kind of propaganda, thus, the novelist nicely separated the religion and modernity by the introduction of science in the structure of the novel and its end was *tacenda* (silent). In a modern society, we still do not acknowledge any optimistic vision of human survival because no “happy end” will be preferred. It showed “progress” was still in progress which exposed old age enamel of Hindu religiosity with great force. “Under the foreign rule, the whole of our life process had been broken up by the assaults of an alien culture” (Naik 175). It seemed that Naik was defining only the East-West encounter but the terrible conditions of untouchables pervade in Indian society before the British invaded India. Anand’s book was written only to destroy the myth rather than creating sympathy for the hero, which marked true identity of the progressive outlook. What Aziz Ahmad said about *Angare*, is true about Anand’s work:

The greatest defect⁶² of *Angare* was the absence of circumspection an unprincipled extremism. For this reason, the destructive object of the book was fulfilled; but it could not achieve nothing constructive. It was certainly reactionary to scream capitalism behind religion, but the unprincipled attack on religion, which even Socialist

⁶² A similar kind of thought was offered by Khalilur Rahman Azmi who said that the “Revolutionary and rebellious ideas had burst forth ...like a storm... showed that youthful enthusiasm, lack of moderation, boldness and rebelliousness ...of the period. For this reason, the tome of the satire and scorn against the prevalent morality and religious doctrine had become very prominent... the publication of this book produced a great stir among the traditionalists” (Coppola 3).

Rationalism cannot condone, and Insults to the Divine Being were in no way authorized (MISAL 2).

There was a protest against it and the novel was, undoubtedly, banned by the British Raj for its critique of high caste Hindu culture. By espousing the cause of untouchables and by depicting the deplorable conditions under which they live, Anand was delineating “acute misery and degradation of the Indian people as a whole... [and]... the problems of hunger, poverty, social backwardness” (Manifesto 8) which were the issues of those days. The new literature of India should address these problems according to the theoretical framework of the PWA. Further, Anand was critical of orthodox Hindu who upheld the traditional status quo—like *pandit* Kali Nath.

Thus, satisfying and conforming to the Association’s avowed intention to “the basic problems of our existence today,” (Manifesto 8) the novel can accurately be put into the category of “progressive.” Furthermore, Anand did not “allowed [Bakha] to do violence to the integrity of his art” (Narasimhaiah 109). The novel was tinged with European view of India as both disgusting and exotic in turn. While professing to render a narrative from the point of view of “untouchables,” or a subaltern character, the novel had been structured on European view and more insidiously, a reaffirmation of the colonialist view of the colonized. Anand went to the lowest dregs of humanity in search of Bakha. The anti-climax might puzzle the readers but the novelist believed in posing questions rather than answering them.

The novel was/is an attempt to establish the identity against the myth that has dominated in India from last two thousand years and the novel could be termed as the creative manifesto of *Dalits* in India. Anand had been working towards the new myth of man and try to discover a man who will be master of his fate and never be harassed by any superior being, especially in the name of caste, sex, gender, religion. He put an emphasis on the dignity of human personality and demanded equality for the downtrodden and directed his revolt against the decayed aspects of Indian tradition. In a nutshell, by favouring the Egalitarian theory, Anand gave cure for the ills of Indian society through the sufferings of Bakha, who was executed as untouchable but for the future generation became a hero. It was Bakha’s literary effect that in the future untouchables were given the equal rights with the establishment of Indian Constitution in 1950 with article 15, 16, 17, 18 and, above all, a special gift, reservation. With this, they were consoled with equality in the eyes of law but equality does not mean justice because deep rooted prejudices, the barbarism and the cruelty

with which men inflicted on men still considered nonentities in the eyes of society. So to erase it, the “Untouchability Offense Act” (1955) has been passed by Indian Government with the thought that a world which followed its own ethical rules will be considered “alien” in democracy but the problem still persists after sixty-seven years of Indian Independence.

Anand came with an axe to grind with untouchability and became news for decades because of dropping accepted prejudices for the exploration of “future with hope.” With adoxography on untouchability through *Untouchable*, Anand remunerated a moneyed homage to the enormous bourgeois critical realists such as Anatole France, Rolland, Bernard Shaw, Theodore Dreiser, Heinrich and Thomas Mann—only on behalf of their effectual involvement to a progressive rearguard battle adjacent to the governing set of laws. After this beginning literary tract of Anand, untouchability became a mortifying societal ill in opposition to which a host of philosopher, poets, writers and social reformers set in train to put pen to paper to inscribed not apropos “what there was/is” but on what ought to be there for the *achoots*, the untouchables.

Chapter 3

Idea of Progress in Anand's Other Works

Anand came to India in 1938 in order to attend the second PWA conference but, as Amrik Singh noted, “Nehru family was one among the other people he got to know in the course of his visit” (20). Straightforwardly, Anand, wrote Atma Ram, “returned to India to work with Nehru” (Ram 56) and hereafter, the close association between Nehru and Anand developed which continued until the death of the former. Subsequently, he collaborated with Krishna Hutheesing, sister of Nehru, with whom he published the book entitled *The Bride's Book of Beauty* (1949). He was promoting Nehru's political guidelines in *Is there a Contemporary Civilisation*, as, “only the national and international peace policies ... to keep ...myriad expression of frailty and falsehood and anger in control” (192) rather than Gandhism. During his Indian visit, Anand “spent some time in Allahabad and acted as Jawaharlal's political secretary for a few weeks” (A. Singh 20-21). As a consequence, when the impact of Gandhi lost its power from the mind of Anand, his ideas were haunted by the Fabian vision of Nehru. It was strongly visible in Anand's dedication of the second version of *Apology for Heroism* (1957) to Nehru. In *Is There a Contemporary Indian Civilisation?* the student could locate the paragraphs wherein Anand was advising Nehru on different issues—one special chapter is dedicated to Nehru, (102) whereas, Gandhi was totally absent from the background. Singh noted, “For a decade or more after his return to India, he remained involved in the activities of peace movement and several other initiatives promoted by Pandit Nehru” (50-51). In a nutshell, Anand looked upon Gandhi as his mentor who had a great impact not only on his life but also on his writings but deeper in his heart, after 1940s, he initiated himself more akin to Nehru. This “association” created a stir in Anand's post-independence progressive career. Thereafter, the critics had found themselves in an illusion about Anand's theory. All the above mentioned chaos leads one to label him a Marxist-propagandist. The socialistic party emerging as a force for the gradual ebb and flow of religious beliefs which had begun to fade and left the educated Indian mind to explore the line to which Orwell called “the smelly little orthodoxies which are now contending for our souls” (Charles Dickens 111). Was there any perennial “temptation” for Anand? In the strictest sense, the colonial ban on Anand's novels could be seen as his temptation, due to which he changed his radical route. Hence, while digging the grave of Anand's progressive history of the second half, the critics like Cowasjee, Ram, Narasimhaiah found themselves in the midst of the crowd in front of the Lahore Gate of Red Fort, Delhi, where Nehru was

raising the tricolour Indian national flag on the pleasant occasion of August 15, 1947. Hereafter, they noted his friendship with Nehru, as well as, how Anand was diverting the route of progressive author by becoming more and more bourgeoisie humanist through his editing career under the shadow of a private journal, MARG.

After independence, suggested Gandhi on January 27, 1948 in “Congress Position,” the aim of Congress and its branch, Congress Socialist Party, was over, hence, it should be “disband.” This article published in *Harijan* on Feb 2, 1948 is as follows:

Though split into two, India having attained political independence through means devised by the Indian National Congress, the Congress in its present shape and form, i.e., as a propaganda vehicle and parliamentary machine, has outlived its use. India has still to attain social, moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns. The struggle for the ascendancy of civil over military power is bound to take place in India’s progress towards its democratic goal. It must be kept out of unhealthy competition with political parties and communal bodies. For these and other similar reasons, the A.I.C.C. resolves to disband the existing Congress organization and flower into a *Lok Sevak Sangh*. (Congress Position).

If, following the words of Gandhi, the banishment of Congress would have taken place in 1948, then there remains only the Left parties (Stalin-Led and Lenin/Trotsky Led)—the main aim of those was not freedom but to create India as a Communist state, indirectly run by Russia. Likewise, Lenin-led-left communist ideologues supposed that the single largest proletariat party must be the first condition for the celebration of a communist utopia. The world has seen its worse effect during the reign of Stalin but “they” (both the Congress and the Left) wanted political monopoly despite the difference in their dogmas. In the subsequent year, after Godse shot three bullets into the chest of Gandhi at point blank range from a Beretta M1934, a semi-automatic pistol (serial number 606824), the gap between the two shores began to take the shape of an abyss. The Congress remains the strongest party, whereas, following the instruction of Fourth International (a group of Trotsky’s followers or more broadly of Lenin), the Bolshevik-Leninist Party of India (BLPI) merged with the Socialist Party (SPI, though its origin were much later) of India in 1948. The SPI was a group of revolutionary members of the CSP which recently separated from the Congress. In the meantime, the left parties were on the edge of weakness. Some of their powerful

leaders/writers (Abbas, Anand and others) were dropped or others move to Pakistan (Zaheer, Faiz, Manto and others). The condition of PWA (divided into IPTA and APPWA) was not much different from that of the CPI, which afterwards, divided into three parts CPI, CPI(M), CPP (Pakistan). One of many aims of the CPI/PWA was to criticize the colonial authority for independence which was successfully achieved on August 15, 1947. Now, they had no official authority to criticize the yoke of colonial government as Indian Peacock (the National Bird of India) became “free” from the clutches of British “Robin” (enlisted as the National Bird of United Kingdom). Every member of the Left, including Anand, was part of the Congress but when the friendship between Anand and Nehru developed, the left (PWA), especially, the Calcutta Branch, began to criticize Anand for not following the manifesto (or the left ideology). To put in other words, Anand’s moving closer to the “centre” (Nehru) would have made him unpopular with the CPI, the PWA, and the Socialist Party. India or Nehru adopted the democratic form of the government but the Left was dreaming of a socialist state. If the Left criticized the policies of government then they were speaking against the country and doing so would be taken as an act of conspiracy towards the nation, as happened with Zaheer and Faiz in the Lahore Conspiracy Case (Pakistan). To avoid the critical situation, Anand move towards the Centre, or, the Congress under the leadership of Nehru. For this reason, the difference between the PWA and Anand was at its peak as he was deadly silent on the tragedy of “Partition.” It seems that his pen was out of ink or he chose to refill it with the blood of innocent lives by becoming quiet or save it for conditional use by becoming the editor of MARG.

Anand’s criticism by the Bengal’s Left (PWA) unit, in 1949, served as a rub on the wound of his humanistic view. Apart from this, the political conspiracies led his Left friends, Zaheer and Faiz (till 1954) and Zafar (till 1951), to the jails of Pakistan and India, whereas, Joshi was banished from the CPI in 1949 due to his closeness to the Congress and Nehru. Like the Pakistani *Hukumat*, the Indian government invigilated activities, conferences, speeches, published articles and others materials related to the PWA (CPI). The writings of Abbas, Chughtai and Manto, during, 1949, could be served its perfect example. Anand did not want to swim in the river of political propaganda, like Zaheer, Zafar, Abbas, Manto, Joshi, Ali and others. On contrary, communist’s literature of resistance (Anand’s inspiration) was against the government’s policies (British or Indian), hence, it was often proscribed by the authority, like Anand’s socio-political works. The curse of prohibition from Anand’s hermeneutics was healed in 1951. Before it, his literary documentaries were taken as an act of

“propaganda” or “anarchy” but, in real sense, its primary purpose was to create nationality, equality, fraternity and brotherhood by forcing the reader to “look East” and their problems. To inject his liberal views in the veins of Nehru’s government and to lift the ban from his novels, the demand of the hour was a close friendship between the two. To put in different words, to stay aloof from the political barriers, he chose the profession of an art critic. One could metaphorically say, like the greedy fox of *Aesop’s Fables* (which Anand edited), the bunch of PWA’s ripe grapes became sour to Anand, hence, similar to the action of the thirsty crow, he drank the water from the pitcher of the movement and flew away. It could be taken as his psychological odyssey, in the political sense, from the role of a Leftist (undeclared) to a liberal writer, or more broadly, he moved from Left to the Centre, like all the hard-boiled Indian leftists of the time.

James, Dower, Fox, Padmore and Anand were on the writer’s list for those the Left Press, especially the British, “manufactured a new public sphere as powerful as any physical place” (Codell 21). Fully harsh and arbitrary nature of the colonial press towards the new writers was evident from the nineteen rejections of *Untouchable* until Wishart, a Left publication branch, published it. From 1929 to 1945, Anand’s career was in the company of Leftist or socialist but after achieving the peak of success, Anand returned to India at a time when, “the towers of London, Vienna and Paris were about to fall,” as reflected in *Lines Written to an Indian Air* (4). In this unhealthy and falling world, Anand was an “outsider” like Meursault of Camus’ *The Stranger* or like Saleem Sinai of Rushdie’s *Midnight’s Children*. Whether in India or Britain, Anand was never accepted as an “insider” and beside it, in 1949, Indian Left took one bolder step by declaring him “decadent.” To put it in a phrase, he was “a cuckoo in the nest” for the Indian nationalists (whether the Leftist or Congress). On the base of insider and outsider, Anand’s career could be divided into two categories of fictional (novelist) and non-fictional (art-critic) writings. He paid his homage to the BBC talkie job (London) in 1945 for a new opportunity of the critic-artist with the beginning of MARG. If the previous profession brought worldwide recognition then the artistic field opened new and unexplored doors for him, simultaneously. He achieved greater popularity and respect from all corners of the world which marked the beginning of his second career of progressive intellectualism. Here, the old phrase, “a leopard never changes his spots” is fully applicable in Anand’s case, who changed his political “outlook” (from Left to Centre) and became an editor but, on no account, he changed his progressive themes (only in the novels not in MARG) and the way to look at the problems of society. With his

downtrodden themes, he emerged as one of the robust voices challenging patriarchal and the casteist violence in society but, in MARG, his theory was totally opposite of the progressive manifesto that he had written in 1935.

I

MARG and Progress

With MARG (Modern Architectural Research Group), Anand brought the Indian erotica out of temples and ruins to dwell into the career of artists' (national and international) who were willing to know about Indian arts and scriptures. The journal became his bow with which he hit the arrow of architect-progressive desire. The timeline lead one towards the chronometer when Anand moved from England to India, literally flying eastwards, which exactly indicated how his views become totally Indian. With his voyage from West to East, Anand had lost half of his revolutionary fervour as he was secretly wedded with the Congress. The literary climax of PWA failed, like the ending of Anand's novels but again, like his novels, the anti-climax is yet to come. In the very first issue, MARG announced its commitment to modern architecture, urban planning, contemporary art and craft, art education and training, erotica, sculpture, dance, music, temples, heritage, tourism, photography, folk cultures and classical literature including museology. "Throughout these discussions, certain ideas of what it means to be modern and modernist informed his interventions" (Garimella 18). Its main concern, in this sense, was to put Indian arts in comparison with the European arts.

Like the PWA's secret engagement with the CPI, MARG too related to the MARS Group (Modern Architectural Research Group, Britain, 1933) wherein Anand was introduced by Eric Gill, to whom *Persian Painting* (1930) is dedicated. Anand was founding editor of MARS, as well, as of MARG, which means "path." Begins in 1946, MARG was a group of progressive associates, the lovers of modern architecture, including Minnette De Silva, Anand (General Editor), Otto Koenigsberger, Marcia [Anil] De Silva (Assistant Editor and sister to Minnette, as well as, third beloved of Anand after Yasmin and Irene Rhys) and Karl. J. Khandalvala (the Art Advisor). All were its founding members but their leader was Anand, who as an art lover published *Persian Painting*, which was selected as a part of Eliot's Faber Criterion Miscellany series. Later, his artistic imagination developed in *Hindu View of Art*, which was published at a time when Anand "was Keeper of the Indian and Oriental collection of the Boston Museum of fine Arts" (A. Singh 44). As a novelist of the 1940s, the ship of

Anand's career was moving towards the East but the passenger of Marxist leanings in him looking Westwards. After spending twenty years in Hendon, Bloomsbury and in Primrose Hill, he returned to India by becoming an arch-angel who decided to awaken the sleeping skeleton of Indian past, culture, monuments and above all, Indian classical arts. Though Anand had begun the career of an art-writer with *Persian Painting* yet it was MARG which enabled him a place of an artist, as the journal, after each volume, became the taste to those who were genuinely interested in Indian art, scriptures, buildings, caves and classical texts. During his Ph.D., in the company of Gill and Silva sisters in London and friendship with Homi Bhabha, Anand, surely, paved the way for the future of MARG.

Like his novels, the reputation of our connoisseur progressive, Anand, is much stored in MARG, a path breaking Indian journal, wherein the swan song which he was singing enjoyed by the audience of the art-world. With the editing, Anand became, for the second time, an art-critic celebrity overnight—first was the novels. This time he was not digging a deep hole to find the root of suffering of the downtrodden, instead, he returned to a bourgeoisie humanistic perspective. The proletariat doctrines were replaced by the art, erotic sculpture, temples and craft, thus, it was not the same Anand of London. It was a Nehruvian Anand. Herein, Anand was not only responsible for this as his literary bulb was dim due to the ban on his novels. His struggle for success against the British was in peace in India. Singh noted:

In other words, what needs to be reiterated is the fact that the publication of *Marg* came at a stage of his development when his grip over the Indian reality on which he had based his early fiction had begun to weaken. Therefore, he had to map out an alternative for himself. He could have stayed on in UK but more or less as a cultural exile from India. If he returned to India, as he eventually did, he had to have an alternative plan of action (50).

Therefore, he did not have any alternative except a job, hence, in the lack of sources, he moved to the journal, in which, he eventually played the historical role of an architect who was shaping the contemporary Indian society. Singh asserted, "Not only was it exceptionally well produced and printed, its contents were so varied and so thoroughly researched that Indian art, both ancient and contemporary, received an extraordinary degree of projection and understanding. That *Marg* still continues to run is a tribute both to Anand who conceptualized it in the first instance, and his successors who have continued to sustain it

with the same degree of commitment and excellence of which the very first issue of *Marg* had given stunning evidence (42). As a consequence, in post-independent India, Anand was a player of “three parallel careers,” of novelist, art-critic and social critic.

MARG became a huge success with its very first issue and its impact was overwhelming and “Within a few years, it virtually became mandatory reading for anyone who was interested in Indian art” (A. Singh 44). All the achievements were great but when we check MARG through the torch of Anand’s handwritten manifesto, we will not find it progressive or radical (in the Socialist sense only). It was devoted to “great changes” of Premchand (Hindi manifesto) but not to the “radical” of Anand (English manifesto). In the very first issue, the editor of journal published an essay of G.S. Gyani under the title, “Historical Survey (Mohenjodaro),” the first Harappan city of the Indus Valley Civilization during 3000 BC. Beside it, two editorials “Architecture and You” and “The Story of a Town (The Growth of Jamshedpur)” was also inscribed on its pages. Its content was also showing an article on the paintings of B.N. Treasuryvala and two articles on Amrita Sher-Gil (one by Francis Thompson and second by Baldoon Dhingra). Some pages also reserved for “The Sculpture of Ambernath” by R. Van Leyden. Apart from this, there was “Notes on Indian Jewellery”; Book Reviews; “Art in Industry”; “The Need for Urban Planning in India” by Percy Marshal and a film Review: *Kalpana*. One could enjoy the historical survey of old and new civilizations, traditional and modern architecture of the new cities, paintings and artists lives, the scriptures with jewellery, book reviews and urban planning including the film review. This issue was the base of the journal’s future but there was nothing related to the “reality” or “with the basic problems of our existence today—the problems of hunger and poverty, social backwardness and political subjugation” (Manifesto 8). Except this major problem, not even a single aspect of the Indian art is neglected, as the minor forms like craft, pottery, playing cards, metal casting, art, criticism, cave-art (Ellora and Ajanta), dance (Bharata Natyam), erotic Art (Kama Kala, Kamasutra, Konark), Buddhism, Jainism, Tantra art and others were there. Thus, over the progressive manifesto, MARG preferred its objectives:

To rediscover the heritage of Indian and Asian Art through the centuries, to celebrate the continuity of tradition of arts and crafts, textiles, pottery and metal casting. To analyse contemporary trends in architecture, sculpture, painting and graphic design.

MARG did not narrow its area only to the architecture and arts and went beyond what was inscribed in its subtitle “A Magazine of Architecture and Art.” It published articles related to different Indian dancing traditions, handicrafts, carving on clay, lacquer leather, wood, various metals and so on. The perfect example could be found, fairly early in the third volume where a full article on “The Playing Cards of India” has been published and the game showcased later in *Old Woman and the Cow*. If the articles on the minor-arts or architectures decorated the pages of *Marg* then The Taj Mahal, Fatehpur Sikri, Ajanta and Ellora were also there. The reader has the pleasure to read the article “Dream in Marble” which is nothing but a long and detailed thirty page analysis of Shah Jahan—the same volume also has another article entitled “Shah Jahan, Architect or Lover?” The timely analysis of Mughal Architecture of Jadunath Sarkar, famous Mughal historian, was also offered to the readership. Apart from this, in the issue of 1969, the article on “Gandhi’s Views on Art,” primarily based on Anand’s experience while staying with Gandhi at the Sabarmati Ashram, had been printed on the pages of MARG. Why were all these articles published? In following the fifth resolution of the manifesto, all was done “to protect the interests of author, to help authors who require and deserve assistance for the publication of their works” (9). MARG turned out to be a kind of second coming of a “fallen angel” (Anand) and it was going to be the deciding factor in the art-career of the writer.

The achievements of MARG were so unique that on its Silver Jubilee Function, Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India in 1971, offered her “Congratulations” to the journal for bringing forth “a breath of fresh air and opens windows to diverse aspects of art—as a conscious creation and as an integral part of the daily lives, religious traditions, and festivals of our rural and other folk” (A. Singh 49). All the members of MARG, especially Koenigsberger, were “aspired to develop a low-cost, place-specific architecture, derived from the scientific study of local cultural needs, environmental conditions and existing building materials and forms” (Lee and Chakraborty 4) and its result was effectively seen in Chandigarh and Bombay Project.

Progressive Project of Chandigarh

Anand, who recently became an artist-architect from a novelist, “played a decisive role when it came to the selection of who was to design and plan the town” (A. Singh 55) of Chandigarh, the city beautiful. Prem Nath Thapar, the head of Chandigarh project, gets the idea, “Why not build a new capital?” (A. Singh 55) from Anand. In this way, after Anand’s

enlightening advice, the project begins in order to heal the wound of partition and the psychological crisis which haunted the mind of *Punjabis* who “had been physically dismembered, shorn in the process of its best arable land, disrupted socially, and burdened with refugees. The economy was prostrate, the future uncertain, and, although the government may have had some sort of general aims regarding future industrial development or economic improvements, nothing specific in the nature of comprehensive planning was under way” (Evenson 10). Since then, political speeches, local and national newspaper articles and the government’s official documents were voicing in one tone that the aim of project was “not only an administrative necessity but also the largest single step towards the rehabilitation of displaced persons” (Thapar 11). True enough, Anand was not involved, directly, in the administrative section of Chandigarh but he played the most vital role in the formation of city as he suggested the name of Le Corbusier (A. Singh 55; Dalvi 61), the main architect of the city from France. After his absolute authorization from Punjab government and Nehru, Anand congregates with Le Corbusier in Paris and finalized the name of Maxwell Fry, Jane Drew and Pierre Jeanneret:

Anand himself took the initiative to persuade Le Corbusier to accept the offer.... Once the details were finalised, Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew who had worked with Le Corbusier at one time agreed to spend some time in Chandigarh. The third important member of the team was Pierre Jeanneret who had been Le Corbusier’s partner at one time for several years. While Le Corbusier was designated as the planner-in-chief, the other associates spent more than two years in working out the details of what had been conceptualised by Le Corbusier (A. Singh 56).

After partition, Lahore, the capital of undivided Punjab, was ceded to West Punjab (Pakistan) and no city in East Punjab (India) had the potential to be declared as the capital of Indian state. “The loss of Lahore would thus, hypothetically, be followed by a period of prosperity and wholeness, while Chandigarh’s residents inherited a living environment so radically ‘new’ as to garner worldwide attention” (Mallot 33). Herein, the critics had different opinion by considering it as the “costly” project and questioned can the government healed the wound of partition with bricks and cement? And, conversely, Anand and Nehru were searching for the answers. Therefore, the project could be called a freebie for Indians, especially for the Punjabis. Like an architect, suffering from the disease of progress, Anand’s mind was equipped with more inventing power as he came up with the idea of making a “new city” in

the remaining part of Punjab and the project of Chandigarh was suggested to Nehru. Thus, the words of the manifesto “a new society is being born” (Premchand, HM 6) becomes true with the formation of Chandigarh on November 1, 1966. Anand played an exclusive role in the developmental evolution of Chandigarh with the support from Nehru’s vision of the “New India” and with MARG.

In the view of J. Edward Mallot, “Chandigarh has proven to be the most controversial project well before the city’s construction, arguing that Chandigarh was too expensive and too Western to work. The capital has since been criticized for its alleged failure to meet residents’ needs, both practically and psychologically” (30). The controversies had arisen because of Indian Independence but Anand came in with a strong defense of Chandigarh Project through its presentation on MARG pages. In fact, he published Le Corbusier’s article “Urbanism” (10-18) in MARG as well as Otto Koenigsberger’s article “Chandigarh-The First and the Revised Projects” (25) about the detailed descriptive plan of the construction of Chandigarh, along with the article from Jane Drew “On the Chandigarh Scheme” (19-20). In the following fifteen years after the implementation of the Constitution, many issues on the plan and architecture of Chandigarh appeared regularly on the pages of MARG, especially in 1953 (two issues by Le Corbusier). In 1957, Pierre Jeanneret, T. J. Manickam, and Mansinh M. Rana came out with “Chandigarh Symposium” (45-50) and Jon Lang, Madhavi Desai and Miki Desai with their article “Architecture and Independence: The Search for Identity—India 1880-1980” (50). Anand himself, too, shared the writing platform with the others when he wrote an article in 1961 issue entitled “A New Planned City” and the Special Issue in 1963. In consequence, his schemes for the formation of a new capital, to publicize or advertise the plan of a city in the form of articles in MARG were part of progress which was based on the manifesto. The articles were Anand’s progressive slap on the faces of democrats who were attacking the project, which was, in reality, “an event of global import, and it may cause talk for centuries” (Rand 35). Following the manifesto, Anand was “lead[ing] our country to the new life for which it is striving” (7) which resulted in Chandigarh. To get to the bottom of it, the City Beautiful was created to give a new identity to the lost people but, in one way or other, both, Nehru and Anand, were practically materialistic as no such kind of idea was suggested for the Indians of West Bengal. They were, it seems, ignored or overshadowed by the creation of Pakistan. One may add to it, the building of the city had other hidden political motives too.

In relation to Chandigarh, asserted Correa, Anand was highly sensible in his understanding of “architecture and design” (A. Singh 45) and MARG was devoted to the same objective. From progressive views, Chandigarh was “not only an administrative necessity but also the largest single step towards the rehabilitation of displaced persons” (Thapar 11) due to partition. Chandigarh, as Drew mentioned in “Chandigarh Capital City Project” was “the world’s most modern capital” (56). On the basis of Anand’s contribution to Chandigarh project, no one can deny his role as a “self-styled progressive” of India, who replaced classical art by some innovative ideas about the planning of a new city in recently liberated *Bharat*. Officially, Anand was giving voice to revolutionary urban space over the dictum of Gandhi, i.e., “return to villages.” The city was constructed at a time when India was in the list of Third World Countries and national leaders like Nehru had a firm belief that the new cities would transform Indian society. Like Nehru’s dream in *Discovery of India*, Anand’s vision peeped into the future as “there is no going back, there is no turning back even if this was thought desirable. There is only one-way traffic in Time. India must, therefore, lessen her religiosity and turn to science. She must get rid of the exclusiveness in thought and social habit which has become like a person to her, stunning her spirit and preventing growth” (495). Anand was so possessed with the formation of Chandigarh that “He spent time with Le Corbusier both on site and later in Paris” (Dalvi 61) and when he “was the Tagore Chair of Art in the University of Punjab at the time had interacted freely with all the principals of the Chandigarh project during its development and early growth” (Dalvi 61). Anand never looked back and went on inventing more cities and with this, he “shaped a concept for Indian modernity” (Garimella 18) with the need to historicize and by building a utopian vision that was buttressed by modernist faith. He did not stop there and came up with one more radically progressive innovative plan of *Navi Mumbai* (New Bombay).

Progressive Project of Bombay

Anand became an inventing machine as he, again, suggested innovative plan to broaden the area of Bombay City. After finishing the project of Chandigarh, he was again visible in the public sphere through MARG because of *Navi Mumbai*, so called New Bombay Plan as designed in 1965s Volume 18.1 of MARG. Anand wrote in a Letter “On the Disintegration of Bombay” to A.R. Antulay, dated April 9, 1981 that “I hope on my return to telephone you for an appointment to discuss the possibilities of Greater Bombay and beyond.

I believe the slow death of the present metropolis requires diagnosis just in case we can get together to find some solutions for the health, wealth and happiness of the peoples between Greater Bombay and beyond to Pune.” In fact, Anand’s description of Bombay is seen in *Coolie* as “a new world, to the new, the wonderful world of a big city, where there were ships and motors, big buildings, marvellous gardens, and he fancied, rich people” (C 145). Whether Munoo or Anand:

Never, throughout his long journey from North to South [Chandigarh to Bombay], had he seen the outskirts of a city extend for as many miles as this colossal world he was entering. The train rushed past groves of dates and palms, past the golden domes of temples, the long minarets of mosques, the tall spires of churches, the flowery facades of huge mansions, past mills, burning-ghats, graveyards, past stone-yards, past fish-drying sheds, past dyeing-grounds over which lay many miles of newly coloured silks and calicoes, past flocks of sheep and goats, herds of cows and buffaloes, past throngs of men, women, and children dressed in clothes of the oddest, most varied shapes and colours (C 151).

Anand wanted to change the shape of Bombay and well before the plan of Chandigarh, he was part of a scheme regarding the expansion of Bombay, called Greater Bombay Scheme.

In a typed draft document “The Monkey Business or a new experimental architecture in India,” Anand wrote that post-independent India was “situated between two worlds, one not yet dead, the other refusing to be born” (Dalvi 56-57). The world of colonialism was dead but India was denying the concept of modernism by preferring the traditional way of life. The road to modernisation, as Anand and Nehru thought, could be achieved by the jettisoning of religious outlook and by the adaptation of a new way of life, i.e., scientific, machine and political rationality and equality. Independent India, as Anand wrote in “How Chandigarh got built (a recall by Mulk Raj Anand),” could be seen as “an agro-industrial civilization, which has to cope with the new millennium,” (Dalvi 57) and herein “agro” related to the Gandhian notion and “industrial civilization” was the dream of Nehru. In the words of Dalvi, Anand:

Championed architectural progress in a syncretism of Gandhi's all inclusivity within the “agrarian” country and Nehru’s intention to put India at the global “industrial” forefront. Gandhi advised the intellectuals in the country: “When you despair with yourself, think of helping the poor.” Mulk in his writings propagated a modernism

seen through the modernization of the villages of India. He envisioned a developing world that retained a nearness to the elements. He nevertheless acknowledged “the much stronger pull of the ‘new world.’ India could only be seen with all the contradictions intact (57).

The design of New Bombay envisaged by the trio of “Marg architect” (Anand’s phrase) including the name of Charles Correa, Pravina Mehta and Shirish Patel. The trinity was the main broadcaster about the news of this new-modern city which was a progressive but silent blow to the “combat the burgeoning bulge of the old,” (Dalvi 61) or as Correa noted:

It was the kind of document equally at home in someone’s living room or tabled on the agenda of a government committee meeting. And in this latter role, its value was truly priceless ... the *Marg* issue was invaluable—for it made sure that the original idea, sketched succinctly in a nutshell, did not get watered down, compromised, and lost (New Bombay: Marg as an Urban Catalyst 68).

Like Chandigarh and London, Anand’s other home was Bombay and after his retirement from Punjab University, Chandigarh, his permanent address was Bombay, which was “potentially one of the boldest experiments in Asia going even beyond the establishment centre of Chandigarh to an industrial township of a very intricate nature, with implications far beyond this into the multifunctional phases of life in this region which is already on the highways of the world” (Correa, New Bombay: Marg as an Urban Catalyst 69). With the formation of Chandigarh and Mumbai, is India really becoming modern? At that time or now, India, in reality, is a mistaken modernity which cannot be judged by inventing new cities but can only be effective with “new thoughts” which, are simultaneously rejected in the open. The field of education (schools, universities) was totally barren. True enough that there was no space for Indians but, at least, one Indian is following the concept (at least the manifesto that he had written around forty years back). If such was the case, then there is no denying the fact that Anand was affected with the virus of progress, in relation to the building of new cities.

Apart from this, Anand continuously published, like the Chandigarh project, articles regarding the Bombay Plan in MARG, especially the article in Volume 2.1 entitled “Introduction to the Reports of the Greater Bombay Scheme” as well as Otto Koeingsberger’s “A Review of the Greater Bombay Plan.” Here one more article was devoted to “Historical

Note (on Bombay).” The full Volume (18.3) is dedicated “Bombay: Planning and Dreaming” which contains the article “Splendours and Miseries of Bombay” (Anand); “Observations on the Development Plan for Greater Bombay” (V.N. Modak); The Future of Our City (Jal F. Balsara). The essay “Planning for Bombay” (Charles M. Correa, Pravina Mehta, and Shirish B. Patel) comes under the head “The section “Municipal Plan: Some Important Points from the Development Plan for Greater Bombay.” It was divided into three parts: “Pattern of Growth,” “Twin City,” “Current Proposals” which is an overview of what were the issues and demands of Bombay and what must be done to solve the problem which occurred during the Bombay Plan of Redevelopment. Today, as celebrated by Singh, “the city [Bombay so called Mumbai] has now expended in that direction in a fairly planned manner and, in terms of transport, an appropriate railway connection and all other infrastructural facilities have been provided” (60). Bombay issues and controversies such as, large population, future planning, amount of money and what could be done to resolve the problems, were discussed. Anand himself penned the article “Splendour and Miseries of Bombay” which described the history of Bombay as wedding gift of the Portuguese to the East India Company. Architectural modernism and definition of new cities were equally projected by Anand’s scientific notion of progress.

Credit must be offered to Anand and MARG for the Bombay Development Plan and, thus, the manifesto’s statement, “great changes are taking place in Indian society” (Premchand, HM 6) is fully applicable here. At this point, Anand and his MARG could be easily projected as progressive. His ideas of Chandigarh and Bombay have not been challenged by any critics, social or political dictators, or the government till date. On the one hundredth birth anniversary of Anand, MARG published an edited book of Annapurna Garimella, *Mulk Raj Anand: Shaping the Indian Modern* in which Charles Correa wrote an essay on “Mulk Raj Anand at 100.” Herein, he defined: how the collaboration between Correa, Mehta and Patel had taken place:

Suddenly we had all the resources of *Marg*, and all those colour pages, for discussing the future of our city. The three of us spent many session with Mulk, and with Dolly Sahiar—the brilliant designer who was main collaborator. It was they who produced *Marg*, creating every quarter a unique journal—not only in its content, but in its visual look and feel as well. For Dolly cleverly used different kinds of paper, from thin tissue paper to the most wonderful handmade varieties, as well as different

printing techniques, from chase black and white to the most opulent colour spreads, to evoke the pluralistic collage that is the essence of India. Looking back, it seems to me that *Marg* represents the apotheosis of the India of 1950s (72).

The architect was in the “crisis of the spirit” which, as recorded by Anand in “Postscript to contemporary architecture in India,” must be solved before “we come face to face with some of the problems of contemporary architecture in our country” (Dalvi). With the modernist project like Chandigarh and Bombay India could, as Nehru and Anand thought, unshackled itself from the chains of pseudo modernity of *Angreji Hukumat* and also from its nostalgic indigenous past. To Nehru, “Chandigarh is of enormous importance” which Corbusier called “a big village.”

[Chandigarh is] A big village. In burnt brick. I will bring in air. Keep Sun-God in control. Garden in every house. Not Paris, London, New York-Chandigarh, new city. ‘A dream,’ I said, ‘ala Rimbaud!’ (M. R. Anand, A Chat with Le Corbusier)

In fact, Corbusier’s idea and vision about Chandigarh have similarities with Anand’s vision as recorded in MARG. As a (un)professional architect, Anand was (in)directly related to the construction of India’s “two” (Chandigarh and *Navi Mumbai*) fresh urban projects after independence. According to Dalvi, “Anand’s singular contribution to Indian urban planning is considerable in itself, in that he helped shepherd what was then less than a figment of imagination to what is now more than a city.... To Mulk in the early 1950s and then again in the early 70s, promoting the ideas of forward-looking urbanity was a—labour of love which he pursued, forging his very own *Marg* (the book-magazine, as he called it) to achieve a widespread acceptance... [Thus].... Anand’s passionate espousal of both these projects and his ability to uniquely position them in the limelight at the time (both through his associations as well as his publications) allowed them to see the light of day” (Dalvi 62). Accordingly, in the formation of new architecture, Anand was a new kind of progressive, an archaeological progressive but after staying in this role for a short span of time, he incarnated himself into an Eros writer.

Progressive Erotica

Anand wrote in *Apology for Heroism*, “I had come to socialism through Tolstoy, Ruskin, Morris and Gandhi, imbued with the sense of this doctrine as the embodiment of an

ethical creed, in so far as it was a protest against misery, ugliness and inequality. So like many of my generation, I accepted Marxism as a fairly good historical yardstick but considered humanism, the view of the whole man, as the more comprehensive ideology” (129). But after WW-II, in the words of Raymond Williams, Marxism was undergoing change as it had an additional meaning or it became an “amalgam” of the systems:

of Keynesianism... Fabianism.... Liberalism.... liberal anti-imperialism.... and of a non-Marxist, anti-capitalist critique of industrial capitalism and of militarism. We can identify this amalgam.... In strictly terms, as I understand them this is precisely, Social Democracy, in its post-1917 sense (235).

In his erotic sculptures or writings, Anand rejected the above conventional and post-modern Marxist tone by presenting it in a new form. His progressive views changed over the “materialistic representation” of the Indian erotica on the world scale. Indian Eros was totally alien to the aesthetic world, hence, Anand wanted to put it in line with Greek and Egyptian, and more especially with European art. Unlike these arts, Anand did not present Indian erotica as a “spiritual aesthetic” like Apollo, Cupid, Cave of Ida, Fall of Adam and Eve, Garden of Eden, instead, he defended it in “cultural-materialistic” term which had its association with the Leftist Orientation.

As a spiritual aesthetic, the erotica sculpture which Anand canvassed on the pages of MARG could be criticized on the charge of elaboration of sex, pleasure, sensuality and of conjugal love but for Anand, it had an “Objective reality” (Khajuraho 11) or could be seen as *Dhyana Mantra* “of symbols, undistributed by any direct attempt of portraiture or description of material facts” (Khajuraho 11). Anand’s presentation of erotica was a battle of “primitive art” against the “Naturalistic art” and “It is based mostly on intense feeling and not on visual analysis. It is like ripening fruit bursting from the pleasure of the sap within. It does not treat the stone, or marble, in terms of smaller units, through outside measurement, but relates the pictorial synthesis to the imagined form as a whole. It has little or no relation to ‘reality as it is,’ but seeks to communicate the flow of energies and power, through symbols, by the relation of masses” (Khajuraho 11). He shielded the new progressive outlook to look at the Indian erotica with the help of MARG publication branch. Such as, *Homage to Khajuraho*, *Kama Kala* and *Kamasutra of Vaysayayan* (edited book), *Delhi-Agra-Sikri*, *Bharatnatyam*, *Contemporary World Sculpture* and many others.

Homage to Khajuraho

In *Homage to Khajuraho*, Anand covered the story of thirty temples or ruins of Khajuraho which “represents one of the highest and most intense moments of the Medieval Hindu Renaissance” (2). These temples were nothing more than “The transition from the Gupta styles to the work of the medieval Hindu renaissance which represents, therefore, not so much an innovation of type, but the shifting of emphasis to image making as the necessary and important part of architecture” (2). In the untold tale of history, these leftovers narrated an epic “with detailed embellishment of Gods and Goddesses and celestial beauties and human beings and animals, in an intricate array of the metaphysical story of creation, where there is no beginning and no end” (2). To put it in right words, “the evolution is Organic” was the main progressive theory of Anand. In the picture of Khajuraho, one could see, as Anand asserted, “so much love, so many flowers but no fruit!” (4) but he wanted to prove, “the universe as the outcome of the cosmic union between the male and the female” (4). Herein, Anand tried to project Khajuraho as a progressive text as it was far away from the sight of the readers, however, the critics look at in a different manner.

After the examination of the text, Khajuraho could be criticized as a narrative “on the elaboration of the play function of sex” (Khajuraho 4) which reminded us of the warm sensuality of a bygone age or of erotic Hindu literature. Anand talked about a society which “permitted the initiation of young virgins in the tenderness of conjugal love” (5). Anand was, in this erotic text, defining the god “Brahman” (12) and this move was undoubtedly against the PWA theory based on the manifesto. The “realist” theory of projecting weaker section overtaken by the theory of “existence” of man, description of temples and ruins, Gods, Masters, winged animals, nymph of Heaven, cycle of life and so many other humanly and mystical aspects. The picture of Vishwakarma, the architect of Heaven, was nicely showcased in plate number two of the book. The nudity was canvassed in plate number five in which a female was “playing with ball” in the nude and the next image again was similar one with the heading “A Thorn in the Flesh,” with plate numbers ten, eleven, and twelve, and all were following the fifth plate. The photography then move further with the portrayal of three different female bodies before and after sex with their lovers in plate number 7, 8 and 9. Anand again crossed the bridge which covered the cataract of PWA by preferring the “War” in plate 14. The eroticism was at its peak in plate 17 and 18 wherein different sexual poses are defined with a full fledged description and all these images are enough to take him away,

in the conventional form, from the path of a progressive direction. The description of plate 18 was as follows:

This sexual pose, which seems almost like a yoga exercise, is obviously one of the *Kaula-Kapalika* practices. The serenity of the male figure standing on his head and the acceptance by the maids assisting the conjugation, would suggest a ritualistic performance, noble perhaps for the difficulty of the pose and inevitably practised only by the accomplished adepts (24).

Equally nude, erotic, and love making scene are figured in plate number 21 (“Tenderly merge the bodies into each other”) and in 22 (“the union of the cosmic principles”) and again in number 23: “obviously a ritualistic ceremony in which the conjugating couple are lay figures in the embrace recommended by the priest with the symbolic staff on his shoulder. The lady on the side, so uninitiated, bashfully hides her nudity” and finally plate 24 stood for “tenderness in love.” Apart from the nudity, Vishwanatha Temple, Chiragupta Temple, Lakshmana Temple, Devi Jagdamba Temple, Duladeo Temple, Adnantha Temple and Parsawnatha Temple were described with full descriptions. The final judgment could be, after reading this text, Anand preferred “Fixed ideas and old beliefs” (6) which “had the fatal tendency to escape from the actualities of life,” (6) hence, his projection of nudity cannot be taken for granted as the “progress” which he mentioned in the socialist manifesto.

Kama Kala

Anand, again, rejected the Marxist notion of progress by rejecting “realistic” literature and came out with eros, *Kama Kala*, which is a small progressive essay about the erotic literature of India from the times of the *Vedas* or the Buddhist cult to the eleventh century, including *Ramayana*, *Mahabhart*, Ajanta and Ellora Caves, Khajuraho Temples, *Bhagwat Gita*, *Manusmrti*, *Advita* and *Vaishanva* Cult, *Kaula* and *Kapalika*, *Mahalinga*, *Panchamrita* Kalidasa’s period, *Kamasutra*, Yoga and Jainism. Alex Comfort had brilliantly described this phenomenon as “the terroristic god of Victorianism is gone, but he has left his footprints in the minds of a whole generation of parents and the obsessional traits of their children... Ritualistic cleanliness has replaced the older squalor!” (v). Here, the progressive colourings created the image of:

This delinquency, whether it may be of the minor forms, recognised by the law, or the more dangerous types, which lead to aggression by the desire for domination over others, is essential a sign of prematurity or of the survival of barbarism.

If the “mad hatter’s tea party,” which is our present world society, is sadistic at every step, both overtly and covertly, it is because masochism becomes the main attribute of citizenship under barbarism. A code of morals drawn up by, and for, nomadic tribes, in a patriarchal society, has received accretions from Christian and other monastical orders and exercises vigilant control on our lives, ready to detect and punish, through the policeman, normal human impulses, even when the primitive codes ceased to find acceptance or belief among enlightened men.

The name of such society is death, not life! (v).

According to Anand, the concept of “original sin” and sexual secretiveness were not part of the intense phases of Indian culture. The PWA itself was against “the mystical devotional obsession of our literature, its furtive and sentimental attitude towards sex, its emotional exhibitionism and its almost total lack of rationality” (Manifesto 7) but Anand thought that in the “Indian plastic arts, the human form became the expression of the sculptor’s vision of the life force ... And, most always, they are carved without any suggestion of pornography, but with the utmost tenderness and sensuous beauty (vi). The progressive writer of the past, who used to criticize the Indian traditional culture in his novels, now theorized, “Everything had a soul. And this soul was in the process of transmigration from incarnation to another, according to the law of *Karma*, through which good deeds and bad deeds assured a higher or lower rebirth until the attainment of *Moksha*, release” (12). In this work too, the critics had to search for: whether Anand was a “fuse” progressive or “confused” progressive as there was a significant gap in his ideas between his first and second career.

A new career brings new hopes, opportunities and is simultaneously equal to a clean slate which could be used for making an impression on the new readers. But in Anand’s case, the opposite had happened. If one look at *Kama Kala* as a progressive book then it “will come as a big disappointment,” (157) as the reviewer Frank Raymond Allchin remarked, who termed it a “picture book” and labelled Anand’s philosophical task as “premature.” This small book of around 15000 words, including typo, was not enough for a “coherent criticism” of Indian Erotica. Though Anand charged Europeans, especially the Christian Missionaries or

the Puritan philistines, for corrupting Indian arts and tradition but his notions were not enough to promote a “balanced consideration of the philosophical basis,” as Allchin howled. Against Anand’s missionaries comment, he said, even saints like Tulsidas and Kabirdas “no less described woman as a serpent whose bite could kill man.... In short Puritanism was present in ancient India, long before it was brought forth and strengthened by the Muslim invasions and turned into a weapon of Britain’s ‘mental imperialism!’” (158). The question came: if Puritanism and prudery in Indian continent already existed, especially among the Brahmins, then why was India decrying only against the Europeans? The answer must be: they were the one who legalized it. Some of the eighty illustrations in the text could be omitted as they were unnecessary. This text does nothing for the buyers who were really interested in Indian erotica as it showed less “scholarly” interest which was enough to turn it into a volume of “flabby urbanity and pseudo-aesthetic” (158). Despite the charge of Allchin, Anand could be seen as a progressive who was the first Indian writer who brought the sculptures of Khajuraho and Konark together in this book.

Kamasutra of Vaysayayan (edited book)

The Indian eroticism canvassed by the exposure of the Khajuraho carvings or by the Konarak sculptures but the reputation of Anand as a progressive was sullied down by the salacious photography and details of clinging triteness of coition in *Kamasutra of Vaysayayan*, edited by him and Lance Dane. The book became an endless railway platform for assorted touristy paraphernalia and was described by its reviewer, Chander Uday Singh, in an article in journal *India Today* (Dec 15, 1981) entitled “Directory of Desire: Kama Sutra of Vatsyayana” as a “primary source for the sex-shop industry” (Internet). It brought out the panorama of India erotica with the examination of sexual nuance, a labour of love-making which surely established it as the “Encyclopaedia of Indian Erotica.” The orgies of lesbian love, baiting, biting, body massage, *auparishtaka* (oral-sex), wife swapping, enforced sexual segregation were all inscribed on the pages of “this extraordinary directory of desire” as the reviewer examined. Vatsayayan asserted that the sexual drought could be quenched with intercourse (in the *yonis* of animals like the mares, she-goats, and bitches or by masturbation) by those who are unable to find a female body. The staunch critics could quibble on, why did Anand this? In earlier editions of *Kamasutra*, either the text or the illustrations were published but by collating them in this book, Anand makes the text accessible for the reader. He was defensive in the introduction and tries to take it, “beyond the puritan struggle between

the body and the soul” (49). Herein, the reviewer said, the old erotic palettes exploded on the new and modern canvas with sanctimonious foray. The *kama* theory as sexual gymnastics could be seen as an aficionado of sophisticated positions of sexual-intercourse. Rejecting the manifesto, Anand preferred the function of old writers whom he criticized in each of the PWA conference, and like them, he:

...has tried to find a refuge from reality in spiritualism and idealism. The result has been that it has produced a rigid formalism and a banal and perverse ideology (Manifesto 6).

The words, “some women of the inner court, when they are amorous, do act of the mouth on the *yonis* of one another” crossed the limits of all the mores of the progressive manifesto. Hence, in his book *India*, John Keay described *Kamasutra* as a “compendium” (81–103) of sex, whereas, for Roger Fry, it was just “yielding movements of the body” (6). What was the reason for Anand turning his back from deprived section to erotic literature? Anand himself answered it in Preface of *Kama Kala*, “Until recently some of the European critics have, for one reason or another, denied the essential values of Indian sculpture.” For instance, Fry confirmed:

Hindu art is singular in thus combining an extraordinary control of free plastic movement with a marked indifference to the structural mechanism. The Hindu artist’s imagination is so enthralled by his feeling for the undulating and yielding movements of the body as a whole, and his feeling for the surface quality of the flesh replaces all his emphasis of these aspects, to the exclusion of that fundamental structure which occupied the other great schools of plastic design (6).

Anand, following the suggestion of his friend, Rudy von Leyden, had taken the statement of Fry as a “mistake” and suggested that the “surging force” of the Indian erotic sculptures are equal to the skin of human flesh “which determines the surface and its swelling contour” (6). Anand confessed, why he turned to the erotic literature? Fry labelled the Indian *mithuna* sculptures as “irreverent” which distracted attention from the main artistic purpose. As an aesthetic bohemian, Anand came in with a strong defense of Indian Erotica with the words, “From Manu to the younger critics of Indian art in Europe themselves reject the desiccating effects of the previous generations of Puritanism” (6). In this way, the “progressive realist” reincarnated as a “progressive artist” but the kite of Anand’s artist career was not flying in

the direction of the manifesto as the flight was without “social progress,” (9) which Premchand demanded in his Hindi manifesto. Whatever the views of his critics, Anand worked with a new theme which was based on the old traditional theory of *Kama*.

While writing the manifesto, the traditional progressive critic in Anand was against “Fixed ideas and old beliefs” as he preferred “a new society” in which literature, like the classics of the past, would not “find a refuge from reality in spiritualism and idealism.” Anand was strictly against “the mystical devotional obsession” and “furtive and sentimental attitude towards sex” due to which old literature was “total[ly in] lack of rationality.” As a true progressive or Leftist, he highlighted in his own handwritten manifesto that “Such literature was produced particularly during the past two centuries, one of the most unfortunate periods of our history, a period of disintegrating feudalism and of acute misery and degradation for the Indian people as a whole.” Anand, in the 1930s, came forward like a *messiah* to, “rescue [Indian] literature and other arts from the priestly, academic and decadent classes” (Manifesto 6-8). This was Anand’s stand in England or in the first phase of his career but the socio-realist or cultural critic in him changed after his return to India as he was saddened by world’s outlook on Indian erotica arts, paintings and sculptures. The West considered it “sensual.” Like the downtrodden hero of his novels, Anand took the responsibility to present it on the world’s stage. These works are Anand’s “Search for beauty in art,” as he wrote in *Preface to Kamasutra* (8).

Now the bell rings in one’s mind, how was Anand’s erotica obverse of progressive principles? As per the words Anand had written in the manifesto, the PWA writers should not write on “obsession” (7) and have a “furtive and sentimental attitude towards sex” (7). Following the manifesto, the erotica texts are not dealing with the basic “problems of hunger and poverty, social backwardness and political subjugation” (8). At this stage, Anand’s text and statements were contradictory to the manifesto, as the reader may “Witness the mystical devotional obsession of ... literature, its furtive and sentimental attitude towards sex, its emotional exhibitionism and its almost total lack of rationality” (7). Like the male protagonist of *Death of a Hero*, Anand, too, was a “self-confessed rebel” (85) with his haunting inwardness about moral fiber. He homogenized millions of people to destroy social anarchy. Refusing the revolutionary passion of previous works, Anand turned his road towards eroticism but it would not, as the manifesto demanded, “lead our country to the new life for which it is striving” (6). In one line, here Anand, asserted by Krishna Nandan Sinha, “uses

the mythopoeic or the ironic method of delineation like a prophet or a sage” (132). Thus, critics decried that he was swimming against the river of PWA or the manifesto, hence, he was not a progressive.

Over the socio-experiences, Anand preferred the “totality of human experience” (love, sex, imagination) which he earlier rejected by writing in the manifesto that he will not “escape from the actualities of life” or take any refuge “in spiritualism and idealism” or elaboration of sex called “sentimental attitude” or “the mystical devotional obsession” (Manifesto 6). At this crucial stage, Anand was, in classical Marxist sense, not been able to “rescue literature” from the “priestly, academic and decadent classes.” Thus, there is nothing progressive in Anand, if we check him in the light of old Marxist school, which preferred human experience and realism. Dealing with eroticism against Marxist manner is, thus, progressive, but in a different sense than the conventional Marxist one. It gives a new dimension to the criticism by differentiating the old Eros as “spiritual-aesthetic” and Anand’s erotica as “cultural-materialist.”

Cultural-materialism defines different aspects of the “cultural” past by relating it with “materialism” which is nothing but “a prevailing pattern of desire for mere sensory enjoyments, mental possibilities or physical comfort, at the expense of any higher moral or spiritual values or concerns,” which, in the traditional way, could be termed as “a range of metaphysical positions” (Scott and Marshall 149). Marx and Engels rejected orthodox “idealism” and narrow use of “materialism” based on mechanics, which primarily talked about “sensuous existence” of human subjects. Both were defining only the mode of production, distribution, consumption, economic equality and so on. The explanation of Marx became pejorative for Anand, hence, in Eros, he discarded the old views of Marxism, where a clear distinction was made between economic, political, artistic, non-economic, physical and metaphysical. Anand not only disdained Marxism completely but jettisoned the old “spiritual-aesthetic” which was considered necessary by him in order to project the erotic. But, again, following the Marxist notion, he did not idealize old-methodological laws of religion or he never set on a journey for the search of Universal laws (like *Quar’an*, *Gita*, *Manusmrti* and so on). He avoided historicism, idealism, Marxist-materialism or production, traditional law of society and came up with different beliefs and values which were contrary to the existing environment. Anand tried to falsify history through his pseudo-empirical syndrome about the Indian Eros, especially in *Kama Sutra*, which were, in fact, claiming “everything” (sexual,

artistic, spiritual, cultural, materialism) but, in truth, says/do nothing new in Anand's canon of writings. He did his best to raise Indian sculpture to the level of art-aesthetic but he failed as these "plastic arts" were speaking in different lines. The unsurpassed mania for Anand is that he presented the carvings in the best way to an unknown visitor but there is nothing for the artist. He failed to present erotica as "aesthetic" or "cultural" work but was happy to offer the "cultural-materialism" in them. Through Erotica, he was giving sensuousness to the educated reader, as well as, to the uneducated viewer of the sculptures. Despite the charges, Anand was the first Indian art-critic who re-painted these dead sculpture not only in MARG but also in the international domain. He separates the old-aged dust from the mirror of Indian erotica and put it on the world's stage to show the performance against the audience across the black waters. In fact, Anand was like Lord Shiva of the novel *Untouchable*, who drank the poison to save the world, like him, symbolically, with the claims of critics, Anand too drank the sip of poison for the safety, progress and celebration of Indian sculptures. Anand bears the blow of criticism but he successfully brought the lost reputation to these Eros sculptures of India.

Thus, "the return of diachronic and synchronic" is termed by Marvin Harris as "neoevolutionism" which could be bracketed as the "understanding of the developmental continuities within anthropology by its suggestion of a revival doctrine which is associated with the struggle to establish the fact of speciation. Historical particularism, culture and personality, and synchronic functionalism are perfectly compatible with both biological transformism and cultural transformism" (Harris 634). Religion plays a supportive role in determining the cultural-materialism which stated "sociocultural systems undergo cumulative changes" (Harris 635). By labelling religion as "opium," Marx starched a parallel line between "spiritual, vitalistic or idealistic" and "mechanistic, materialistic" by paying much of his emphasis upon the latter. Thus, cultural-materialism could be called a standard application of understanding the historical past and their point of view. In Eros writings, Anand was challenging "mechanistic, materialistic" symptoms of the West towards Eastern Erotica in general and Indian art in particular but he did not try to project them as "spiritual, vitalistic or idealistic," instead, he combined both with slight variations. He presented the Kama players as actors who were performing on the stage of public bed with pure intentions which has similarities with the fall of Adam and Eve. Here, Anand's preference of "materialism" of "sensory enjoyment or physical comfort" which smarmy were absent in Adam and Eve. Apart from this, he avoided idealizing Indian Eros like Adam and Eve, and

this claim is in the line of Marxism. In adopting this kind of theory, Anand was damaging Marx's scientific theory of cultural-materialist of "hammer and sickle" (Marxist symbol) by rejecting the older Communist dogmas. Anand's past after 1945, especially after 1949, offers the headline that his cultural-materialism was trying to avoid the communist approval, not completely, but as a substitute as he was showing his basic leftist orientation. How did Anand make use of cultural-materialism is the main question?

Like the Indian painter, Raja Ravi Varma, Anand was presenting the mythological erotica in MARG or in his writings, which, like the paintings of Varma, were highly controversial in nature. Unlike the oleographs/ lithographic printings of Varma, Anand's texts were not about the god/goddesses of Indian epics but explained the festivity of human activity to complete the "greatest pleasure" of the body. This mode of presentation was entirely different from the mythology of Greek, Europe, Egypt or even from the Hindu folds. Anand strived to proffer the sublime nature of Indian Eros which was, for him, unique in its own way. Here, by going against the manifesto, Anand was strongly proving that the written theories cannot be taken for granted by the "loyalty of oaths" but by presenting the equal nature of the situation. By their symbols of hammer and sickle, the socialist, so called Communists, were politicizing their old agenda of cultural-materialism but Anand rejected it in *toto* for nomothetic inquiry of Indian Eros. Now, the "opium of the people" was losing its grip and as per the manifesto, "out of the present turmoil and conflict a new society is emerging" (Manifesto 6) which is full of mysteries and challenging the knowledge of Indian orthodoxy. This new era, with the writings of Anand, was talking about the strange phenomena to motivate the imagination and open up new grounds against undreamed possibilities of the past. The new imaginative-consciousness was not speaking about trivial or non-existent objects recommended by hard-nosed empiricists of religion or the tough-minded rulers, kings or colonists of India. Anand's way of producing Eros, undoubtedly, put him in the category of "epiphenomenon," a quality generated by the brain but meaningless in nature.

If one is satisfied with critics views then Anand's novels were also not progressive (as they called him a propagandist). On the core level, the rejection of critics' views would take one towards Socio-Marxist theory of writings which was based on "social-realism" and in erotic texts Anand was far away from this. In this sense, there was some truth in critics' judgments but Anand was fighting to bring the Indian erotica sculpture in the context of the world. Again, following the manifesto, Anand was "bring[ing] the arts into the closest touch

with the people” (7). With erotic texts or sculptures, he was trying to put emphasis on “thinking” rather than the “thinging” of the *Kalyuga* (the Iron Age) and preferred the aesthetic theory of arts. The problem with cultural-materialism is that while reading it, everyone return to the Old Marxist school where there is no place for spirituality. They preferred Lenin/Stalin’s socialist theory of “social realism” but both of these established inspections, for Anand, had a basic and common empirical approach by rejecting the religion. The same old Socio-Marxist disease was flowing in the blood and body of post-modern critics, who were against the spiritual orientation by choosing “humanistic direction,” to which, surely, Anand belongs. While preferring a new kind of theory, symbolically like Sisyphus, Anand was rolling the rock to a mountain peak where Marxist empiricism shakes hand with mysticism. He was not ready to bow his head against to Marxist god, rather, he became a doctor by operating on the Marxist notion and also by injecting the spiritual drugs through his literary operation.

Thus, in *Homage to Khajuraho*, *Kama Kala*, *Kamasutra* and other erotica writings, Anand moves away from the “old progressive” conventions as suggested by Marx, Tolstoy and others, who were comprehensively writing on the totality of human experience in the world. If the old progressives were fighting for the place of the invisible man in existing society, Anand was in a hurry in bringing the hidden cultural past, art, sculptures, paintings, carvings and other aesthetic aspects of Indian traditional art. In doing this, he rejected the “spiritual-aesthetic” theory of “human-sin,” so called “Puritanism” and presented “unseen” folds of Indian classical arts in cultural-materialist style of old Marxist with a change. Here, with Indian dead sculpture, Anand wanted that Indian culture should be recognized as a materialistic art like the Europeans—Europe had sole proprieties on arts and aesthetics at that time. He considered it necessary that Indian erotica should be compared aesthetically, “not sensually,” with the fall of Adam and Eve, their celebration of love, the beginning of the cosmos and other humanly aspects. Anand clearly aware of the fact that the British were killing their culture by criticizing it, as Macaulay called Indian literature a “dustbin.” How can they give importance to Indian erotica? Anand came in strong defense of Erotica as a progressive—as he did in his novels. If this was Anand’s core application of objective, (which he emphasized in the Prefaces of his erotica texts) then he was fully “progressive” in his erotica which was wandering in aesthetic wilderness at that time. Anand was not writing only on the erotic literature but also brought out some excellent books on Hindu culture, Dance, Music, folks, tradition and civilization, i.e., *The Hindu View of Art, Is there a*

Contemporary Indian Civilization, The Dancing Foot, Bharatnatyam (edited), *Singinline, Annihilation of Caste* (edited) were also published and edited by him.

Hindu View of Art

Apart from erotic representation of Indian art and sculpture, Anand also exercised his pen to write on religious phenomena as his *The Hindu View of Art* was the “elaboration” (9) of Ananda Kentish Coomaraswamy views on art, whose theory based on the “Cosmos” and “Rasa,” as Anand suggested in the third Preface. The book was written to bring out, as Anand noted in the second Preface, the difference between the East and West with regards to the aesthetic-arts, thus, the “rediscovery of India has begun... to assume the character of a minor renaissance” (9). Totally opposing the PWA manifesto, the book clearly reflected the metaphysical world where “messenger tells Krishna that Radha is offended with him” or “Krishna paining on the feet of Radha” same as the life “interpreted by religion and philosophy” (25). In other words, it followed the conception of art for art’s sake over social-realism. Anand also talked about God, the Cosmic Soul, the Higher Self of man, as mentioned in the chapters, “The Veda” (33), “Buddhism” (44), “Jainism” (50), “Puranas” (59), “Classical Sanskrit Literature” (61), “Philosophical System” (65), “Brahmanical Theism” (69), and the “Tantra” (76). In the text, Anand “connected with temple” (28) but he came in strong defense of it as a “Lacuna” which will fill the empty space between religion, art and aesthetic. The motif of Anand, behind the text, was “the search for beauty” (15) so that the people of the world could come together to celebrate the spirit of tolerance, understanding, sympathy and good will. The confusion of the analytical mind regarding the religious and aesthetic often lead people only towards failure and due to ignorance they pay heed only to the “stupid preferences.” In this way “a conservative attempt has been made to relate the Hindu view of art to its counterparts in Western systems of thought” (13). Anand wanted to prove that the Hindu and Buddhist tradition was deeply metaphysical in the past. Here, nowhere, Anand was projecting the progressive view of PWA as mentioned by him in the socialist manifesto.

In the theory of PWA, Anand was not been able to avoid the gravitational pull of known force of the classical literature. By branding the text as “the religio-philosophical hypothesis,” (8) Anand, like Coomaraswamy, had desired a roaring comeback in Indian aestheticism but the book is still far away from expected crescendo as there was nothing new in the book—it was not more than old wine in a new bottle. But Anand thinks that the book

portrayed “the basic hypothesis about the deep inner connection between aesthetic and spiritual values in India, and, indeed, in the whole of Asia, was sustained right until the European impact of the eighteenth century” (HVA 12). If we examine it through the old socialist manifesto or the PWA’s radical premise, once again, Anand had chosen a progressive suicide in publishing this text. Throughout the book, being a confused progressive, Anand knocked exclusively on the door of traditional Vedas and Indian conventional history. Anand says:

I hope, however, that this essay can help students to study the Indian heritage, properly, as Coomaraswamy insisted, from the totality of the philosophical, religious and social background from which it was produced and not merely from the point of view of ‘significant form or other limited classical, medieval and other periodic point of view or from the point of various Western aesthetic or of pragmatic John Dewey, the formalist, Clive Bells significant form;’ or Le Corbusier’s mechanical functionalism (HVA 10).

It could be reviewed as a delirious brawl between the progressive Anand and the artist Anand, who did not run away from the battle like a scared rat but took the fight to an uphill battle-place.

Like Stalin (who is critically presented in *Animal Farm*, wherein the rules changed automatically), Anand too changed the manifesto’s aim but by “claiming to be the inheritors of the best traditions of Indian civilization,” (Manifesto 6) he published this book because of his “growing interest in Indian art ideals, both in our country and abroad” (9) and in order to counter the Europeans (Roger Fry, Laurence Binyon, Codrington) beliefs that “the Hindus did not evolve a coherent system of aesthetics” as our “plastic arts of sculpture and painting were considered to be purposive arts in the service of faith” (9). In India, as the European vigorously debated, “stone image was used for ritualistic worship and the painting was employed both for concentration of the mind and prayer and extension of consciousness, as well as for extrovert illustration of the myths and legends of the gods and goddesses (mythical exaltations of nature energies and of heroic men and women), for popular worship” (HVA 9). Laurence Binyon canvassed this truth about the Indian artists as per the European viewpoint:

Probably to the artists the religious import seemed everything: their conscious endeavour was concentrated upon that. Design, colour, composition, all the purely

aesthetic elements in their work, were left to the more intuitive activities of the mind. From this, I think, comes the happiness of their art; it is not self conscious; it evolves difficult problems not be scientifically working out a theory but simply—*ambulando* (19-20).

After the Indian Renaissance, the importance of art begun to flourish with the painter Raja Ram and “painting as a fine art came to be accepted as the expression of the individual artist” (9) but still “the ladies and gentlemen of the court prayed to the gods for inspiration” (9). With this book, a new world was taking shape with solid understanding of the trajectory of Indian aesthetic arts. Anand’s base was Coomaraswamy’s two essays (“Hindu View of Art: Historical” and “Hindu View of Art: Theory of Beauty”) published in *Dance of Shiva* (1918). This new world was not following the old religious phenomenon of art as it was fully aesthetic also longed for its interconnectedness with the European art and aesthetic as a whole. Anand tries to unite the two particles, East and West, divided by the geographical, topographical or ideological boundaries. This struggle of mingling fanned the artistic flames of simmering rage against the control of British hegemony over art and aesthetic and also against revisionism in India. Thus, the book is written to define “the differences between the traditions of East and West in regard to the approach to aesthetics” (9) and Anand holds the view that “In India beauty was the aesthetic aspect of the Transcendent spirit.... In the West, especially after the Italian Renaissance of the 15th century, Beauty tended to be considered as an autonomous emotion evolved by compositions in colour, line and form” (9). He was offering a new dimension to the world to look at the Indian art, as he continuously tried to prove the Western thought as “wrong.” This art work is an example of changing progressive attitude wherein an “alternative” way of projecting was suggested to the new but serious readers. Herein, Anand highlighted the difference between Indian and European arts affected by human attitudes, “Space in India was then cosmic, beyond understanding, to be realised by alliance with its vital energies. In Europe after the Renaissance, it was to be conquered, occupied, exploited” (9). Kenneth de Burgh Codrington, a Western critic, thinks that the Hindu:

Indian thought does not isolate objects by aesthetic analysis or any other analytical process. The associations of a piece of sculpture or a whole temple and the associations of the person brought into contact with it both contribute to the state of mind from which the sense of values is derived. Among the associations of a piece of sculpture or

temple, which, so to speak, wait upon the mind, its subject or dedication and its repute as a place sanctity, its legends or miracles, and the thousands of pieces of money that have been paid to bring it into being, all have import. It flows that devotion can drive value from any chance stone or redubbed rock (19).

Here, Codrington was defining the Indian aesthetic in the mode of spiritual blindness as Indians were following religion blindly like a calf to cow. They do not prefer any rational or scientific notion which was at the base of Marxism. “This confusion between the religious and aesthetic, so obvious to the analytical mind, is not a matter of failure to arrive at distinctions, but if a definite refusal to admit of distinctions in the sum of reactions that is human life, in which qualities are held to exist as stupid preferences and intensity alone is satisfying” (Codrington 20). Indian art, in this flow, was equal “to the perception of intelligible non-conceptual form” (HVA 10). Here, Anand was trying to save Indian art from the influence of Europe which “have become part of our culture, through the preference of modern secular democracy in which the growth of the individual is important. In view of the conflicts between the demands of tradition and the compulsion, of modernity, I have worked out, in my writings, some hypothesis for a humanist aesthetic” (HVA 10). With its perversions and deformities, rediscovery of Indian art had begun under the leadership of Anand and “under the impulse of Indian emancipation, to assume the character of a minor renaissance and new spurts of activity are visible in the field of Indian art discussion” (12). Themes were weak and did not possess any revolutionary fervour which Lenin demanded but Anand’s aesthetic was most encompassing, radical, profound, and epoch-making as it was breaking the bridge of European set of artistic laws. In his artistic career, Anand was defeated in some “battles” (artist, editor, architect and others) and from some others combats he “withdraw” (foreign friends, socialism, Marxism, Gandhism) but he never ran away from the encounter, as he was continually fighting like a wounded tiger with the redness/greenness of the West and peacefulness of the East. All was true but here too, accurately enough, ideological weakness proved to be Achilles heel of Anand, who was struggling between novelist and artist. The main object of the book was to bring to the stage the nature of “Indian aesthetic ideal” (12) as nothing as appeared since Coomaraswamy.

Anand was the first writer who wrote about the downtrodden, outcastes and deprived section of the society by following the progressive manifesto and similarly like a radical painter/artist, he thinks that “there is no record of any concrete appreciation of a work of

plastic or pictorial expression in Indian literature throughout the ancient and medieval periods, until the Mughals” (HVA 9). He understand the need of the day and “for the demonstration of India’s exalted tradition in arts, in the wake of Indian national resurgence, the nomenclature of poetics was invoked and put forward as a full fledged aesthetic theory for the arts. Coomaraswamy, however, corrected the superficial tendency of posting a substitute theory of aesthetics, where none existed to match various western systems of aesthetic, by drawing attention to the aesthetic ideals implicit in Hindu religion and philosophy” (9). In writing this book Anand diverted the attention of critics, who were continuously putting him in the category of “communist,” and, with this, he got another chance to polarize his fresh views, which are recorded in MARG. The *nayak*, (hero) of his books are substituted with sculptures and pictures, the homes with temples, where the gods were living. With his MARG career, Anand brushed the communist carpet and put art into the centre. As a progressive, he was trying to inherit Indian culture through creative action and by resisting against the British set standards of the art.

“Revisionism” or “alteration” is the very core of Marxism-Leninism and by refuting the traditional laws through collaborations and by rejecting the historical/ religious lessons. Here, as a champion, Anand makes a peaceful transition from “radical socialist” to a “peaceful artist” by favouring peaceful transition over bloody revolution. He sticks to the old phrase “pen is mightier than sword.” Objectively, the Marxist word “revolution” meets its tragic end and the new word “peace” was baptized. In fact, Anand’s moving away from the socialist theme was not a revolution but a transition or revisionism from the old Marxist standards. The critics, especially Leftist Bengali Branch in 1949, were howling against Anand and if they were right, then he was a fully radical and progressive bohemian aesthetic, who was revising the artistic way of looking at Indian subjects and objects with our own views, not from the imported analysis of Russia like the Leftist or more openly, of Europe.

Annihilation of Caste: An Undelivered Speech (edited book, 1990)

Untouchability was one of many themes of Anand, not only in *Untouchable* and *The Road* but also in the three short-stories (“The Dreamer,” “The Sinful Life and Death of Tinkori,” and “The Man who wanted to change his Name”) in the collection entitled *Between Tears and Laughter* (1945). Bakha and Bhikhu of the novels were replaced by Kania in the first, Tinkori in the next story and Gautama in the final story. He also edited Ambedkar’s *Annihilation of Caste: An Undelivered Speech* with Preface and bio-data of Ambedkar.

Anand termed it as “the *Geeta* of the untouchables” (9) or “little *Bible*, a new testament of the former untouchables” (10). He wrote “the seed of revolt sown by him have flowered in the recognition by the Parliament of our free India” (7). In the Preface, Anand talked about those “moments in history which taken ‘at the tide’ may push men and women forward from the very sweep of the currents of thought and action released by the onrush of previous waves” (7). Anand accepted the fact, in this epical book, how he was criticized by Ambedkar “for accepting Gandhiji in the role of liberator of untouchables, in spite of the Mahatma’s allegiance to Hindu Varnashrma.” Anand confessed, how he:

accepted his rebuke and did urge with the Mahatma, who justified his stand by asserting the need of unity of people of all persuasion in the interest of the political struggle against British Imperialist attempts to divide Indian through separate electorates. In fact, so strongly he believe in the unity of all sections of Indians that he ‘fasted unto death’ against the proposal of separate electorates for the scheduled caste out forward by then Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald (9-10).

Here, a changed Anand was visible on the literary scene who was indirectly rejecting Gandhian notion of progress and giving air to Ambedkar’s views of the establishment of Egalitarian society.

With *Untouchable*, *Between Tears and Laughter* and *The Road* what was Anand willing to prove? Was he fighting only for the rights of untouchables in India and their marginal status in education, life-style and everything? From 1935 to 1990, Anand was combating skirmishing with his writings for the rights of Dalits from the elite’s point of view but he was not ready to take any direct “responsibility.” Gandhi was trying to convert India into a country made from within by the inner consciousness of people, like the civilizations of Europe, America, Japan and Singapore, wherein societies are constructed on the basis of lots of hard-work and discipline, not just a politics of agitation and demand. Someone who is seen as an Indian in America might be considered as a Non-Resident Indian (NRI) in India, subaltern in Australia, Diaspora in Europe or marginal in African continent and totally different in the countries like China, Japan and Russia. Hence, the Eurocentric theory of experience is not suitable for the cultures like India, China, Africa as all of the European theories are grounded on the critique of universality: Lenin (socialism), Marx (Class struggle), Gramsci (hegemony)—because the need of “their” were different than “ours.” With his changing themes and theories, Anand was playing a mysterious game in which one has to

catch a Whale in the ocean with bare hands. In Anand's gallery of untouchable characters, every individual (Bakha, Munoo, Gangu, Bhikhu, Lalu and even Gauri) craves for individuality but they forgets its/their Objective. These stereotype characters were ready to create but if something wrong happened then Anand or characters are not ready to take responsibility. Anand, too, was also following his characters by changing his ideologies from time to time and the problem arises as everyone has a birthplace, due to which, a new attitude arises, that is individuality or self-hood. In India, identity of everyone is based on the ethics which are implemented by high classes on the lowers to enjoy the power. India achieved the target of its independence in 1947 and thereafter the Constitution for equality was drafted in 1950. Untouchability Abolition Act, 1955, was passed but the problem of untouchability still exists (after 67 years of Independence) and the reason is that the people are not ready to change the orthodoxical ethical set by the "olds." Socialism is achieved in India (in 1947) but the "ethical socialism" is yet to come. Anand, as a socialist, was writing to achieve this level but somehow he failed. By using the paradigm of "History 1" (rich) and "History 2" (poor) of Dipesh Chakrabarty, Anand tried to show, how H2 broadcast the image of H1 and how H2 countered them? Why was there infinite difference between H1 and H2 of India? The simple answer could be the "Family." Hence, the cultural problems occurred in securing the equality between H2 and H1. The question emerged, how was Anand's progress received by the untouchables and the government or the critics? When a H1 writer, like Anand, writes about H2 section of society under the shadow of humanitarian aspects then his path often filled by the thorn of criticism. In Anand's case, he was criticized by his own class and was also not accepted by the under-privileged section of the society. In Indian scenario from 1940s to 2004, he emerged as a "dreamer" of the collection *Between Tears and Laughter*, who wanted that the rights must be offered to all without any ill-will of higher and lower. Though this demand equally matched with the progressive theory but Anand still had to travel a lot to achieve the label of progress, thus, for Anand, in the old phrase, *Dilli abhi dur hai* (result will come late). None of Anand's later untouchable themes (*Between Tears and Laughter; The Road; Annihilation of Caste*) were comparable to the crescendo of the literary success achieved by the symphony of *Untouchable* but despite the fact, he was among the earliest musicians playing the historical trumpet, the sound of which is now audible to the ears of the newer generations.

Anand had keenest eyes and sensitive nose on the historical, socio-cultural as well as against the political aroma of the forties and on the base of direct experience as a first person,

he tries to build a, as recorded by him in *Roots and Flowers*, ‘kind of bridge... symbolically, [on] the two worlds of the Ganga and the Thames’ (15). Under the guidance of Anand, the bud of progress sprout out fully but he was put aside due the critical orthodoxies regarding the progressive historiography. Disdaining the fact, Anand moved away from the manifesto’s concept of “radical” (6), hence, less kindness is paid to his revolutionary cries which were in the form of non-fiction, in both: Britain and India (before and after) independence. Like his short-stories and non-fiction writings, MARG never achieved any critical insight and still was lying in wilderness where it has been waiting for the prophet to come and enlighten the hidden way of MARG’s critics. Anand had, if we follow the comment of Nasta, “rarely [been] investigated as a multi-voiced polymath who, by strategically straddling the discourse of numerous different and often competing political constituencies, could re-inflict thinking on the cultural histories of both India and Britain” (142). Thus, a hunt to establish Anand as a progressive or radical or as a writer of resistance in Indian society must be started in a broad way, if one wants to pay homage to this progressive *messiah* (prophet) of the oppressed.

Conversations in Bloomsbury

Different sea and ships of culture had been navigated by Anand during his stay in England as a novelist, as a war soldier during the Second World War and finally as an artist and editor in India which are recorded in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*. Like Alexander Pope, he was a sole proprietor of commenting on the ill-wills and sufferings of the “lesser breeds” (as Rudyard Kipling called them) caused by the Imperial powers or the socio-religio taxonomies of one community over the other. “The writers of the Bloomsbury,” articulated Anand, were “humane people” who belonged to the middle section and simultaneously had “obsessive concern with the lower strata of society in the novels” but in reality, “they remained enclosed in their precious world” (viii). The conversations took place, mostly, in Virginia Woolf’s drawing room, London pubs, British Museum and the Hogarth Press and during the conversation “there was much questioning of the ‘ivory tower’ attitude of the Victorians, the Edwardians and the Georgians” (viii). Though Anand was at the centre of Bloomsbury yet he had the feelings of “as though I [Anand] was inferior and others were superior,” (12) hence, there was an “undeclared ban on the political talk” (ix) of Anand. What did the “political talk” refer to here? Did it relate Anand to India or the British? The political talk could be the views of other Bloomsbury associates towards India and the superiority of the British. The talk points it’s finger towards the statements of Orwell (till 1942) and Eliot

who were not in favour of India's freedom and believed that Indians should "leave government to the British empiricists" (16) and the latter moves one step beyond by declaring Gandhi as "anarchist" (16). The BBC pamphlet of 1944 entitled "Indian and the Four Freedoms" could be its perfect example. In Anand's conversations about the Bloomsbury members, especially Eliot, Paranjape writes, "does not really have a fair chance" (CIB 20). He added, Eliot is seen as "conservative" and "arrogant imperialist" by Anand while comparing the attitude of Europe and India. In this sense, what could be progressive in this critical work?

The conversation, as Anand stated, is totally based on memory as there were no written record of it, hence, the writer called it a "confessional-dairy-journal-novel about my self-search" (ix). Paranjape questioned, "Should we 'accept' at face value what Anand records as 'reliable?'" Though Anand gave the best possible memory yet the views could be taken as one sided. He only talked about or remembers those points which suit the arguments from his point of view, "I then recorded some of my talks with these writers which I have since revised" for publication. Due to this reason, Paranjape asserts, "The Indian students of English literature instantly identifies with Anand's discomfiture" (Paranjape, CIB 19). Despite this weakness, he has seen this book as "authentic" (Paranjape, CIB 20) piece of information and added, "Anand's entire project becomes doubly meaningful, not simply as a personal encounter between a major Indian writer and the greatest English poet [Eliot] of his time, but as a political act, struggle of two cultures, between colonized and the colonizer" (Paranjape, CIB 19). But, true or not, Anand, as the reviewer, Shyam M. Asnani, of *Conversations in Bloomsbury* chalked out:

with his characteristic energy he [Anand] is actively engaged in the task of reconstructing a new India as cultural adviser to the Prime Minister [at the age of seventy seven] and as the moving spirit behind several national and international cultural associations, university seminars and conferences... he is active in helping the rural populace build roads, open new schools and raise standards of hygiene (348).

Everything here could be treated on the line of "progressive," as Anand's handwritten manifesto stated. "Anand's project," asserted Paranjape, "thus, becomes one to capture the West through Eliot" (CIB 18). Now the subcutaneous layers of mind ask, what was special in *Conversations in Bloomsbury*.

The *Conversations in Bloomsbury* could be seen as tug of war, on one side, when Bonamy Dobree termed Henry James as “slightly boorish” (6) and called Joyce “arrogant” (9) and for him and Eliot was a “prig” (4). For Dobree, Gandhi was “Mickey Mouse” (4) but Anand was defending Indians, against the severe criticism of Eliot. Dobree and others criticized Indians by calling them “frank and truthful,” whereas, Gandhi was compared to the Caliban of William Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. Like Rushdie’s *Imaginary Homlands*, Anand too had a dream to “open the universe a little more” (21) which was sometime visible but like a fuse bulb or a confused progressive.

As a progressive, Anand was a harbinger of change who brought, as a father of modernism, freedom of thought, action, speech, expression, irony of the situation, scepticism, experiment with ideology, rural-urban landscapes with realistic imagery, candidness in theme, die-hard quest for identity with a break from the past and criticism of the present. For Paranjape, “Anand’s progress by comparing him with his state at the beginning of the encounter” (18) with Eliot could be easily established. “Here, Anand is completely penetrated by the dominance of the metropolis whose representative Eliot is” (19). At this stage, he was defending Indian thoughts and the ideologies of Buddha, Shankara and Gandhi against the oriental views of Eliot, for whom Buddha “lacked a center of gravity,” and Schopenhauer is “superior” (145) than Shankara, whereas, Gandhi was an “anarchist.” Anand attacked the European philosophers, particularly Schopenhauer, “a sad man who could not smile, while his Indian counterpart had a sunny temperament, and that while the Hindu found the world transient yet permanent, the German failed to connect himself with Being in the attempt at Becoming” (145). Like a true Indian radical representative, Anand was not ready to accept Eliot’s notion of Schopenhauer’s superiority over Shankara, who, as Anand noted, “had rescued the Hindu faith from ritualism...and restored some purity” (145). Anand, an Indian, was asserting that “Schopenhauer probably did not know about the positive side of Shankara’s gospel” (145). By resisting against Western doctrines in general and Eliot in particular, the falcon of Anand’s progress was beating its wings in the air for its maiden tropical flight across the horizons of Europe with the thought “nothing was simple to us. We embraced all life in our myths of God,” (147) without giving any stress to our consciousness in asking “P’s and Q’s” about them but, “‘the magical Hindu mind is always cloudy’ said Eliot. ‘Unclear!’” (147). Thus, Anand emerged as a semi-god or an arch-angel of a modern Indian aesthetic or bohemian for whom a temple could be dedicated. Secular and materialist culture in Anand was at brawl with each other but, the only motto, of both, was to establish a

democratic society, wherein oppressor and oppressed could live easily without exploiting each other.

The nationalism, it seemed, played havoc in Anand's mind while writing this text, as he quoted Nikhil, who remarked, "ignorant buffoon Macaulay consigned all our literature to the dustbin" (5). Whether Eliot, Dobree, Leonard and Virginia Woolf, John Maynard Keynes, John Middleton Murry, Bell, Read, Arthur Waley, Forster, Beryl de Zoete, Huxley, Laurence Binyon or others Bloomsbury personalities, they could not pass the European ideology of the fictional characters of Anand, who projected them as a first person narrator who had seen the world with Indian eyes. Hence, the Bloomsbury Writers' were checked through the acid test of Europeanism. Anand's relation with them could be equated with the tea scene in *Coolie*, which ended in a great fiasco. The final judgment came: Anand was neither accepted as a Bloomsbury member nor as a progressive writer, or in the words of Paranjape, he was "doubly marginal" not only lower in "literary hierarchies" than Bloomsbury members but also "racially, culturally and socially inferior" (CIB 18). In this way, Anand's pen took all the pains to define the differences phases, colours and aspects of Indian life and culture especially in the second career, followed by the first.

Following the progressive manifesto, Anand projected the resistance of an ordinary Indian in London by showing his anger and the "spirit of reaction" against the superior races. He radically challenged the "old beliefs, social and political institutions" which were "still operative" in England due to their education, science and colonial authority. In *Conversations in Bloomsbury*, Anand did not try to present Indian mysticism, spiritualism and idealism which were practiced by Coomaraswamy or Tagore as he desired the "a banal" of "perverse ideology." Through the book, Anand was, symbolically speaking, acknowledging the "feudalism and of acute misery and degradation for the Indian people as a whole," especially in the colonial era. The book, following the manifesto, is "register[ing] the actualities of" Anand's life and, "as well as lead us to the future" because herein he "criticize ruthlessly, in its political, economic and cultural aspects [of the West], the spirit of reaction [shaping] in our country." If the manifesto is the application of "progress" then on the basis of it, the book was dealing "with the basic problems of our existence" during that time and highlighting particularly the "social backwardness and political subjugation, so that it may help us to understand these problems and through such understanding help us to act" (Manifesto 6-8). Anand was doing and mentioning the same in this silent anthem of resistance. Thus, as per

the resolution of the manifesto, this conversational book could be put into the category of “literature of a progressive nature” which was result of a fight against a particular “cultural reaction” so that “social regeneration” could take a new shape.

The modern critics, as noted by Nasta, are “negotiating” a new world order designed by Anand, one of the leading Indian “public intellectual at the Heart of Empire” (140) during the 1940s and, later, projecting the Indian arts and eros on the International scale. His role in non-fiction critical works (*Conversations in Bloomsbury*, *Roots and Flowers*, *Is there a Contemporary Indian Civilization*, *Culture and Vulgarity in the Media*) is of a qualified critic but these are not looked upon with equal care as the novels. These works are highly important in understating the shift and realities of the existing era with cultural process and progress of that time, especially from Anand’s angle. The critical varieties of these texts could serve as a productive force for the development of Anand’s career. These non-fictional texts define all the socio-political aspects of India in the past which runs through the background of his novels.

II

Progress in Novels

From the 1940s till 2004, Anand sailed the boat against the tumultuous waters of the literary river holding onto his application of being a progressive writer but all scrutinize were in fiasco when encountered by the half-conscious critics. After his return to India, as he stated in the introduction to Devendra Satyarthi’s *Meet My People*, “we know that large volumes of water have flowed down the Ganges, and that there is change, and that the inner change is more integral. And we can dismiss those who still say that human nature is unchangeable as idiots or morons whose business in life is to remain self-involved, to prevent words or to bluff the voters” (33). On the basis of this fact, Anand, as noted in the novel *The Big Heart*, was the only writer who “spread the balm of pity over the rotting flesh of the whole of *Hindustan*” (67). He was totally against the religious people by disdaining the notion, “religion commands us to believe,” as Rousseau asserted in *The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* “that men, having been drawn by God himself out of a state of nature, are unequal because it is his pleasure they should be so” (2). In the socio-cultural novels, Anand fully reflected social realism or socialism including the colouring of Marxism or democracy with

the new humanism of Gandhism but he was frequently termed as tyro, leftist, anarchist or propagandist by the literary mafias.

The question which begs an answer is: why Anand's works after 1946 were unsuccessful? Was his return to India responsible? Was his private career responsible? In the view of Hyden Moore Williams, "With the disappearance of the British "enemy" Anand appears to have been left without a subject" (Cowasjee, SMF 153). The Leftist critics cried, if Anand was a Marxist, he must criticize the bourgeoisie "Brown" government which replaced the colonial "White" government. He must become a ferocious opponent of it by accusing it in a similar tone as he did with the *Angreji Hukumat* but he did not choose this weapon against Nehru. What was the reason? The answer could be: after the declaration of Anand as a "decadent" by the Bombay PWA, he came closer to the Congress Party. After Independence, Nehru gave him the uncrowned job of involvement in the cultural life of India, as a result, he had been seen mostly in visiting the International conferences abroad and represented India in the same. After his close association with Nehru, it became harder and harder for Anand to criticize the newly formed Indian government. In this sense, the Congress turned enemy in their favour. It seemed, Vibhishana (Anand) was again in the favour of Rama (Nehru) by leaving Ravana (the PWA or the CPI in loose sense). It was difficult for Anand to put the critical guns on Nehru's policies without offering him a chance to improve which, apparently, was his biggest mistake as a novelist of the downtrodden, hence, his post independence career was not more than a failure. By doing this, Anand was in the rat's race. Consequently, like the rat on the turning wheel, he remained at the same place as no new stone was turned by him. With his invisible political career, Anand became powerful but "A friend in power is a friend lost" (phrase of Henry Adam) and for Anand, this friend was PWA or Zaheer and other progressive writers both in India and abroad. By means of changing career, Anand and Nehru became strong but the PWA (and the CPI indirectly) lost one of their strongest writers, whom they were praising as a progressive since 1935.

Anand sailed along with Robert Frost's phrase "constellations of intentions" (Brower viii) in the texture of his novels which allowed him to follow the tradition of Dostoevsky or Melville in order to telescope the psychology of his "caricature" (term of Forster) characters. His novels, simultaneously, were a comment on those who reject mankind for the pursuit of aristocratic life. The artistic butterfly of Anand, with each novel, exfoliated into beauty by coming out of critical chrysalis and forced to the world to put finger under their teeth at the

underprivileged condition of the Indian downtrodden and workers. Whatever be the charge of the literary lawyers against Anand's ephemeral life as a novelist in India, he became scented with MARG without topical, burning questions and without narcissism.

Coolie

Anand exposed the greedy wolf of capitalistic-profit-making creed by introducing the child labour behind the domestic wall as well as in the factories of metro cities like Bombay. He bared the shallowness of British hegemony. He was writing "in a country which abounded with the largest unemployed intelligentsia in the world" (Apology 21). Thus, Anand had to confront many hard battles. He witnessed the poison of unequal social dynamism and vomited it out in the texture of his novels. In one of such cases, the untouchability had/has been related to the jumble of caste system since then (to now). Anand showed some revolutionary fervour while declaring, "I am going to write Kipling's *Kim*... from the opposite point of view" (CiB 50) and the result was *Coolie*. It looked like the hell had been let loose on Munoo when he was forced to "imagine that the East is menacing the West" (ITaCC 5). *Coolie*, as reviewed by Dewsbury, based on the "evils of exploration and graft" (208) but in the novel, for Peter Burra, "The whole is a terribly vivid panorama which is propagandist only in the sense that any frank statement of such facts is bound to appeal for their correction" (30). Here, Anand was totally rejecting the oriental way of looking at the Indian problems and projected the real and authentic picture of 1930s Indian life.

The defining issue of *Coolie* had been the enigma, hope, confusion and ambiguity for the progress, and at the same time, centered on the fifteen years old Munoo, born out of capitalism and colonialism, whom Anand introduced as followed:

I was called Munoo at Bilaspur, Mundu at Sham Nagar.... My father died and my mother died too. My uncle Daya Ram, who is a *chaprasi* in the office of the Bank of Sham Nagar, got me a job as a servant in the house of a babu. Yesterday the Babu beat me and I have run away.... (63).

Thus, the words "I am an orphan" could be taken as the prelude of Munoo, an uncivilized brute, with a lack of self-consciousness came from the rustic village of Kangra Hills (Punjab) as a servant who, "did not know where to begin and how to set about doing things in this house" (C 16). Anand, depicted the miserable existence of coolie's life, directed his satire at

the society through the mouthpiece of Munoo but what was the notion of progress conceived by the novel?

Coolie had totally diverse progress embarked by way of a “careless” fifth class teenager of fourteen years, Munoo, grazing the cattle and hiding at the back of a tree, whose thrust of leadership degrades him into a “thief.” Thus, after going through the role of a rough, thief, servant and monkey, he finally became a “domestic slave.” Munoo “wished he could somehow disappear from the world” (17) because “The devil is after us,” as Nehru declared, “and we have to progress rapidly. It is not a question of some people, or a few individuals progressing, but of 360 million people progressing and our taking them along with” (ITaCC 127). If Munoo was an ambassador of progress, then his uncle, Daya Ram, the Chaprasi of Imperial Bank of India, stood for pseudo-progress by the promise of a pair of shoes to “barefoot” but he did not allow him the cart-ride due to his “false-pride of red-coat” that was the sign “of the position he occupied in the service of *Angrezi Sarkar*” (5). Everything in those days filled with the fake promise of aristocratic life which the lower people could only dream.

If Upton Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, one of the most reformatory and progressive American work at the beginning of twentieth century, canvassed a grim portrait of “death in life” (phrase of T.S. Eliot) of American meat-packing factory workers, so did Anand’s *Coolie* pictured the life of workers in a Bombay factory but, on the whole, it could be termed as the “biography of Indian factories” set up by the colonial government under the impact of the profit making policy. Like Sinclair’s *The Jungle*, Anand’s *Coolie* had been a fictionalized account of Bombay Factory, Sir George White Cotton Mill. The coolie of title was none other than Munoo, who, like the immigrants of *The Jungle*, flew to the charms of Bombay (by train) with the hope for a better future. He was elected by Chimta Saheb as a worker in factory. Soon an announcement was made about company’s loss and some workers, like Ratan Singh, were let off. As per the new notice, “there will be no work for the fourth week in every month” (223). The theory of Frantz Fanon fully applicable as “the big Sahib’s greed that is responsible for the order” (228) because “the company’s interest not only in this mill, but in the Calcutta Jute Mill and Madaras Mines, and to guard against any loss to shareholders” (225). After this dying note, the coolies were getting more and more restive, socialist and were ready to strike to achieve their goals and in the end, the event of a “Strike” takes place. In case of events, Anand’s text clearly reflected the socialist concept of progress,

which the PWA wanted to achieve. Some progressive questions were left unanswered: did the strike get any success? What happened with the workers? What were the conditions and work timing of the factory? How the workers lived and ate during the lunch?

As a true progressive with a Marxist vision, Anand brought out all the answer of the above asked question. The working conditions were terrible. There were lots of workers suffering from disease while some had lost their limbs in machines as the case of Hari's son. For the coolies, the job was important neither food nor even their children as after the accident Hari cried, "I will lose my job now" (189). Here the job was:

The only privilege left to them; the privilege of work—a privilege, indeed, because it meant wages, whereas its withdrawal mean starvation! They are willing to do anything, so long as they could have their regular pay, even with a little cut for damaged cloth and for the foreman's commission and the interest of debts, so as they could have enough pay the landlord and to buy rice and lentils for the month (228).

Apart from this, everyone afraid about the doomsday, i.e., returning to the job after weekend because, "On Monday morning they faced death again. And, as if the monster of death were some visible power which throttled them as soon as they set out to work, they walked to the factory in a kind of hypnotized status of paralysis, in a state of apathy and torpor which made the masks of their faces assume the sinister horror of unexpressed pain" (216). The description of Anand about a coolie was more horrifying as he was "an emaciated man" of "the bones" or only the "skeleton" which was "locked in a paralytic know." The pathetic description of this kind was visible only in the Victorian novels of Charles Dickens and Anand just takes his legacy one step beyond the boundaries. At some steps, Anand overpowers Dickens, especially in the ending of his novels. Each of Dickensian plot have an happy ending, i.e., in *Oliver Twist*, the child named Twist restored to the wealthy family; in *David Copperfield*, too, Copperfield became rich by the climax; *A Tale of Two Cities* also have positive ending and many other in the list have the same positive line of theory but in Anand's case the hero appears in a condition worse than in the myth of Sisyphus.

Like Sinclair's work, *Coolie* too, no compensation existed for injured workers of the factory as the employer had no responsibility towards the coolies working for them on their machines. The last scene of novel also offered the hideous picture of Munoo coughing constantly due to tuberculosis and later spitting puff of blood on the ground and dying in the

arms of Mohan. Similar to *The Jungle*, after the factory work, the workers used unhygienic huts and there was hardly water for them. The accesses to toilets were limited and the workers had to walk in order to take bath or other morning activities. In the factory, there was no any place called lunchrooms, in the lack of it, the workers had to eat where they worked. *Coolie* exposed the appalling working conditions of 1940s factory but no action was taken to improve the lot of employees except the ban on book as it was hurting the sentiment of British government. Like *The Jungle*, *Coolie* reflected those ugly realities in which animals refused to live. In this dour atmosphere, Munoo had suffered a chain of heart-wrenching misfortunes and after the riot, he accidentally get struck with the car of Mrs. Mainwaring, who according to the reviewer Dower, was “not a vicious caricature of Eurasian womanhood, but a subtle comment on the prejudice and religion which has made the Eurasian community what it is” (17). Before his accident, as similar to the background of *The Jungle*, Munoo too meet a socialist leader Sudha, he had listened and agreed with her speech and decided to join the “Union” (All India Trade Union Federation or Red Flag Union). Forsooth, like Jurgis Rudkus, the hero of *The Jungle*, Munoo too got inspired with the Socialism but unlike *The Jungle*, the ending of *Coolie* was not a positive one, here, Munoo died a tragic death without any heroic gesture.

The novels showed other young boys like Gopal Das, Varma, Lehnu, Bonga, Maharaj, Tulsi between the age of fourteen to eighteen who were treated not better than the street dogs. The novel was written as a reply to The Factory Act of 1933, which did not allow the children to work without the written consent of their parents or guardian but no form of consent has been signed by the parents in Anand’s text. As a true progressive, like Sinclair, Anand too brought out the hidden cockroach of colonial policy out of the hole. The lack of food, unending works made the situation miserable for Munoo as, “He rose early at dawn before he had had his full sleep out, having gone to bed long after midnight. He descended to work in the factory, tired, heavy-lidded, hot and limp, as if all the strength had gone out of his body and left him a spineless ghost of his former self” (89). The atmosphere of factory:

seemed to awkward and dangerous to descend into the strange, dark, airless outhouse of the factory.... patches of cow dung or dirt or mould plastered the wall or where the shoot hung in slimy black clots and the bats clung like crystals in a cave... It seemed the wind of the heavens never visited this world, and sun never entered it (67-69).

Munoo was jammed in a labyrinth as he could neither go forward nor find his way back to home, thus, he had to accept this conscientiousness without any choice of will or security by starting on this new job. The description of Bombay was even worse as:

There were corpses and corpses all along the pavement. If the half-dead are company he was not alone. But he felt a dread steal through him, the dread of sleep, uncanny fear of bodies in abeyance whose souls might suddenly do anything, begin to snore, open their bloodshot eyes for a second, grunt groan, moan, or lie still in a ghastly, absolute stillness (165).

The Bombay of 1940s became a place where men more afraid not of the ghost but of men who were beaten by the “dumb burden of self-consciousness” (114) and “they seemed peopled by swarms of men and women, layers upon layers, in a sort of vertical overcrowding, literally in the top of each other” (168). The grim atmosphere of a morning was enough to tell the present, past and future of coolies:

Those who were not awoken by the noise of an asthmatic or consumptive cough, by the sharp, thunderous spurts of spitting, or by the loud and vehement blowing of noses, or by the multifarious names of God, were awakened by the arm of the law which, baton in hand, came to clear the pavements (167).

Here “asthmatic or consumptive cough” or “spurts of spitting” were the future cause of TB, whereas, the God and Law stands for the Present which suggested the grim past of lives of coolies in 1940s.

Munoo became sensitive to the power not of *Angreji Sarkar* but of the biggest cotton mill of India and at this crucial point, “he felt crushed and alone in his heart and wanted to get up and run away, run like mad across the hills of Kangra, or the simple main street of Sham Nagar, or even into the confused but familiar world of Daulatpur” (171). But he preferred to stay here for a job at “fifteen rupees” monthly which he got by paying a commission to foreman, Jimmie Thomas/ Chimta Sahib, “on whose bounty the workmen depended or the security of jobs once they had got them” (175). After getting the job he went to a hut of:

Six feet tall and five feet wide... beam supporting it in the middle... not a window nor a chimney to let in the air and light and to eject the smoke. Munoo's dreams were shattered as he surveyed the gloom of the grave in which he stood (176).

In work, at least, he achieved progress but "For the progress of this swarm was slow, very slow," (183) as the working hours started at six and ends at five. By the end of the first day:

He was thrilled to realize that he had learnt his job.... It was simple and easy job. The machine seemed to do all the work. He was only moving a handle, while the machine was gathering up the thread and weaving it into a pattern of farther ahead (185-86).

Munoo realized in the beginning, the work with machines consume less time and energy but he was wrong. The real demon of industrialization was hidden behind the curtain which soon will be raised to him. After working on machine "that gyrated at twenty miles an hour" (187) for some time he was full of sweat "but he did not know how he could do so while his hands were engaged ... [as] ... many armed machine god was chuckling with laughter at the grim joke it had played upon him" (187). Herein, Anand turned his novels into, as the manifesto noted, "the vital organs which will register the actualities of life, as well as lead us to the future" (7). Everything could be taken for granted but what was the future of Anand's progress? What did he want to prove?

Anand did not follow Nietzsche's notion whether "God existed" or not but he kept on trying to reconcile the rational impetus with the madness of world which suffered because of the "lack of hope" for better future. In all the situations and solutions, Munoo quite resembled the myth of Sisyphus (the ultimate icon of coolie's condition):

The workman of today works everyday in his life at the same tasks, and his fate is no less absurd. But it is tragic only at the rare moments when it becomes conscious. Sisyphus, proletarian of the gods, powerless and rebellious, knows the whole extent of his wretched condition: it is what he thinks of during his descent. The lucidity that was to constitute his torture at the same time crowns his victory. There is no fate that can not be surmounted by scorn (Camus 121).

Like Sisyphus, the coolies, too, had to begin the work every day anew, moving on to the next day was a burden which was unceasing. Like the worker of the Chicago Factory or Brown's

slaughterhouse in *The Jungle*, in the Bombay Mill everyone was concerned with himself and “Munoo was becoming accustomed to the strange reticence that prevailed among the mill people, few of whom seemed anxious to know each other, though they lived and worked only a yard or two away” (196). It seemed modernism was hunting them and all became “aliens” to each other while breathing on the wasteland. In this dim atmosphere, he established kinship with a wrestler, Ratan, the true socialist revolutionary, who cared for his fellow persons and was ready to fight with his lords in the name of rights for the coolies. With the corporation of Ratan, Munoo “walked to the factory in a kind of hypnotized state of paralysis, in a state of apathy and torpor which made the masks of their faces assume the sinister horror of unexpressed pain” (216). Endless pain was the motif of Anand’s novels, especially *Coolie* which could be compared with the novels of Dickens.

Most of Anand’s critics calls the novel “neo-Dickinsian” or labelled Anand as “Pro-Dickens” but his plot revolved around the situation as he saw around him and this quality was more akin to the “Negative Capability” of John Keats. It was clearly reflected through the mouth of Sudha that if: “Stand up, then, stand up for your rights, you roofless wretches, stand up for justice! Stand up, you frightened fools! Stand up and fight!.... from tomorrow you go on strike and we will pay you to fight your battle with the employers” (233). Munoo had been over-worked, constantly abused and given only the most meager food, hardly enough to keep body and the soul together:

But he did not curse his destiny. Born to toil, the abundant energy of his body had so far overcome all his troubles. He had found that he was fairly happy when he had food every day. He was in love with life and thrilled to all the raptures of the senses. And he still regarded the trappings of civilization, black boots, watches, basket hats and clothes will all the romantic administration of the innocent child (239).

Munoo had to pay the cost of his life for his innocent lust for fashion, which proved, in the past, the workers had no place in colonial India.

Every novel, defining the status of downtrodden, has a standard hype which might be termed as defining, epoch-making, make-or-break, deciding the destiny of the nation. The readers were being addressed by Anand about the “idea of India” which was at stake. The novel had been a comment on “more money” (23) “money, you see, attracts money” (31) “the strong foundation of money” (36) “Money! Money, Money you want all the time,” (47)

“love for money” (49) or even more important than caste was, the division of rich and poor. This kind of society has no place for humanity as the civilization had died long time before the God of mercy was born. Herein, Munoo felt alone and isolated and died “watching the peaceful hills and valleys he had abandoned for the plains....” (Cowasjee, SMF 61). It proved the “underdog’s wits are powerless in the” (Cowasjee, SMF 61) society effected by “the “paraphernalia of sahib-hood” (190). Anand fully projected the socialist or Marxist ideology in this healthy socio-political novel. It described, as recorded by Dewsbury, “a realistic depiction of India,” (208) which could, true or not, brings some hope for the coolies next to come.

The socialist part of *The Jungle* was successful and brought some hopes for the workers but the socialist leaders in *Coolie*, like Omkar Nath, on one hand, were crazy after the peaceful ordeal with the bourgeoisie class instead of “strike” for the workers. To put in simple words, the leaders and the strike failed to add more colours to the pattern of novel. On the other hand, the second socialist, Saudha, a true “hero,” who gave air to the fire of strike to the coolies and they were ready to follow her. In the strike “a pack of lions were at war with the demoniac elephants” (193) which stands for “nationalistic demonstration [or] communist propaganda” (217). If Indians have their weapon, then colonists too had their own, stronger than the thoughts of Indians and they followed the oldest notion of “divide and rule.” A false rumour was spread about the kidnapping of a Hindu boy by Muslims. Hence, “riot” or “dirty war,” and everyone forgot about the strike and were killing each other in the name of religion. The scene became the slaughterhouse of Pandemonium “and death stalked the earth in the illusory forms of masses of darkness, like panting hordes rushing through time and space, convulsed, hysterical and fierce, like the hundred forms of Satan who hounded men to death” (238). It became a place where the smell of dead bodies filled the air so Munoo ran far away from this place: “He ran as if he were a rocket of fire going to be launched in the sea” (241) and landed at the shore of ocean but “He did not know where to go, what to do, and what his soul wanted” (243). C.D. Narasimhaiah complained that the novel should end here. At some place, the critic was right, if Munoo dies in Bombay riots than there left no room to declare it a “socialist” novel but Anand had another plan.

The progressive line of *Coolie* failed if compared with *The Jungle* wherein some rights were won by the workers with the help of socialistic party. Thus, no dispute about *Coolie* as Anand’s youthful romance with progressive theory of socialism and Marxism as he

was eager to change the world during the daytime but exchange ideas at night. The coolies pronounce in unison: due to the “big sahib’s greed” (228) coolies remained poor “niggers” (183) and they eternally “belong to suffering” (215). The principal interest of the English factory owners, at some stage in the colonial era, was not the welfare of the working class but cheap labourer like Munoo and all this prevented the workers from achieving their greatest dream. For Ambedkar, “So long as you do not achieve social liberty, whatever freedom is provided by the law is of no avail to you.” To achieve this aim, a strong hope must be the first requirement. Nietzsche noted down, “Hope is the evil of evils because it prolongs man’s torment.” Often, by gripping onto hope, one makes the suffering worse but Napoleon thought, “a leader is a dealer in hope” (52). In Napoleon sense, Munoo represented hope, (blind hope), a hope in what had seemed no hope at all, or we should hope for what we did not see and wait for it with patience like Bakha and Munoo. Anand sold some shiny new vehicle of salvation: the class must submit to “capitalism” or be ready to destroy. Thus, reasonable hope could soon become unreasonable and the words of Nietzsche became the last truth. The genesis of *Coolie* is unclear as did not advocate how to take Munoo out of the capitalist inferno and plant him in a socialist paradise? Munoo was trying to come out of his existence and was quite successful in the company of Indians but failed when the question of Industrialization/ capitalism/ colonialism came. The colonial-capitalism was not more than a hell as seen in *Two Leaves and a Bud*, wherein Gangu, a farmer migrated to Assam from the land of Punjab.

Two Leaves and a Bud

In 1937, Anand launched a fierce tirade against the British rule in progressive novel *Two Leaves and a Bud* which offered him “a leading position amongst contemporary, revolutionary novelist in England” as Stephen Spender reviewed. Gangu, the protagonist, emerged as a radical symbol who directed his half-revolt towards the authority. This fifty years Punjabi farmer, a sub-human with no rights, had constantly been used as a serviceable tool and he was shot “one, twice, thrice” (203) at a “distance of two yards” by Reggi Hunt, who wanted an easy escape from the hut of Gangu, on whose daughter Leila, the virgin bloom not been plucked, he had a bad eye under the “perfume spell of drunkenness” (200). Anand projected it for the first time that even the lower strata people were ready to protect their family which stands for their demand of the moral rights. But the opposite had

happened, all characters failed and capitalism wins as Reggie was discharged from the crime of shooting by the Justice Mowberley and a jury of seven European and two Indian members:

The clerk of the court interrogated the jury:

‘Do you find the prisoner guilty or not guilty of the murder of Gangu Singh, coolie, on the Macpherson Tea Estate?’

The foreman of the jury replied:

‘We find him, by a majority vote, not guilty.’

The clerk of the court interrogated the jury:

‘Do you find the prisoner guilty or not guilty of culpable homicide?’

The foreman of the jury replied:

‘We find him, by a majority vote, not guilty.’

His Lordship addressing the prisoner, said:

‘Prisoner at the Bar,

‘An Impartial jury has found you “not guilty” on the charge of murder or culpable homicide.’

‘I concur with the jury’s view of the evidence.’

‘You are discharged’ (203-04).

The novel had a therapeutic effect but the virus which was injected in the veins of workers could not be healed by Anand. The novel had achieved some judicial rights for the future workers yet was not able to equal the success of Sinclair’s *The Jungle*. Hence it has contrary reviews but if the novel, for Cowasjee, was “a failure” (83) then what was progressive here?

The progressive element was Anand’s socialistic view of the condition of workers in the Monabarie Tea Estate (fictional name in the novel was The Macpherson Tea Estate), Assam. The novel was reviewed as a text of the “virtual slavery” by Goronwy Rees on April 30, 1937. Anand respond to the review with immediate effect in the form a letter to Rees (June 10, 1937) and informed him about the conditions of Assam Tea Estates, wherein the life and wages of coolies, like Gangu, were clearly against “the penal provisions of the Assam Labour and Emigration Act and the repeal in 1925 of the Indian Workman’s Breach of Contract Act” (21). Later, Anand send a letter to L.J. Godwinon, the head of Monabarie

Tea Estate in Assam, on behalf of *The Whitley Report*,⁶³ which stated that the “‘ghastly’ conditions” (21) were still accumulated in Assam but he, simultaneously, disdained Whitley’s report which, according to him, was “inspired by a tremendous goodwill for the employers” (21) and not for the workers. After Anand’s effort:

It was admitted by the Secretary of the Indian Tea Association that the actual results of the Assam Labour and-Emigration Act of 1901, which abolished the planter’s right of private arrest, were that “abuses flourished and much improper recruiting’ was done principally by contractors.” On the basis of such evidence Mr. Whitley’s Commission proposed to abolish that Act, and, among other reforms, recommended “the appointment by the Government of India of an officer in Assam (the protector of immigrants) who will look after the interests of emigrants who have not yet decided to make Assam their permanent home.... (Reply to Godwinon 21).

Anand brought into the consciousness of everyone about “the lowness of wages as against a rise in prices” (Reply to Godwinon 21) in Assam (Tea Estates) and there was “none of the attraction of higher wages to tempt the worker to transfer his service from one garden to another...We would point out that the workers suffer owing to the absence of any organisation on their side to counter-act the powerful combination of their employers” (21). On behalf of the Royal Commission, Anand recommended “steps should be taken to secure public contact with workers’ dwellings on all plantations” (21). On the other side, if the children were employed in *Coolie* against The Factory Act (1933), in which a child below the age of fourteen could not be employed in a factory, so does it happen in *Two Leaves and a Bud*, wherein, as Anand noted in his letter on September 3, 1937 to Godwin, published in *The Spectator*, about the labour of children:

“At what age do they (the children) generally work?” Sir Alexander Murray asked Mr. J. J. C. Watson, manager, Gandrapur Tea Estate. The answer was: “4, 5 or 6.... We had 44 children working yesterday” (21).

Rees authenticated Anand’s description of the Assam plantations as “true” (21). Anand accepted it as the novel had the dramatic quality of a Shakespearean tragedy but Anand remarked in the novel’s introduction to the second edition:

⁶³ Earlier, the Royal Commission on Labour in India under the chair of John Henry Whitley published a report with the title *Report of the Royal Commission of Labour in India: Evidence* (1931, total in nineteen volumes). The provisions and conditions about Assam and the Dooars recorded in the volume six.

In the light of that and my experience, I would say that the descriptions in *Two Leaves and a Bud* are comparatively under-estimates. Only the decent Englishmen at home will not easily believe that their representatives in the Empire could be guilty of such excesses as are familiar to most of the subject races!

Like other novels, this novel too was reviewed by the best journals in Britain but the review of Rees created havoc in the hearts of the owners of the Tea Plantations of Assam and there emerged a storm of protest against the novel and the writer. The book whittled down into the category of proscribed section and Anand dubbed was as “propagandist” and from here had begun a hot exchange of letters between Anand, L.J. Godwinon and Rees on the “Report of Royal Commission” and the status of workers in India in 1937. As a progressive, for the first time, Anand was directly in a brawl with the colonial government in the form of letters which were published in *The Spectator*. The problem became so burning and complicated that the editor of the journal announced on September 3, 1937 “We cannot continue this correspondence” (22). On the basis of his fight with *Angreji Hukumat*, Anand could easily be projected as a progressive novelist.

A progressive must possess the ability to deal with the hidden social problems and try to solve them in the most humane or critical way. On the basis of above point, *Two Leaves and a Bud* had brought the problem of, as Cowasjee expressed, the “British justice” which later was corrected by the authority as recorded on the pages of newspaper *Times of India*, Bombay:

Jorhat, February 16. Agreeing with the jurors’ verdict of guilty on a charge of culpable homicide, the additional sessions judge of Jorhat has sentenced J.D. Young, Assistant Manager of a tea garden, to three years’ rigorous imprisonment in connection with the death of a coolie girl aged about 16, in his bungalow on the night of December 10 last. There were multiple injuries all over her body. Young is a Scotchman, and has been in Assam for five years (Cowasjee, SMF 87).

In 1937, Indian Legislature amended the “Worker’s Compensation Act” of 1923 after the assent of the Governor General of India. Like *The Jungle*, the task of improving the judicial system had begun but the progress was so slow that hardly any of the workers benefitted from this amendment. The Assamese plantation worker, before this novel, was an invisible man but the progressive flavour of Anand put coolies’ problems on a worldwide scale. In the

international domain, this fiction-cum-realist text was reviewed by the journals, *The Spectator*, *New Statesman*, *London Mercury* and others. Besides the reviews, the problem of the novel was revived by the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, in government report *Plantation Labour in Assam Valley* (1951). In this sense, it was the only progressive novel which came from the pen of Anand.

If *Untouchable* and *Coolie* had their progressive character, *Two Leaves and a Bud* too had De la Havre, a foreigner with liberal and progressive view but one who lacked patronization for Indian worker in the Tea Plantations of Assam. The words “It is the system. You must hate the system” (103) clearly capture his radical views about the British, who, “never, never shall be slaves, [but] went and enslaved the millions of Asia” (104), hence, the Indian “proletariat starved” (105). Another instance of progressivism was introduced when Gangu led the group of plantation workers from the office of Reggi, the human Mephistopheles, but the revolution was put in peace at gunpoint. The strike like situation guides Gangu’s life in strife which led to his physical exploitation, being beaten mercilessly by Reggi’s officers. The image of Jallianwala Bagh Massacre⁶⁴ came into our mind when battalions of Tommies opened fire at unarmed and defenceless coolies at the tea-estate. In this third consecutive novel, the fruit of progress was not ripe and was plucked mercilessly before ripening as Gangu died in the end. All these concrete images establish the novel as “workers’ biography into art.”

The problem raised in the novel was: as soon as man became sociable or a slave to others, like Gangu, he metamorphosed into a weak, fearful man who has been bonded with a duty towards his master. He at once attained the enervation in force, courage and strength by adopting the soft and effeminate lifestyle. Due to this problem, thus, at the end of the novel, nothing new had happened, neither fatalism nor revolution bore any return but the novel had left an unasked question to the political status of the era. The reader witnessed change but again the progress was half-achieved and same theme was chalked out in *The Old Woman and the Cow*, wherein, at the climax, Gauri was without husband and without help, like Sita in *Ramayana*.

⁶⁴ Jallianwala Bagh Massacre took place in Amritsar (Punjab, which also included Haryana of today) by the order of Colonel Reginald Edward Harry Dyer on April 13, 1919.

The Old Woman and the Cow

In the progressive era, not only males but females were also walking shoulder to shoulder by coming forward. It was a sign of change which was at its peak in *The Cow and the Woman* which became the last successful novel in the progressive list and then “never again was his flame to burn so steadily shine so brightly” (Naik 95). This progress demanded purification of the human mind and soul from the classical myth of the “cow” (Gauri or Sita). Indeed, Anand renewed mythical aspects in light of the modern scenario.

Anand had taken a bold step for the first time as he made Gauri, the only principal female character, the heroine of the novel. In the beginning, she is like any other typical Indian woman. She emerged as a tigress when her husband, Panchi, a farmer, abandoned her and later when her mother greedily sold her to a Lala, who was demanding his interest, in place of a cow. From here began the story of progress as she revolted against the old values of society and started working under a doctor. Here, modernity did arrive but she ultimately fell back to traditionalism by desiring to go back to her husband, who threw her out considering her unlucky. Now let us compare her progressive gesture with some of the progressive novels of the past: like the eponymous heroine in *Jane Eyre*, first she had to leave her home in search of respect. Jane was independent in choosing John Rivers but, in the end, she went back to Rochester. Like Jane, Gauri too returned to Panchi because, like Shakespeare’s heroine Mariana in *Measure for Measure*, she did not want a “better husband” as she “crave no other, nor no better man” (136). For the second time, her pitiless husband threw her out as his fellow friends gossiped absurd about her stay in the city in the company of a doctor—like the talks about Sita’s stay in *Ashoka Vatika* of Ravana had begun in Ayodhya in the epic *Ramayana*. In the beginning, Gauri adopted a feminine method by bearing all the tortures of her husband but, in the end, she becomes a stern feminist advocate, who thinks, that modern Sita would not ask the Mother earth to open up and swallow her. The progressive message was: she will not renounce life albeit reborn into a fuller life. Like Sita, she was against elopement from the world and instead decided to rediscover the world and to find the root cause of her problems. The myth of Rama and Sita had been very artistically interwoven in the structure to criticize traditional people. Gauri, followed the manifesto to “give expression to the changes taking place in Indian life and to assist in the spirit of progress in the country,” (6) through the symbol of cow.

The weaker sex is symbolized as “cow” which turns into a “tigress” at the end. The myth of Sita signified, how, in the past, women were exploited in the name of religion and chastity. Anand’s views on religion were clearly acceptable “I am not concerned with religion... I am talking of what actually happens to people’ (177) as there was no one “who wouldn’t want to loot the tender bloom of innocence of this young hill woman?” (180) with the name Gauri. The modern woman, like Gauri, revolts against the traditions of male dominated society and discovers her own way. These actions, presents her, as totally different from other typical Indian women. The heroine, who praised her husband from the beginning, revolted against him as she found him a weak man. In the city, under the kindness of the doctor, the reader has discovered her in a position to drive maximum water from the river of modernity. For the comparative study, we can say that Gauri was equal to Tess of Hardy’s *Tess of the D’urbervilles* but in her independent decision she stands parallel to Jane Eyre, however, unlike Cathy of *Wuthering Heights*, she never abandoned Heathcliff (Panchi). Like Eyre, she is restored to Rochester (Panchi). Critically, Gauri overpowers Eyre in decision making, when she decides to live her life independently for a better future with the thought “How can you fly if you have no wings.” Here modernism embodies the wings that take Gauri beyond the destiny of old women in the Indian landscape. Progress was evident with Gauri’s wish to live on her own and a similar line of criticism has been made in another untouchable novel *The Road*, the saga of Bhikhu, who, symbolically, could be seen as the future of 1940s Bakha. A morning prayer must be offered to Anand for bringing out the hidden aspects of the Indian life system but his achievements are override by the controversies, hence, Nasta termed his progress as “complicating resistance” (NaNWO 153). For this reason the presence of Anand is not marked in England of the forties.

Establishing Anand’s Progressiveness:

The controversy over Anand’s “commitment” must be checked while situating him as a progressive ideologue. In the first half of his life, he was spreading ink and sparkle on the sheer human survival and its miserable conditions in the existing environment, surrounded by filth and squalor, whereas, in the second half, he concentrated on the life of the mind through his artistic creativity. In the above two careers, critics would find a wide gulf between the “real” (first phase) and ‘ideal” (second stage) but both were about the pale shadow of actuality which was inscribed on the shirt of Indian culture and tradition. In the second career, Anand shuns the high road of absorption in realism of which he was, previously, an

active crusader. He hewed the stones by commenting on the tremendous odds and on the traditional world, ridden with religious beliefs. Hence, he could be conceived of as an emblem, who was fighting for the lower strata successfully and by doing this, he becomes an eye and voice which lit up the avenues of future *generations*. While projecting Anand as a socialist, Marxist or Gandhist, his one career is judged through the acid test of socialism but the second half remains forgotten. No work is visible regarding Anand's commitment in the second phase which is symbolized in MARG. True enough that in the journal, the progress of Anand's private line of business, both in terms of content and context was ascending not in a linear fashion but was spiral in nature. In the light of progressive theory, Anand was using devious ways of allegory to achieve name and fame through his fiery imagination of the erotic Indian way of life. Here, Anand crumpled the flower of the PWA with his orchestra of sensual feelings without voice but his erotic ecstasy matched the echelons of the sublime.

In the two autonomous careers, Anand was defining two different positions of progressive objectivity (first direct while the later was against the first in a direct manner) and both were in combat with each other in one way or the other. Anand tried his level best to harmonize between the two with his intellectual and creative mind but he failed. In the words of Theodor W. Adorno:

A work of art that is committed strips the magic from a work of art that is content to be a fetish, an idle pastime for those who would like to sleep through the deluge that threatens them, in an apoliticism that is in fact deeply political (188).

Anand's second career is a hint of this. The commitment of his artistic work is totally in peace and distracted from the "reality," celebrated by the Socialist texts, thus, there is a gulf of abyss between the "art" and "realism" of Anand's career but "The possibility of intellectual life itself depends on this conflict to such an extent that only blind illusion can insist on rights that many be shattered tomorrow" (Adorno 188). At this critical juncture, he abdicated his old way of writing by going against his duty and by promoting the phrase "Art for Art's sake" of the Victorians. By damaging reality and by creating the building of the aesthetic, the menacing thrust of Anand's career's antithesis becomes a controversy regarding his status as a progressive. Anand tries his best to substitute one for the other but both the alternatives were totally adverse to each other in nature, in terms, in form and object. As a committed art-aesthetic, he detached art from socialist reality by accepting Fabianism but ties to minimize the distance between the two blocs of creativity. His efforts were not enough to

dissolve the critical stone of the critics, hence, the “realistic goat” (first career) and the “artistic sheep” (second career) are still waiting for separation.

Like a reactionary lawyer in the court of law, Anand made a strong defense of *Homage to Khajuraho* by describing the sculptures as “graceful curves” and by criticizing those who look at erotica negatively:

There is no where among the surviving erotic reliefs of Khajuraho any vulgarity if one brings to the sculptures the warmth of the heart rather than the cold stare of obscene inquiry or the furtive gaze of a latter, more cynical and weary, age. Whether it is with drawn look on the faces of the modest women attendants helping the ceremonies of love, or the unselfconscious embraces of the *mithuna* couples, the bodies of the persons involved are like the graceful curves of those in whom passion has become incarnate (5).

If this was the graceful position then why was Anand criticizing the old generation of writers who wrote on the same thing in the past? Anand forgot the manifesto wherein he had decided to write about, “the basic problems of our existence today—the problems of hunger and poverty, social backwardness and political subjugation,” (8) which was, simultaneously, the main motto of the movement. Where had the notions of PWA theory gone? Did Anand follow any progressive line here? Answering this might be very hard but here too, he was much progressive as he was countering the oriental outlook of the West towards the Indian sculptures:

the success or failure of the Indian sculptor is, therefore, not to be judged according to the naturalistic design preferred, unconsciously, by critics like Roger Fry, but rather from design as it may result from the flow in the walls of loneliness of the unconscious and dream life, in which is situated the paradise where human beings partake of the wild raptures of the gods (11).

Anand’s working on the erotic sculpture had left a high watermark for generations to come as it was the “first flush of the medieval Hindu Renaissance” (12). The didactical method, in Anand’s erotic literature, could serve as, asserted Bookchin, “remedy to the aversion to reason caused by the value-free rationalism of empirical science and Enlightenment” (5). Now the question comes, how is rationalism related to erotica?

The erotic rational theory of Anand separated him from the philosophical term “deep ecology” which bent towards the metaphysical theory and the relation of self to nature rather than “reason.” In opposition to this theory, Anand articulated in *Apology for Heroism*, “For it is by this shifting of emphasis from the dark mysteries so carefully obscured and made darker by churches and priests to man and the universe he inhabits, by the reassertion of man and his powers of imagination and vision that the new life will be revealed which is to be lived” (103). For Anand, man’s relation with man must be preferred over the redundancies of caste, class, religion, power politics, love, sex, eroticism or any other charge. He was against a culture, as stated in *Kama Kala*, which:

prohibits even husbands and wives to hold their hands on the sea-shore or to kiss on a public place. To be sure, the mental imperialism of the West seems to have succeeded in corrupting and perverting the outlook of the conquered more than the physical empire, now luckily overthrown (8).

His alarm on social and moral issues rather than spiritual ones was another difference which saved him from the deep ecologists and established him as a social-ecologist or an eco-Marxists or a radically progressive writer. How was Anand a social ecologist or eco-Marxist?

Anand, truly, had been marching forward with, as noted in *Apology for Heroism*, “the double burden on...shoulders, the Alps of the European tradition and the Himalayas of Indian past,” (67) but simultaneously dealt with the Marxian dialectic which sprouted out of the Hegelian dictum. The ecology argued relationship between the two realms, the social and natural and both were “marked by monstrous attributes, notably hierarchy, class, the state, private property and a competitive market economy that oblige economic rivals to grow at the expense of each other or perish” (Bookchin 32). Hence, Anand was an eco-Marxist. The social ecology predicated on a political schema of resistance and encountered against the malformation of social patterns which cleaved the culture into two, the elite and the subaltern. The latter were the oppressed and marginalized people without social status. When one wrestled the case of subaltern in the court of society against the elite for their rights, occasioned by the wounds of the days of yore, they could be termed as a social-ecologist and Anand was such a writer. In this sense, his notion of progress aligned with the course of eco-writers. Until the end of WW-II, Anand’s novels were based on “Leninist Marxism” (Bald 478; 488) and simultaneously on the “Gandhian faith in negotiation” (Bald 481). For Margaret Berry, Anand was a patient of “Marxist activity” (86) during 1938 but “after 1945

he increasingly repudiated this aspect of Marxist thought and practice” (88). In this sense, throughout his career, Anand could not decide, what he was: a Marxist, leftist, socialist, socio-political writer like Marx, Lenin, Tolstoy and others. Hence, it became much more complex to find any progressive element in Anand while judging both of his careers in the light of the PWA, especially, the manifesto.

When the oppressed people did not revolt openly, their target could go astray. They could become a pawn in the hands of the destiny makers, like Bakha of *Untouchable*, Munoo of *Coolie*, Gangu of *Two Leaves and a Bud* and Lalu as a war soldier in *Across the Black Waters*. Though Anand failed in projecting the full swing of progress, yet he canvassed a realist picture while addressing the existing problems which resulted from the frustration of the depressed class towards the elite. Was Anand only responsible for not making his characters radical or extremist? In fact, for an answer, we must revisit the time when the sources of livelihood were controlled by the satanic corporate forces and high class religious fundamentalists of India, with no pity for the downtrodden. These elite reduced the mind power of the deprived section and made them socially and politically passive. If someone spit the fire of anger against them, they dubbed him a “traitor.” Bakha’s entry in the temple, Munoo’s playing games with Babu’s children, Gangu’s leading of a protest, Lalu’s cutting of hair, Ananta’s preference for machines were such examples. During this sordid age, jobs were limited and workers were huge in numbers, and apart from this, Unions were dismantled. The schools were reserved only for the high class, the corruption rate was high, and moreover, the laws were written only for the benefit of the bourgeoisie without any concern for the proletariat. In such an atmosphere, it became totally impossible for the lower strata to revolt because the revolution of one man could not survive without a mass movement. It was effectively presented by Anand in the strike scene of *Coolie*, *Two Leaves and a Bud*, *The Big Heart* and *Death of a Hero*. Anand was defining these unchallenged factors so that when a new social mechanism comes into existence these issues would be kept in mind while making new laws. Apart from this, the outcastes or the poor, using Marx’s opinion, never mount any revolution although, he accepted, they join it but like cannon fodder. From this perspective, the real enemy of government or the capital class were not the poor but the educated “*déclassé*” intellectual like Anand, Zaheer, Jahan and Bose, who were banned by a rude calcified system which followed the dictum “might is right.” By mingling with the lower class, the *déclassé* formed a bridge between the world of the elite and the

oppressed. Hence, only these “déclassé” became the trigger which exploded the dynamite of revolution and Anand had all such qualities of Marx’s déclassé.

Anand’s establishment as a déclassé writer could be accepted on Marx’s terms but the main question is: what group could be secured to Anand: lumpenproletariat writer or *déclassé* writer? After independence, he became a political string-puppet which would be lifeless without the thread controlled by the “recitalist” (Nehru), hence, he could be named lumpenproletariat, the category, which according to Marx’s *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, “had been organized into secret sections,” (75) as Louis Bonaparte did in Paris. This class included “vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, lazzaroni, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, maquereaux [procures], brothel keepers, porters, literati, organ grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars” (TEBLB 75) and Bonaparte was the chief of the lumpenproletariat. Anand was “literati” of the list and his chief was Nehru in the Indian political scenario. Was this statement true? The statement could be challenged as: there will be no need of a school or teacher if classrooms remain empty, in a similar way, a novelist is dead if his novels are locked in the proscribed section. The colonial government banned on novels of Anand, who wanted to erase the illogical curse of bans after independence. Hence, he became close to Nehru, who kept his words and opened the prohibited lock by allowing him to republish his novels after the implementation of the Indian Constitution on January 26, 1950. After the healing of ban anathema, *Two Leaves and a Bud* registered an enormous success in Indian domain which was impossible in the *Angreji Raj*.

Here, the views of critics, who fight over Anand’s career as a bourgeoisie writer or proletariat writer, could be put into question. He was neither bourgeoisie nor proletariat or lumpenproletariat but a déclassé writer, who was at the right side at the right time and place. His only problem was his views: he never preferred socialism like Tolstoy, Leftist ideas like Zaheer, or communist views like Marx, he was a “hybrid” (term of Darwin) writer.

To look at the problem of revolution from a different angle, one can say that the open revolutions against government or authority would take a long time to ripen their fruit and were mostly full of misery and bloodshed, as history showcased it in the American War of Independence, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, two World Wars and many other movements. The Indian revolution had begun with the Mutiny Revolt (1857) but did not erupt until Gandhi emerged on the political screen. The American Revolution started after

a dress rehearsal of a protest against the Stamp Act, 1765. It could be taken as true or not but each movement had its violent radicals who thwarted the crop of revolution. To put it in different words, leader like Vladimir Lenin, Maximilien Robespierre, Adolf Hitler hijacked successful revolutions. In the case of the novels of Anand, progress had been captured by the poet in *Untouchable*, by Mrs. Mainwaring in *Coolie*, Colonel Mahindra in *Old Woman and the Cow* and Janki in *The Big Heart*.

Another stream which was against the direction of a progressive nature was Anand's autobiographical novels. He was awarded the prestigious Sahitya Akademi Award for *Morning Face* (1971) but each time, an autobiographical story cannot be the story of all. The novels, *Untouchable*, *Coolie*, *Two Leaves and a Bud*, *The Big Heart*, *Death of a Master of Arts*, *Death of a Hero*, *The Village*, *Across the Black Waters*, *Sword and the Sickle*, were influenced by Anand's personal life and he presented things as they were. He never tried to give a different artistic flavour with the realistic imagination: neither attempted to relate it to the political upheaval that was happening during the era and nor with the social revolution. His first three novels were well received by the critics but after *Across the Black Waters*, he longed for a graph of success. The Journal, *Time Literary Supplement* found *Seven Summers* "generally uninteresting," and declared Anand to be a "Freudian... baby ever born in English fiction," (833) whereas, reviewing it for the BBC, Walter Allen quoted, Anand was picturing himself as a "bright little boy, full of the noon day spirit, vivacious and untamed, a parrot in speech and a lemur in movement." He goes on saying that it is the animal vitality of childhood so different from those we "have become accustomed to in recent years in the works of English novelists and autobiographies" (Cawasjee, SMF 170). Antony Curtis in *New Statesmen and Nation* remarked that in his autobiographical novels, Anand has, "written a study of violence as the defining quality of childhood" (262). Along with it, in Anand's fictional semi-biographical novels, the readers noticed, the older regimes of religion were chipped away by revolution of the young but with the pace of a tortoise. Hence, it became utmost difficult for the traditionalist to abandon the conventional system which, on the other hand, was dying its natural death. In this modern age, the supplanting of an old faith with a new one would be in silent motion and if one tried to do it with the speed of light, then it could generate cognitive dissonance. Anand attempted to do it swiftly and failed badly. Due to the slow transition of a radical outcome, it became difficult for the critics to measure the level of progress and such things had happened in the case of Anand.

In the sections on sculpture, artist, editor, déclassé, lumpenproletariat, eco-Marxist, or in literary-autobiographies, Anand's commitment towards the progressive line played a significant role in forming his resistance. His distinction between his career of art (aesthetic critic) and novel (realistic literature) is under the shadow of offering a hallowed vision but it is a concrete truth that the sole object of his aesthetic philosophy was not to publicize Indian art but to bring out the real nature of aestheticism which it deserves. His career, whether first or second, could be personified as "message" in itself, talking about different subjects and objects from various angles and sides but exploring the maiden realm of Indian life, culture, art, society, religion and literature. The problem in establishing Anand as a progressive is the ideology of socialism which is European in nature. Critics and researchers try to judge Anand on the basis of his handwritten manifesto. It is wrong. If one wants to check his career then the manifesto has to be divided into two parts (one cannot judge Anand only from the socialist point of view). The first career should be judged in light of the social-progressive writer while the second under the label of an art-progressive manifesto. Both of Anand's careers are different from each other and one theory or manifesto will not be enough to do justice to Anand. So the manifesto should be "Marxist manifesto" and "aesthetic manifesto." The Marxist pole of Anand's career was totally opposite but equal to Marxist notion but in a different style and manner. Here, the meaning of Anand's role was equal to an "uncommonly practicable Being" (189) of the bohemian artist. If one tries to establish Anand's radicalism only by using socialism then here emerges a kind of confusion. The meaning of a text will be meaningless for a sculpture-artist and that of an image will be useless for a Marxist conservative, for them, an aesthetic image is not related to the reality of their political objective and social revolt. Each of them had a creative meaning in their art with an authentic message but they did not find any creativity in each other due to their ideological barriers. The same problem occurred in establishing Anand as a progressive as the resistance of Anand was never institutionalized in an epoch making manner.

Conclusion

The Marxist terminology of "superstructure" and "base" (bourgeoisie) must be examined in Anand's case. Superstructure is related to education, family, religion, politics, metaphysics, laws, culture, ideology, morality, media and many other things except production, which is part of base that includes machines, factories, land, raw-materials and capital. Superstructure, asserted Marx in *The German Ideology*, is the result of base and

primarily based on the interest of the political apparatus which governs society/capital. In other words, the ruling class has full control over the base, whereas, superstructure is under the power of the ruling hand, which operates the base. When Anand was in league with Gandhism, Marxism and socialism then his subjects talked about the superstructure (by following Marxism) but his return from England was his return to “the base” (not only in India but also capitalism in general). On the ground of Marxist ideology, Anand wanted to maintain the base with the help of superstructure but he failed in achieving his aim, hence in 1945, he preferred to substitute his position of writing. After 1946, or with the editing of MARG, he became a part of the base, as he was in the company of the biggest business tycoons and politicians of the time. Though, superstructure is a weak section yet Anand’s family background was a strong one and he also had the experience of, around twenty years, living in England, which only a bourgeoisie could do. When the friendship with “base” turned concrete, Anand discarded the superstructure writings as he was exercising on erotica, love, mystic objects and religious subjects. The downtrodden were nowhere in Anand’s index or content. This was the ending of his literary achievement about the superstructure.

Anand saw his dying career with his own eyes and hence, he again decided to move back to the superstructure. He edited Ambedkar’s *Annihilation of Caste* which showed resistance, directly or indirectly, against Gandhi or more broadly against the Congress or the Brahmanical Indian society. Once Anand spoke against the feudalism and capitalism but later he joined it (during MARG) and after enjoying it for a long time, he again diverted his thematic route towards superstructure. In Marx’s terminology, Anand’s shifting from superstructure to base and then again from base to superstructure is not a “neutral” relationship. Anand chose both “base and superstructure” and followed neither to the Marxist core. Against Marxist’s “one way relationship” theory between the two, Anand tasted both the fruits in different seasons and conditions. His theoretical ideology grew more and more complex with the passage of time. It will be difficult to put him in the category of “superstructure” or “base” writer, in fact, he was not deeply concerned with Marxism as the need of the hour had changed of theme due to Indian independence. The conditions of the superstructure or base were under a drastic change after independence and hence, Anand could not be blamed for changing the pattern of his themes. Marx found a “dialectical” relationship between base and superstructure as increase and decrease of one syndrome affected the other and Anand was caught in the web of this transition/development. Thus,

when the change in “base” occurred, Anand too, changed his base or so called theory of superstructure.

In fact, Anand’s changing of ideology could be seen as an act of “self-interest,” as the conditions, environments, events and situations of India was in alteration after WW-II. Like Manabendr Nath Roy, Anand’s progressive odyssey could be seen as a political Marxist thinker in the first stage, followed by “radical humanist” approach through disowning Socio-Marxism of Russia but he was, at one time, a national revolutionary involved (indirectly) in the national movement (through BBC). Throughout his career, like Roy again, Anand considered himself universal-humanist rather than orthodox Marxist or Russian Socialist. With his erotica, mysticism and speaking on behalf of the downtrodden, Anand incorporated “radical progress” of his manifesto with “scientific humanism” of erotica or he was taking about the downtrodden with his new Humanist ideological weapon. Whatever be the role of Anand (base or superstructure), his views were concretely based on pure reason, morality, equality, fraternity, freedom and the brotherhood of humanity without following any popular political dogma. From the very first day in England, especially during his Ph.D., Anand was influenced by the socio-political writings of Marx, Hobbes, Hegel, and Lenin, Tolstoy and others. He mingled the ideas of these intellectual personalities in his writings, whether fictional or non-fictional, which created a problem for the critics to read him under the lamp of their thoughts or in one philosophical/theoretical line.

Thus, regarding Anand’s change of career, there is a direct or indirect relationship between base and superstructure but in Marxist cultural analysis, Anand avoids Marx’s “dialectical materialism.” In the early stage of his career, Anand was an “insider” in Marxism but in the second one, he was a committed “outsider.” In this re-return to Marxist ideology, Anand made a synthesis of base and superstructure with his construction of new-thoughts about a new and progressive society. His motion circular is noted by his radical-cum-resistance works which are attached with progressive glue. He was opposing traditional Marxism that was based on the power of a single group of individual inside state or society under the spell of “dictatorship of proletariat,” instead of it, Anand preferred the Fabian kind of society, advocated by Nehru.

Anand chose the purview of the untouchable community, aristocratic class, condition of female, human nature in case of caste and class and many other social ills-wills. To portray it in another picture, he drinks the water from the fountain of life in the vicinity around his

parental house in Punjab. He had been introspecting inner, as well as, outer curve of hurts and pangs which came in the life of the poor by putting a pen on their tension and problems. The twin perfection under the title *Untouchable* and *Coolie* were not only an application of the evil chronicle of untouchability or of capitalism but were about human estrangement which caused pain to “others” and turned life into a perilous odyssey for its passenger in the realm of spirit. In the words of Marlene Fisher *Two Leaves and a Bud* was an “over-rate” (189) novel which was not more than a saga of man’s physical and mental torture inflicted upon man. Simultaneously, she criticized *Private Life of an Indian Prince* as “too schizophrenic and lopsided a novel” (189) which rests upon the drama of the mind and soul of its principal character. *Lament on the Death of a Master of Arts* could be put in the category of existential fictions which were practiced especially in France by Albert Camus and his literary group. The persisting drudge conditions in the twentieth century gave an air of authenticity to the problems discussed in the novels of Anand, who had begun the task of writing when the authors in India were in microscopic minority with the hope that the future would ripen the literary fruit borne through the moot writers of PWA.

Reading of Marx, establishment of the PWA, following the Left ideology, joining the Congress, starting MARG and other activities were rolled into one writer, Anand. All these achievements baffled his critics. Hence, his career became a roller-coaster ride for them and the result was their screaming at his themes. In his texts, the readers will come across scores of characters moving with the symbols of considerable wounds which were perfectly healed by nature; and some factory workers, whose bones once broken or limbs were nearly torn off and later completely united, not by any surgeon but by time due to their poverty and some others characters were totally dead (Munoo, Gangu and Ananta) or left to live like the dead (Bakha, Bhikhu and Gauri). Whatever the life they lived, they, as Anand mourned in *Across the Black Waters*, “never commit the crime of being happy.” In colouring the severe picture of their life in his novels, like Rousseau, Anand was “going to speak to men; for those alone, who are not afraid of honouring the truth” (Origin of Inequality 1) but the opposite had happened as he was termed a “propagandist.” No doubt, Anand was prone to some errors but he had hit society with shrill-pitch which was out-glared and overpowered only by the best in the literary world. He set in with the Bloomsbury group because of his anarchic views about religion and his attracting arsenal with which he wounded theistic assertions of the past. Like all of us, Anand was a man with two feet and two hands but unlike us he “extended his looks over the whole face of nature, and measured with his eyes the vast extent of the heavens”

(Rousseau, Origin of Inequality 4). Though Anand was a changed writer in the second half yet he was equipped, like a dragon, with more fierce power and spit fire on different shades of Indian culture, tradition and religion which were all were enough to clinch him the title of a “Progressive” writer. In the post-independence period, consistency was not his trademark. He swung in the pendulum of brilliance and bewilderment yet his consistency, out of inconsistency, could easily stress the new writers.

Anand’s career as a progressive could be taken as a two headed snake, whose first head was singing the song about the downtrodden or spitting poison on *Brahmanical* theistic cult and pessimistic hypothesis of society but the second one wriggled out its direction towards the ancient culture of erotic literature or bourgeoisie way of looking at things. Like the inhabitants of Billimaran Lane of *The Big Heart*, Anand, too, was, “caught in the mousetraps where they were born, most of them are engaged in the bigger cage of Fate and the various indiscernible shadows that hang over their heads (17). While criticizing Anand, the critics were, as complained by Anton Chekhov in his letter to Aleksei Sergeyevich Suvorin on October, 27, 1888, “confusing two concepts: the solution of a problem and the correct posing of a question. Only the second is obligatory for an artist” (41). If one has to compare Anand’s progressive career with American progressive Era one finds that Anand was only a half progressive as no problem had been solved out through *Untouchable*, *Coolie*, *Two Leaves and a Bud*, *The Village*, *Across the Black Water*, *Sword and the Sickle*, *The Big Heart* or *The Old Woman and Cow* and many others in the list. Despite this claim, these texts, in truth, capture the imagination of readers because, as Chekhov asserted, “all the questions in them are correctly posed.... The court is obliged to pose the question correctly, but it’s up to the jurors to answer them, each juror according to his own taste” (Chekhov 41). Being a progressive, Anand correctly posed the questions instead of solving them and left it to the government to do the strict action, like the APE, and this strong and positive progressive move could be taken for granted as the heritage of Anand’s hermeneutics. The majority of his novels’ ending proved that in spite of modernity, Anand was tightly in the grip of tradition, Gandhism and the Right politics, in a direct or indirect manner.

The critics called Anand the “Charles Dickens of India” (M. Hasan 1) or “Auden in the Indian literary world” (Bald 479), or “the most prolific writer” (Naik 7) or a true Marxist before Independence but more importantly, he was a progressive-revolutionary who stressed on the “liberty, equality, fraternity” (Rousseau’s phrase) and introduced the Egalitarian

approach in Indian literary scenario for the first time. Most of his narratives had begun in the village and ended in the city which marked revolutionary change from traditionalism to modernism. His themes had a direct bearing on the mind of the reader and though he failed in some of his novels yet the provocative material was enough to will-up liquid in the eyes of an individual whether a high class elite or a downtrodden. The society of Anand was a fight between the peregrine and plebeian creatures that represented scented and the unscented nature of species. He presented the novel of a “new type” comparable with the movies of Hollywood, like *Jurassic Park*, wherein all the dinosaurs were dead in the end but one was still alive which suggested that it is not finished at all, such was the ending of his novels. The ending of the *Jurassic Park* was a hint of the future, which we have to imagine in our minds. Similarly, nearly all of Anand’s novels ended with a note of anti-climax and the problem was not fully solved and being left for the reader to imagine what will be the future of a special event or character (we can check Bakha’s going to home, Munoo in the hands of Mohan, Bhikhu’s journey to Delhi, Gauri’s decision to go back to the Colonel Mahindra). This kind of quality had hardly been found in any other novelist of that era, as his contemporaries were showing happy or tragic ending but Anand left everything to the imagination. The reader could conclude positively or negatively against the ending. This quality made his novels more dramatic and related to real life. In the end, Anand’s literary career could be divided into two parts, first till World War II, the second after the War. The first phase was successful and full of novels but the second, a failure, was famous only for MARG and short stories, except *The Old Woman and the Cow*. Instead of it, we must praise Anand for writing about downtrodden, excluded, socially disable and oppressed—a subject not exercised by Raja Rao or R.K. Narayan.

At this juncture, as the words spoken by Lalla Murlidhar in *The Big Heart*, the condition of Anand was like “A crow tried to strut like a peacock, but seeing his feet, wept and cried.... Forgive me” (168). Anand’s reformists in his novels “do not agree with the orthodox *Sanatani* Hindus in keeping the old caste and sub-caste divisions. We have come here openly, and I wish more of us had been informed. We must form a new community based not on caste prejudice but the revival of the true ancient Vedic tradition” (TBH 162). Thus, they were not whole heartedly revolutionary. What was the reason? In truth, his characters were part of a traditional and conservative society. They did not want to form a Sparta in which only the strong and robust will survive and the rest will be destroyed, rather differently, they demanded rights for the “rest” who were left off by the Spartans. The Indian

men did not want to live under the natural impact of “fear” and kept on “attacking” and “fighting” with each other for their survival, like the Spartans. Here, Anand was putting a line between the confounding savage man and the developed man, who came across him during his life. Bakha, Munoo, Bhiku, Panchi, Ananta were in the first list whereas the poet Iqbal, the wrestler Ratan and Sudha of *Coolie*, Colonel Mahindra from *Old Woman and the Cow* were in the other list.

Sinha compared Anand with Honore de Balzac by calling him “a fisher of shadows,” who like Balzac, had cast his literary net on the “sordid elements of the debris of existence sunk into the mud” (81) and brought out on the shore the deep-rooted-creatures. He too captured the real-life values by the inner-touch of readers’ soul through his heart-rending stories about the Indian past which still exists at present. Why did Anand note the sordid past? The reason could be that “we Indians have displayed a very poor sense of history, and there are few contemporary records which might reproduce for us the atmosphere of those bygone ages,” (11) as Anand nipped in *Kama Kala*. With his novels, the critics, readers and scholars could “reproduce” the bygone age and the philosophies of existence or the roots of Indian life.

The decline of Anand’s career had begun after *Lalu Trilogy* as no great work came from his pen although *Gauri* and *The Road* were still in the list. Certain reasons could be pointed out like, India’s independence, his joining of private MARG and craze for elite life. These weaknesses made his themes less peculiar. Whatever be the reason, the progress of Anand’s career began to turn downwards. The themes about the downtrodden had a special niche in Anand’s heart so he wrote about the animal vitality of man and his lust for aristocratic life through the profit but the shocked indignation of capital in the present day withers away. The fissiparous views and tendencies not merely destroyed it but rather created a hegemony which demanded for their socio-political rights in the twenty-first century—or more broadly saying, it was the time when culture, tradition and modernity came close to the periphery. Despite the prodigality about erotic bent, Anand had the half-grandeur of Dickens in literature and half-revolutionary nature of Tolstoy. Even the erotic literature was more progressive but for the critics it reproduced sleeping erotica. The critic’s views could be whup-up. Critics were comparing Anand’s presentation of erotica with the poison of cobra snake which could kill the humans instantly. But they forgot, when the poison is used by medical researchers to destroy the disease or to save the life of the same being who tasted a

snake bite, it turns into an elixir or antidote. Herein, Anand became a researcher who presented the erotic literature of the past with a mystic touch as seen in *Raas Leela* of Krishna with the *Gopis*. It had been handled with such care that after having read it, as Anand noted in *Kama Kala*, “the awe-struck visitor is merely dumb and aghast in vain attempt to understand how such a miraculous achievement was at all possible” (11). Only corrupt practices and ideologies stood in way of projecting Anand as a progressive writer but the writer’s talent did not crave any crown, title, proof or license—Anand was Anand, the only English progressive writer of India on the palm of Indian English literature.

Anand was writing in a less speculative but sanguine age not only for the progress of the downtrodden, outcastes, excluded and underdogs in his novels but also for the development of art, sculptures and aesthetic forms in MARG. He was advancing in opposite environment against the British throne and Brahmanical dominations (powers and principalities) of India at a time when government and conventional prosecutions were rife. Whether in the first or in the second segment of life, Anand practiced the most ultra-modern ideologies of the time, which were hardly rejoiced by the conventional class. In the first, he was running in pursuit of political justice in an indefatigable journey in search of right, not with revolutionary Socialism but with intellectual and calm gravity of Gandhism and all this turned him into a writer who was affected by his insatiable self-esteem. In 1946, his socialist faith was shaken with the wind of MARG or the storm of Nehru and thus, socialism culminated into social-Fabianism and he compromised as an editor by becoming an advocate of new but liberal aesthetic ideals. In the second, he was voicing against the European set standards of art in general and Indian aesthetics in particular. In both the timelines, he was progressive in one way or the other. His progresses should/ could be judged from a socialist angle in the first and as an archaeologist, architect, editor, art critic or bohemian in the second. Both lead to one conclusion, he was opening new forms of Indian traditions, culture, society, art and erotica, which had never happened in the past. Truthfully, some part of the current Indian progressive culture, architecture, arts and aesthetics has its roots in Anand or directs its finger towards him. If such is the case, then, Anand is, indeed, a progressive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- Anand, Mulk Raj. "A Chat with Le Corbusier." *Frontliner* 1986, 25 & 7 January & February. Print.
- . "A Chronology." *Contemporary Indian Literature* 5.11/12 (1965): 42-47. Print.
- . *Apology for Heroism: A Brief Autobiography of Ideas*. Bombay: Kutub-Popular, 1957. Print.
- . *Autobiography: Pilpali Saheb- Part I, Story of a Childhood Under the Raj*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1985. Print.
- . *Conversations in Bloomsbury*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- . *Coolie*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1993. Print.
- . *Death of a Hero: Epitaph for Maqbool Sherwani: A Novel*. Bombay: Kutub Popular, 1963. Print.
- . *Homage to Khajuraho or Ruins of Khajuraho: The Ancient Capital of the Chandels*. Bombay: MARG Publication, 1960. Print.
- . "Introduction." Satyarthi, Devendra. *Meet My People: Indian Folk Poetry*. Hyderabad: Chetna Prakashan, 1951. 17-36. Print.
- . *Is There a Contemporary Civilisation?* Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1963. Print.
- . *Kama Kala: Some Notes on the Philosophical Basis of Hindu Erotic Sculpture*. Geneva: Nagel Publishers, 1958. Print.
- . *Kama Sutra of Vatsyayana*. Ed. Lance Dane. New Delhi: Sanskrit Pratishthan for Arnold-Heinemann; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press, 1982. Print.
- . *Lament on the Death of Master of Arts*. New Delhi: Hindi Pocket Books, 1967. Print.

- . “Letter about the Review of Two Leaves and a Bud: Reply to Goronwy Rees.” *The Spectator* 1937, 10 June: 21. Print.
- . “Letter about the Review of Two Leaves and a Bud: Reply to L.J. Godwinon.” *The Spectator* 1937, 21 September: 21-22. Print.
- . *Letters on India*. London: Butler & Tanner Ltd., 1942. Print.
- . *Lines Written to an Indian Air*. Baroda: Nalanda Publishing, 1949. Print.
- . “Many Languages but one Literature.” *Makers of Indian English Literature*. Ed. C.D. Narasimhaiah. New Delhi: Pencraft International, 2000. 37-43. Print.
- . *Morning Face*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1976. Print.
- . “Mulk Raj Anand Remembers.” *Indian Literature* 36.2 (154) (1993): 176-186. Print.
- . “On the Progressive Writers Movement.” *Marxist Cultural Movement in India: Chronicles and Documents (1936-1947)*. Ed. Sudhi Pardhan. Vol. I. Calcutta: National Book Agency, 1979. III vols. 1-22. Print.
- . “Preface.” Ambedkar, Bhimrao. *Annihilation of Caste: An Undelivered Speech*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemaan, 1990. 5-9. Print.
- . “Preface.” Vatayan. *Kamasutra*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemaan, 1980. 7-11. Print.
- . *Roots and Flowers*. Karnatak: Dharwar Publications, 1972. Print.
- . *The Big Heart*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1980. Print.
- . *The Hindu View of Art*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1987. Print.
- . *The Old Woman and the Cow: Gauri*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1981. Print.
- . *The Road*. London: Oriental University Press, 1987.
- . *Two Leaves and a Bud*. New Delhi: Hind Pocket Books, 1977. Print.
- . *Untouchable*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1984. Print.

Anand, Mulk Raj, Jyotirmaya Ghosh and Sajjad Zaheer. "The Manifesto of the Progressive Writers' Association, London." *Marxist Influences and South Asian Literature*. Ed. Coppola Carlo. Vol. I. Michigan: Michigan State University, 1979. II vols. 6-12. Print.

Secondary Sources:

Adorno, Theodor W. "Commitment." *Marxist Literary Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Tarry Eagleton and Drew Milne. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2006. 187-203. Print.

Aesop. *Fables*. New York: Magnum Books, 1968. Print.

Ahmad, Talat. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nationalism: The Progressive Episode in South Asia, 1932-56*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Alberuni, Abu-Alraihan Muhammad Ibn Ahmad. *India*. Ed. Edward C. Sachau. Vol. I. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1910. II vols. Print.

Ali, Ahmed and N.M. Rashed. "The Progressive Writers' Movement in its Historical Perspective." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 13.1/4 (1977-78): 91-97. Print.

Allchin, F.R. "Rev of Kama Kala: Some Notes on the Philosophical Basis of Hindu Erotic Sculpture by Mulk Raj Anand." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 23.1 (1960): 157-159. Print.

Ambedkar, Bhimrao. "Annihilation of Caste." Ambedkar, Bhimrao. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Ed. Moon Vasant. Vol. I. Bombay: Government of Maharashtra, 1979. XXII vols. 23-96. Print.

—. "Gandhism: The Doom of the Untouchables." Ambedkar, Bhimrao. *What Congress and Gandhi Have done to the Untouchables*. Ed. Vasant Moon. Vol. ix. Bombay: The Government of Maharashtra, 1991. xxii vols. 274-297. Print.

—. "The Revolt of the Untouchables." Ambedkar, Bhimrao. *Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar: Writings and Speeches*. Ed. Moon Vasant. Vol. V. Mumbai: Government of Maharashtra, 1989. 256-58. Print.

- . “What do the Untouchables Say?: Beware of Mr. Gandhi.” Ambedkar, Bhimrao. *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*. Ed. Vasant Moon. Vol. IX. Bombay: Government of Maharashtra, 1991. XII vols. 239-273. Print.
- Ambedkar, Bhimrao, et al. *The Constitution of India*. New Delhi: Government of India, 2007. Print.
- Anand, S. “A Honourable Occupation?” *Tehelka Magazine* 4.49 (2007). Internet.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Asnani, Shyam M. “Rev of Conversations in Bloomsbury by Mulk Raj Anand.” *World Literature Today* 57.2 (1983): 348. Print.
- Avasthi, Rekha. *Pragativad aur Samanantar Sahitya: 1936 se 1951 Tak ke Sahitya ka Dwandatmak Vishleshan (Hindi)*. New Delhi: MacMillan, 1978. Print.
- Babbar, Nadira Z. “Foreword.” Zaheer, Sajjad, et al. *Angarey: Nine Stories and a Play*. Ed. Vibha S. Chauhan and Khalid Alvi. Trans. Vibha S. Chauhan and Khalid Alvi. New Delhi: Rupa Publications, 2014. i-vi. Print
- Badiou, Alain. *Ethics*. Trans. Peter Hallward. London: Verso, 2002. Print.
- Bald, Suresht Renjen. “Politics of Revolutionary Elite: A Study of Mulk Raj Anand’s Novels.” *Modern Asian Studies* 8 .4 (1974): 473-489. Print.
- Barry, John. *Rethinking Green Politics: Nature, Virtue and Progress*. London: Sage, 1999. Print.
- Bary, W. Theodore de. *Sources of Indian Tradition*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass and Indological Publishers and Booksellers, 1972. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter. “On the Concept of History.” *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*. Ed. Howard Eiland and Michael W. Jennings. Trans. Edmund Jephcott and Eiland and others Howard. Cambridge: Bellknap Press of Harvard University, 2003. Print.

- Berry, Margaret. ““Purpose” in Mulk Raj Anand's Fiction.” *Mehfil* 5.1/2 (1968-69): 85-90. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- Binyon, Laurence. “Introduction.” Dey, Mukul. *My Pilgrimage to Ajanta and Bagh*. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1925. 15-22. Print.
- Bluemel, Kristin. *George Orwell and the Radical Eccentrics: Intermodernism in Literary London*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.
- Bonaparte, Napoleon. *Napoleon in His Own Words: From the French of Jules Bertaut*. Trans. Herbert Edward Law and Charles Lincoln Rhodes. Chicago: A.C. McClurg and Co., 1916. Print.
- Bookchin, Murray. *The Philosophy of Social Ecology: Essays on Dialectical Naturalism*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1995 . Print.
- Brower, Reuben A. *The Poetry of Robert Frost: Constellations of Intention*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. Print.
- Burra, Peter. “Review of Coolie.” *The Spectator* (1936): 30. Print.
- Bury, John Bagnell. *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*. New York: Dover Publications Inc, 1955. Print.
- Camus, Albert. “The Myth of Sisyphus.” Camus, Albert. *The Myth of Sisyphus and Other Essays*. Trans. Justin O’Brien. New York: Vintage Books, 1991. 1-138. Print.
- Channa, Subhadra Mitra and Joan P. Mencher. *Life as a Dalit: Views from the Bottom on Caste in India*. Ed. Subhadra Mitra Channa and Mencher. Joan P. New Delhi: Sage, 2013. Print.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and the Post Colonial Histories*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993. Print.

- Chekhov, Anton. "Letter to A.S. Suvorin, 27 Oct, 1888." Chekhov, Anton. *Letters of Anton Chekhov*. Ed. Avrahm Yarmolinsky. Trans. Avrahm Yarmolinsky. New York: The Viking Press, 1973. 41. Print.
- Codell, Julie F. "Introduction." *Imperial Co-histories: National Identities and the British and Colonial Press*. Ed. Julie F. Codell. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003. 15-26. Print.
- Codrington, Kenneth de Burgh. *An Introduction to the Study of Mediaeval Indian Sculpture*. London: Edward Goldston, 1929. Print.
- Coppola, Carlo. "Asrarul Haq Majaz: The Progressive Poet as Revolutionary Romantic." *Indian Literature* 24.4 (1981): 46-62. Print.
- . *Marxist Influences and South Asian Literature*. Ed. Carlo Coppola. Vol. I. Michigan: Michigan State University, 1974. II vols. Print.
- . *Udru Poetry, 1935-70: The Progressive Episode*. Ed. Carlo Coppola. Chicago: Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, 1975. Print.
- Corbusier, Le. "Urbanism." *Marg* 6.4 (1953): 10-18. Print.
- Correa, Charles. "Mulk Raj Anand at 100." *Mulk Raj Anand: Shaping the Indian Modern*. Ed. Annapurna Garimella. Mumbai: Marg, 2005. 66-73. Print.
- . "New Bombay: Marg as an Urban Catalyst." *Marg* 49.1 (1997): 68-69. Print.
- Cowasjee, Saros, ed. *Author to Critic : The Letters of Mulk Raj Anand to Saros Cowasjee*. Calcutta: A Writers' Workshop Publication, 1973. Print.
- . *So Many Freedoms: A Study of Major Fictions of Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1977. Print.
- Curtis, Antony. "Rev of Seven Summers by Mulk Raj Anand." *New Statesman and Nation* 42 (1951): 262. Print.

- Dalvi, Mustansir. "Mulk and Modern Indian Architecture." *Mulk Raj Anand: Shaping the Indian Modern*. Ed. Annapurna Garimella. Mumbai: Marg, 2005. 56-65. Print.
- Dancy, Jonathan. *Practical Reality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Dasan, A.S. "Anand's Art Fiction: A Journey into Existential Humanism." Narasimahiah, C.D. *Makers of Indian English Literature*. Delhi: Pencraft International, 2000. 93-101. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Allen Bass. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1993. 278-93. Print.
- Dewsbury, Ronald. "Review of The Coolie by Mulk Raj Anand." *Life and Letters To-Day* 15.4 (1936): 208. Print.
- Dower, Cadric. "Rev of Coolie." *Congress Socialist* 1.35 (1936): 17. Print.
- . "Towards Coloured Unity." *Congress Socialist: The Organ of the All India Congress Socialist Party* 2.3 (1937): 14. Print.
- Drew, Jane. "Chandigarh Capital City Project." *Architects' Year Book* 5. Ed. Trevor Dannatt. London: Elek Book Ltd., 1953. 56-66. Print.
- . "On the Chandigarh Scheme." *Marg* 6.4 (1953): 19-20. Print.
- Evenson, Norma. *Chandigarh*. Berkeley: University of California, 1966. Print.
- Fisher, Marlene. "Mulk Raj Anand: The Novelist as Novelist." *Marxist Influences and South Asian Literature*. Ed. Coppola Carlo. Vol. I. Michigan: Michigan State University, 1974. II vols. 117-130. Print.
- . "Review of Mulk Raj Anand by M. K. Naik." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 10.1 (1974): 188-189. Print.
- Fitzgerald, Scott. *The Great Gatsby*. London: Everyman's Library, 1991. Print.

- Forster, E.M. "Preface." Anand, Mulk Raj. *Untouchable*. New Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1984. 7-10. Print.
- Gajarawala, Toral Jatin. *Untouchable Fictions: Literary Realism and the Crisis of Caste*. New York: Fordhan University Press, 2013. Print.
- Gandhi, Mahatma. "Congress Position." *The Harijan* 1949, 2-February. Print.
<<http://www.gandhi-manibhavan.org/eduresources/article15.htm>>.
- Garimella, Annapurna. "Introduction." *Mulk Raj Anand: Shaping the Indian Modern*. Ed. Annapurna Garimella. Mumbai: Marg, 2005. 18-27. Print.
- Gopal, Priyamvada. *Literary Radicalism in India: Gender, Nation and the Transition to Independence*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Guha, Ramachandra. "Introduction." Anand, Mulk Raj. *Untouchable*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2014. i-xxv. Print.
- Guha, Ranajit. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983. Print.
- Hallet, M.G. "Circular." New Delhi: CP Joshi Archive, JNU, File No.1936/29, 1936. 1-5. Typescript.
- Harris, Marvin. "Cultural Materialism: General Evolution." Harris, Marvin. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press, 2001. 643-653. Print.
- Hasan, Mahmud. "Mulk Raj Anand (1905-2004): Charles Dickens of India." *Impact International* 2005: 1-2. Print.
- Hasan, Sibte. "Introduction to Urdu Edition." Zaheer, Sajjad. *The Light: A History of the Movement for Progressive Literature in the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent*. Ed. Amina Azfar. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2006. xiii-xix. Print.
- Home Department, Government of India. *Report to the Indian Office About the Confiscation in India of Copies of the India Progressive Writers' Association Publication "New*

- Indian Literature.*”. New Delhi: PC Joshi Achieve on the Contemporary History, 1936:50. Print.
- Hubel, Teresa. *Whose India?: The Independence Struggle in British and Indian Fiction and History.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1996. Print.
- “Indian Childhood. Rev of Seven Summers.” *Times Literary Supplement* (1951): 833. Print.
- Isherwood, Christopher. *Goodbye to Berlin.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969. Print.
- Jafferlot, Christophe. *India’s Silent Revolution: The Rise of Low Castes in North Indian Politics.* New Delhi: Paul Press, 2008. Print.
- Jalil, Rakhshanda. *A Literary History of the Progressive Writers’ Movement in Urdu.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013. Print.
- James, C. Vaghan. *Soviet Socialist Realism.* London: Macmillan, 1973. Print.
- Joshi, C.P. “A Statement.” *India To-day* 1.1 (1951): 46. Print.
- Kapur, Geeta. “Partisan Modernity.” *Mulk Raj Anand: Shaping the Indian Modern.* Ed. Annapurna Garimella. Mumbai: Marg, 2005. 28-41. Print.
- Keats, John. “Endymion: A Poetic Romance.” Keats, John. *The Poems.* Ed. Allott Mariam. London: Longman, 1970. 116-284. Print.
- Keay, John. *India: A History: from the Earliest Civilisations to the Boom of the Twenty-first Century.* Grove Press, 2010. Print.
- Keer, Dhananjay. *Dr. Ambedkar: Life and Mission.* Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1962. Print.
- Khan, Ahmad Ali. “Introduction to The Light.” Zaheer, Sajjad. *The Light: A History of the Movement for Progressive Literature in the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent.* Ed. Amina Azfar. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2006. vii-xii. Print.
- Khan, Mumtaz Ali. *Mass-Conversions of Meenakshipuram: A Sociological Enquiry.* Madras: The Christian Literature Society, 1983. Print.

- King, Martin Luther Jr. "I Have a Dream." Sundquist, Eric J. *King's Dream*. London: Yale University Press New Haven, 2009. 229-234. Print.
- Koenisberger, Otto. "Chandigarh-The First and the Revised Projects." *Marg* 6.4 (1953): 25. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: Routledge, 204. Print.
- Lang, Jon, Madhavi Desai and Miki Desai. "Architecture and Independence: The Search for Identity. India 1880-1980." *Marg* 10.2 (1957): 50. Print.
- Lee, Rachel and Kathleen James Chakraborty. "Marg Magazine: A Tryst with Architectural Modernity, Modern architecture as seen from an independent India." *ABE Journal* 1.1 (2012): 1-24. Print.
- Lenin, Vladimir Ilyich. *Collected Works*. Ed. Andrew Rothstein. Vol. 10. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978. 10 vols. Print.
- LeRoy, Gaylord C. and Ursula Beitz, *Preserve and Create: Essay in Marxist Literary Criticism*. New York: Humanities Press, 1973. Print.
- Macaulay, T.B. "Minute on Education." *Sources of Indian Tradition*. Ed. W. Theodore de Bary. Vol. II. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass and Indological Publishers and Booksellers, 1972. 596-601. Print.
- MacNeice, Louis. *The Strings Are False*. London: Faber and Faber, 1965. Print.
- Mahmud, Shabana. "Angare and the Founding of the Progressive Writers' Association." *Modern Asian Studies* 30.2 (1996): 447-467. Print.
- Mallot, J. Edward. "The City Beautiful: Remembering and Dismembering Chandigarh." Mallot, J. Edward. *Memory, Nationalism, and Narrative in Contemporary South Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 29-60. Print.
- "Manifesto of the Indian Progressive Writers' Association, London." *Left Review* 2.5 (1936): 240. Print.

- Manu, Sage. *Manusmṛiti*. Ed. M.N Dutt. Trans. M.N Dutt. New Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Prastisthan, 1998. Print.
- Marx, Karl. “Contribution to the Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right.” Marx, Karl. *Early Writings*. Ed. T.B. Bottomore. Trans. T.B. Bottomore. London: C.A. Watts and Co. Ltd., 1963. 41-59. Print.
- . *On India*. Ed. Iqbal Husain. New Delhi: Aligarh Historians Society and Tulika Books, 2006. Print.
- . *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. New York: International Publishers, 1969. Print.
- . “Thesis on Feuerbach.” *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Ed. David McLellan. London: Oxford University Press, 1977. 156-158. Print.
- Milford, Humphrey, ed. *BBC Pamphlets No 1: India and the Four Freedoms*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1944. Print.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Philip Pullman. London: Oxford University Press, 2005. Print.
- Mukherjee, Arun P. “The Exclusions of Postcolonial Theory and Mulk Raj Anand’s Untouchable: A Case Study.” *Ariel* 22.3 (1991): 27-48. Print.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. “The Tractor and the Plough: the Contrasted Visions of Sudhin Ghose and Mulk Raj Anand.” *Indian Literature* 13.1 (1970): 88-101. Print.
- Naik, M.K. *Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1973. Print.
- Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983. Print.
- Narasimhaiah, C.D. “Mulk Raj Anand: The Novel of Human Centrality.” Narasimhaiah, C.D. *Swan and the Eagle*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1969. 106-134. Print.

Nasta, Shsheila, ed. *Indian in Britain: South Asian Networks and Connections, 1858-1950*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Print.

—. “Negotiating a “New World Order”: Mulk Raj Anand as Public Intellectual at the Heart of Empire.” *South Asian Resistances in Britain, 1858-1947*. Ed. Rehand Ahmed and Sumita Mukherjee. London: Continuum, 2012. 140-60. Print.

—. “Between Bloomsbury and Gandhi? The background to the publication and reception of Mulk Raj Anand’s *Untouchable*.” *Books Without Borders: Perspectives from South Asia*. Ed. Robert and Hammond, Mary Fraser. Vol. II. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2008. II vols. 151–170. Print.

—. “Sealing a Friendship.” *Wasafiri* 26.4 (2011): 14-18. Print.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *Discovery of India*. London: Meridian Books, 1946. Print.

—. “Tryst With Destiny.” Brown, Judith M. *Nehru: A Political Life*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House, 1974. Print.

—. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Ed. Adrian Del Caro and Robert B. Pippin. Trans. Adrian Del Caro. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.

Niven, Alastair. *The Yoke of Pity: A Study of the Fictional Writings of Mulk Raj Anand*. Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1978. Print.

Orwell, George. “Animal Farm.” *Geogre Orwell Complete Works*. London: Sacker & Warburg/Octopus, 1976. 13-66. Print.

—. “Charles Dickens.” Orwell, George. *A Collection of Essays*. New York: Garden City, 1954. 111. Print.

—. “Letter to George Woodcock.” Orwell, George. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My Country Right or Left 1940-43*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and

- Ian Angus. Vol. II. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc, 1968. II vols. 267-68. Print.
- . “Rev of *The Sword and the Sickle* by Mulk Raj Anand.” Orwell, George. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My Country Right or Left 1940-43*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. II. London: Secker and Warburg, 1968. II vols. 216-19. Print.
- . “War-Time Dairy: 14 March 1942-15 November 1942.” Orwell, George. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My Country Right or Left 1940-43*. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. II. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc, 1968. II vols. 339-409. Print.
- Packham, Gillian. “Mulk Raj Anand and the Thirties Movement in England.” *Perspectives on Mulk Raj Anand*. Ed. K.K. Sharma. Ghaziabad: Vimal Prakashan, 1978. Print.
- Panikkar, K.N. “Progressive Cultural Movement in India: A Critical Appraisal.” *Social Scientist* 39.11-12 (2011): 14-25. Print.
- Paranjape, Makarand R. “Conversations in Bloomsbury: T.S. Eliot through Indian Eyes.” Paranjape, Makarand R. *Another Canon: Indian Texts and Traditions in English*. New Delhi: Anthem Press, 2009. 13-27. Print.
- . “Coping with Post-colonialism.” *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*. Ed. Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukheerjee. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996. 37-47. Print.
- . *The Death and Afterlife of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. *Colonialism, Tradition and Reform-An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*. New Delhi: Sage, 1999. Print.
- Pierre, Jeanneret, Manickam T.J. and Rana Mansinh. “Chandigarh Symposium.” *Marg* 10.2 (1957): 45-50. Print.
- Pope, Alexander. “The Essay on Man.” Pope, Alexander. *Poetical Works*. Ed. Davis Herbert. London: Oxford University Press, 1967. 62-85. Print.

- . “The Rape of the Lock.” Pope, Alexander. *Collected Poems*. Ed. Bonamy Dobree. London: J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd, 1969. 76-95. Print.
- Powers, Janet M. “Review of *The Wisdom of the Heart: A Study of the Works of Mulk Raj Anand* by Marlene Fisher.” *The Journal of Asian Studies* 46.2 (1987): 433. Print.
- Pradhan, Sudhi, ed. *Marxist Cultural Movement in India: Chronicles and Documents (1936-47)*. Vol. I. Calcutta: National Book Agency, 1979. III vols. Print.
- Premchand. “The Nature and Purpose of Literature.” *Social Scientist* 39.11/12 (2011): 82-86. Print.
- . “The PWA’s Hindi Manifesto (in Hans).” Coppola, Carlo. *Marxist Influences and South Asian Literature*. Ed. Carlo Coppola. Trans. Carlo Coppola. Vol. I. Michigan: Michigan State University, 1974. II vols. 6-8. Print.
- Rai, Amrit. *Premchand: His Life and Times*. Trans. Harish Trivedi. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002. Print.
- Ram, Atma. *Morality in Tess and Other Essays: In Honour of Mulk Raj Anand*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1996. Print.
- Ranasinha, Ruvani. “South Asian Broadcasters in Britain and the BBC: Talking to India (1941-1943).” *South Asian Diaspora* 2.1 (2010): 57-71. Print.
- Rand, Christopher. “City on a Tilting Plain.” *The New Yorker* 31.11 (1955): 35-62. Print.
- Rekha, Avasthi. *Pragativad aur Samanantar (Hindi)*. New Delhi: Macmillan, 1978. Print.
- Rolland, Romain. *Mahmoud Uz Zafar Khan and Rashid Jehan on Gandhi*. New Delhi, File No 35/1937: PC Joshi Archive on Contemporary History, 1937. Print.
- Rolo, Charles. *Radio Goes to War*. London: Faber and Faber, 1943. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*. New York: Dover Publication INC, 2004. Print.

- . *Social Contract and Social Discourse*. Ed. Ernest Rye. Trans. G.D.H. Cole. London: J. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1923. Print.
- Roy, Rammohum. "Letter on Education." *Sources of Indian Tradition*. Ed. W. Theodore de Bary. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass and Indological Publishers & Booksellers, 1972. 592-595. Print.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. New York: Penguin, 1992. Print.
- . *The Midnight's Children*. UK: Vintage, 1995. Print.
- . *The Moor's Last Sigh*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1995. Print.
- . *The Satanic Verses*. London: Vintage, Random House, 1998. Print.
- Russell, Ralph. "Leadership in the All-India Progressive Writer's Movement, 1935-47." *Leadership in South Asia*. Ed. B.N. Pandey. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1977. 104-127. Print.
- . *The Pursuit of Urdu Literature: A Select History*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1992. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge, 1978. Print.
- . *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Vintage Books, 1996. Print.
- Sales-Pontes, Alzira Kilda. *Dr. Mulk Raj Anand - A Critical Bibliography*. Loughborough: UP disser of Loughborough University, 1985. Print.
- Scott, John and Gordan Marshall. "Cultural Materialism." *Dictionary of Sociology*. Ed. John Scott and Gordan Marshall. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. 149. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *Measure for Measure*. Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*. Ed. John Ervine, Henry Glassford Bell and Henry Irving. London: Collins' Clear-Type Press, 1923. 107-137. Print.

- Sharma, Rajeev. *Realism and the Indian Short Story: A Comparative Study of Mulk Raj Anand, Manik Bandyopadhyay and Sadat Hasan Manto*. New Delhi: UP disser JNU, 1990. Print.
- Singh, Amrik. *Mulk Raj Anand: Role and Achievement*. New Delhi: National Book Trust, 2008. Print.
- Singh, Chander Uday. "Directory of Desire, Book Review: Kama Sutra of Vatsyayana." *India Today* 1981, 15-Dec. Internet. 2014 20-Dec.
<<http://indiatoday.intoday.in/story/book-review-kama-sutra-of-vatsyayana/1/402451.html>>.
- Singh, Khushwant. "'Good Guys, Bad Guys and Mulkees.'" Rev of Morning Face." *Times of India* (1969): iv. Print.
- Sinha, Krishna Nandan. *Mulk Raj Anand*. New York: Twyane Publishers, 1972. Print.
- Sisson, Richard and Stanley Wolport, *Congress and Indian Nationalism, The Pre Independence Phase*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1988. Print.
- Slate, Nico. "A Coloured Cosmopolitanism: Cedric Dover's Reading of the Afro-Asian World." *Cosmopolitan Thought Zones: South Asia and the Global Circulation of Ideas*. Ed. Sugata Bose and Kris Manjapra. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. 213-235. Print.
- Smith, Stevie. *The Holiday*. London: Faber and Faber, 1949. Print.
- Spencer, Herbert. *Social Statics or the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness Specified and the First of them Developed*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley Publishers, 1969. Print.
- Srinivas, Mysore Narasimhachar. *Social Change in Modern India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman Limited, 1977. Print.
- Tagore, Rabindranath. *Nationalism*. London: Macmillan, 1937. Print.

- . “Rammohun Roy.” *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore*. Ed. Sisir Kumar Das. Vol. III. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1996. III vols. 667-669. Print.
- . “The Way to Unity.” *The English Writings of Rabindranath Tagore*. Ed. Sisir Kumar Das. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1996. 459-469. Print.
- Tallents, Stephen. “The Work of the BBC Overseas Service.” *London Calling* (1940): 37-39. Print.
- Tennyson, Alfred Lord. “The Talking Oak.” Tennyson, Alfred Lord. *Poems and Plays*. Ed. Sir Thomas Herbert Warren. London: Oxford University Press, 1968. 83-86. Print.
- Thapar, Prem Nath. “A Little Known Town that Became Modern City.” *Times of India (Bombay)* 1953 7-October: 10-11. Print.
- Travis, Alan. “How a real Big Brother kept an eye on George Orwell, the bohemian communist.” *The Guardian* (2005): 3. Print.
<<http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2005/jul/18/past.booksnews>>.
- Valmiki, Omprakash. *Joothan: A Dalit's Life*. Trans. Arun Prabha Mukherjee. Kolkata: Samya, 2010. Print.
- Vivekananda, Swami. *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*. Vol. IV. Kolkata: Advaita Ashrama, 2006. IX vols. Print.
- Wadia, Sophia. “The International Writers' Congress.” *The Indian P.E.N.* 3 (1935): 7. Print.
- West, William J., ed. *Orwell: The War Broadcasts*. Trans. William J. West. London: Duckworth, 1985. Print.
- Williams, Raymond. *Problems in Materialism and Culture*. London: Verso, 1980. Print.
- Woolf, Leonard. “Introduction.” Anand, Mulk Raj. *Letter on India*. London: George Routledge & Sons and The Labour Book Service, 1942. i-vii. Print.

Zafar, Mahmud-uz. "Intellectuals and Cultural Reaction." *Marxist Cultural Movement in India: Chronicles and Documents (1936-47)*. Ed. Sudhi Pradhan. Vol. I. Bombay: National Book Agency, 1979. III vols. 84-89. Print.

Zaheer, Sajjad. "Reminiscences." *Marxist Cultural Movement in India: Chronicles and Documents, (1936-1947)*. Ed. Coppola Carlo. Trans. Naqvi Khaliq. Vol. I. Calcutta: National Book Agency, 1979. III vols. 33-47. Print.

—. *The Light: A History of the Movement for Progressive Literature in the Indo-Pakistan Subcontinent*. Trans. Amina Azfar. Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.

Zaheer, Sajjad, et al. *Angarey: 9 Stories and a Play*. Trans. Khalid Alvi and Vibha S. Chauhan. New Delhi: Rupa Publications, 2013. Print.

Zaheer, Sajjad, Munibur Rahman and Carlo Coppola. "Vision of Paradise." *Journal of South Asian Literature* 22.1 (1987): 184-88. Print.

Zakaria, Rafiq. *Price of Partition: Recollections and Reflections*. Mumbai: Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, 1998. Print.