

Suffering and Denotative in Bhabani Bhattacharya's Famine Novels

Author: A. Jancy Dyana
PhD scholar (Dept of English)
Nirmala College for Women
Coimbatore

Co-Author: Dr. Mary Neena
Assistant Professor
Nirmala College for Women
Coimbatore

Abstract

Bhabani Bhattacharya's novels, "So Many Hungers" and "He Who Rides a Tiger" furnish an epistemic change to majestic chronicles around the Bengal Famine in 1943 that affiliate with the idea of the insignificant as a ethnic oppose discourse. Bhattacharya challenges portrayal of a submissive modest population habitual to poverty by highlighting individualized characters with a practical artistic. Yet pragmatism is broken by the reminder (quiet, shouts, ellipse) and Bhattacharya moves protagonists from Denotative to per formative ideas of personality. These abilities of the denotative portrayal of suffering.

Keywords: Bhabani Bhattacharya, Famine, insignificant, performativity, denotative.

Introduction

It is evaluated that three million people died as a result of the Bengal Famine 1943, an incident that was marked by the British Empire as the consequence of Malthusian population flows, native stock piling and the inability of Indian officers, unprepared for freedom. In past years, economic historians have responded that the famine was generated by the "Denial policy" which appropriated harvests and boats in expectation of a Japanese road by strategy that forbidden the allocation of grain from external state and by a collapse to check enlargement (Sen., 1981). The imperialist state denied recognizing food insufficient and mass famine till late in 1943 and by force displaced famine casualties arriving in Calcutta from the countryside in seek of food back to penniless rustic locations. While the state deleted proof of the famine, Bengali artists such as Somnath Hore, Zainul Abedin, Soba Singh and chittaprasad, Photographer Sunil: writers including Ela Sen, Sukanta Bhattacharya, Kazi NazrulIslam

and Bhowani Sen and journalists Tushar Kanti Ghosh, Freda Bedi and several others defied the formal accounts with their own depictions.

The Anglophone Author Bhabani Bhattacharya was promoted by his friend Francis Yeats Brown and by Rabindranath Tagore to utilize to use English to attain an best Bengali Indian, and worldwide audience working as a journalist in Calcutta in the early 1940s he was concerned in the organizations that were accomplices and liable for the famine the influence for the families, the part of sexual brutality, the exposure of kids and the part of the state in displacement the casualties. In translating to famine to an Anglophone audience, Bhattacharya pictured a best comprehensive feel of society that was the event in government oratory through pragmatist and non-pragmatist depictions.

His works states an epistemic substitute to royal narrative regarding the famine that arranges with the notion of the insignificant as an ethnic counter-discourse. While Delouse and Guattari (1986:17) magnificently cite deterritorialized discourse, political involvement and unity as characteristics of the insignificant in Bhattacharya's (1947) first novel *So Many Hungers* the author sets significance on the political strategies that generated the famine in dissimilarity to the majestic focus on natural disaster and battle. As such Bhattacharya bars administrative depictions of a submissive modest population habitual to poverty by pushing individualized characters with a realistic artistic. Within this he focuses several records of language containing what Ashis Nandy (2015:598) relates to as the reminiscent (quiet, shout, elision) to establish a deterritorialized feel of language at odds with the language of the majestic government. In *Who He Rides a Tiger* Bhattacharya (1954) ties the Bengal famine and caste examining the method of meaning that converted people of low caste into non-persons vulnerable to death by famine in a manifestation of bio-power. He moves the protagonist from and suffer of caste as noticeable on the body to a performative idea of caste personality and lastly to an involvement in anti-royal patriotism. In the novel, opposition to consumptive schemes of signification is establish not only in anti-royal patriotism led by an best but also in craft, understanding and narration Amid extensive evading of liability by authorities, Bhattacharya invests the reader with a feel of involvement with famine fatalities and obligation for community restoration.

So Many Hungers!

So Many Hungers was published two months after independence in October 1947 while Bengal was still recovering from the famine and undergo the fierceness of division and it utilizes literature as a way of formatting public thought and gathering funds. The novel assume a dual concentrate narrative as it tracts two families one

wealthy and urban the other inadequate and rural Rahoul is son of the rich and immoral industrialist Samarendra. Sporadically complicated with patriotism, Rahoul is a Cambridge educated physicist, husband and father. His younger brother Kunal enrolls as officer in the army throughout World War II and he regards it as a way of achievement the academic the conviction needed to toss off the letters of expansionism. Rahoul's grandfather Devata is a steadfast patriot who is imprisoned over the cause of the novel for his anti-colonial activity and has fathered and second rustic peasant family with whom Rahoul builds connection. In the second family the main figures are a young girl Kajoli who lives with her younger brother Onu and their mother. It is the family that falls into the clutches of famine and drift to the city where Kajoli prostitutes herself to gain money for her family and community of destitute after her husband Kishore is shot by the authorities. Kajoli is raped and assaulted by the jackal on the road to Calcutta. This results in the loss of her unborn child.

Countering the government's rejection to announce a famine and collect funds beneath Indian famine encrypt passed in the late 19th century-via what Priyamvada Gopal(2001) has called "a crude constructivism which attempted to retain control of material condition through the control of language"(p.81). Bhattacharya attempts to certify the incident in outstanding detail become all the more urgent. One of the best impressive in the novel is the author's shrewd explanation of the drives of the famine which are alike to interpretations given by contemporary economists.

The empty stomach was due to no blight of nature, no failure of crops. It was a man-made Scarcity, for the harvest had been fair, and even if the army bought up big stocks, with rationing at the right level there could be food for all. But there was no rationing. The belated law against hoarding was a dead letter-never was lifted against the rich food-profiters, henchmen of the Excellencies and Honorable. Forty thousand country boats want only destroyed. Many villages evacuated. The uprooted people pauperized. Inflated currency, the spine of war finance, added the finishing touch, eating up the people's purchasing power, reducing the small savings of a lifetime to a fifth of their worth. Nothing was left of the foundations of life, the roots deep down in the soil. (Bhattacharya, 1947:146)

He underlines that each famine target has the complication of life experience that he arrays out in Kajoli's story."Humanity all the same-all people with minds with the capacity to feel an inner gift that was now a curse for the agony of the spirit was even harder to bear than hunger"(Bhattacharya,1947:186). The artist starts to think sorrow at having alone to help the baby and Rahoul notes "The artist had lost his detachment and with detachment vision. He seethed with human feeling" (Bhattacharya,

1947:216). Rahoul and his grandfather are conscious of the injustices of the Empire, as they discuss the prospectors going on strike in Australia over a better fraction while a mother sinks her three kids in famine afflicted Bengal (Bhattacharya, 1947:249). They realize the effect on generations, who have become horrified by the famine and “those who survived but who growth would be stunted” (Bhattacharya, 1947:250).

Dorothy Shimmer (1975) compose that Rahoul’s depiction constructs him a representative for the author. “His role in life is to be sensitive to (but not sentimental about) the human condition and get into the words that will capture it for the widest possible reading public and for posterity”(p.31). Their rich father Samarendra, “who” had hoarded food grains in secret dumps in the famine areas “funds the kitchen (Bhattacharya, 1947:238). He was “like the right honorable at white hall who called the famine on act of God and caste a blind eye on the clear process of cause and effect” (Bhattacharya, 1947:238). Bhattacharya at several junctures disputes the truth of Rahoul’s thoughts. Rahoul marvels how a population so energetic in the anti-majestic motion might yield to hunger.

Barely a year had passed since these men, or their brethren, had risen in anger against the tyrants, the robbers of freedom, who had swept the people’s leaders into prison even without a pretense of trial. But they would not rise in revolt that their stomachs could be soothed—a selfish personal end! (Bhattacharya, 1947:149)

Kajoli family is liberal, with same tiny Onu split the figs he selects high up in the trees with families lower happy than his own. When they quit their home in desperation the story happen further intense. In the series in which Kajoli is raped and the assaulted by a jackal in the area language vanishes into oval both on the portion of the soldier who rapes her and Kajoli herself. At first, “the soldier was lost in twilight half dream, half reality(Bhattacharya, 1947:199). After he leaves Kajoli on the ground, “the jackal attacks her. The jackal was gazing down on her tongue rolling, and cold sweat bathed her body. She felt the snout of the animal and shuddered and screamed in mad terror and her voice was a faint gurgle in her throat. Mad she screamed over and over again and all her shrinking body screamed... (Bhattacharya, 1947:203).

There is another juncture when surplus of misery cause not a collapse in language but quite in language but fairly an artistic shift. The intense and ghastly detail requires the reader to be a spectator to the substantial influence of famine, as in the subsequence passage.

Corpses lay by the road, huddling together. Picked to bone, with eyeless caverns of sockets, bits of skin and flesh rotting on nose and chin and ribs, the skulls pecked open, only the hair uneaten-fluffy babies hair, men's hair, the waist-long hair of women. Screamed..... (Bhattacharya, 1947:189)

The rambling shift of focus onto the monstrous body, deformed by the animals interrupt the sympathetic realistic story turning them into a spectator of a beneath attack. Michael Rothberg (2000) has marked the stress among the realistic urge and the collapse of language in face of suffering as “traumatic realism” (p.6).Cathy Caruth (1995) explains as tracks the difficulty with the denotative portrayal of suffering.

I would purpose that it is here, in the equally widespread and bewildering encounter with trauma-both in its occurrence and in the attempt to understand it-that we can begin to recognize the possibility of a history that is no longer straightforwardly referential(that is, no longer based on simple models of experience and reference),(p.11)

Ashis Nandy (2015) has portrayed history that surpass language as “mnemonic or memory Drives and cover some of our intimate relationships private hatreds traumatic or life-attiring experiences dreams and encounters with the sacred” (p.598).Nandy (2015) characterizes them as “outside the domain of the state and outside authoritative professional disciplinary constructions of the past”(p.598).The idea is beneficial in knowledge the unique nature of Bhattacharya's focusing.”The individual is an intersection of singularities the discrete exposition of their simultaneity, an exposition that is both discrete and transitory” (Nancy 2000; 85).In *So Many Hungers!* The adventures of the famine cannot be delineated through one goal eventually discourse and occasionally cannot be delineated at all, but they incriminate each character and reader.

He Who Rides a Tiger!

Bhattacharya's (1954) *He Who Rides a Tiger* is frequently examined jointly with *Hungry Bengal*, but it characteristics an extreme concentrate in which the Bengal Famine of 1643 is related to a critique of caste and class unfairness and capitalist victimization. The characters work with a gutting method of significance and seek to rectify it. Bhattacharya consider on the ways in which the indicating systems of caste and class discrimination and capitalist the row away non-persons consequent in their victimization and death. He cultivates a national feel of unity established on political participation in the food entry and anti-majestic actions on compassion and craft to substitute self-concerned and caste-founded styles of recognition.

In the novel the low caste man and dedicated father named Kalo (Black in Bengali) sets out from his village during the famine, leaving back his attractive and expert daughter Chandralekha. He is imprisoned for theft bananas and after release works at a brother in the city. There he considers that his daughter has been forced into sex trade. In the Societal of the novel, gloomy skin and a poor look are indexes of low caste and poor look are indexes and virtuous character. As Gyanendra Pandey (2013) puts it in writing around the Mahars, "The body of the Mahars unclean grimy, superstitious irrational lacking in human dignity, self-confidence and self-respect, is the mark of their degradation" (p.177).

Priyamvada Gopal was concentrated on the use of language in the novel to reinterpret significance. She imparts as examples the meaning of Kalo and Lekha and the creation of the story of the wonder of Shiva's appearance, "both survival and revenge can only be effected through speech acts however difficult they may be to initiate" (Gopal, 2001:70). Sourit Bhattacharya (2016) argues that both physical appearance and language are critical pointers that get handled in the course of the novel (p.57). Kalo utilizes not just language but also "skin color and a host of other phenomena including the legal basis of the production of the colonized body" screamed..... (Bhattacharya, 2016:59) to resist the determinative.

Kalo is named for his gloomy skin, but he ruptures with the method of significance that named him. The name Chandralekha is given by a Brahmin customer of Kalo the Blacksmith, who observations that it is name of the "gentle folk". "Dark minded folks of your caste have a fancy for Haba and Goba Punt and Muni han?" (Bhattacharya, 1954:2). In spite of her strange characteristics has tiny role in the novel beyond representing charm, love and virtue. Charu Gupta in writing of sexuality and in caste in rectify literature, has claimed that depictions of low-caste women displaced in the early 20th century from categorize of illegal gender to Victimhood:

Dalit women emerged here as victims of caste exploitation, circumscribed employment, And poverty. Metaphors of sympathy, however, were marked by incongruity: they coalesced with images of acquiescence and superiority to regulate Dalit women's bodies. (Gupta, 2016:54)

The character's consciousness of his own insincerity results in the break of his mind into Kalo and his Brahmin persona Mangal Adhikari: "was not Mangal Adhikari polluted every minute of his life by the connection of smith man? Or was the smith man lost entirely, leaving no shadow on the Brahminic self?" (Bhattacharya, 1954:112). The system of significance concentrate on substantiality is not completely

abused by Bhattacharya. It is the part of the intimacy of father and daughter that Kalo possess “every little change that came on that face, mirroring her moods while Lekha loves to watch him at his craft (Bhattacharya, 1954:9).”The truly wonderful grow was not in creation but in production but in profits, particularly speculative gains through profiteering in food, share market operations and the black market in general” (p.407).

When Kalo is caught for theft bananas on a train, he clashes a system in which the inadequate are seen as useless prior to his look before the judge fairness carries a extreme various significance are observed as different meaning for Kalo: “Among his simple set of values was faith in the law, that instrument which served out justice even to the poor” (Bhattacharya, 1954:30) when Kalo describes that he steal the bananas in order to endure the judge asks “why did you have to live?” (Bhattacharya, 1954:31).Although the judge asks about whose lives have value and whose are useless:”why? Asked the man of equity in his gloomy English clothes why did you have to live? (Bhattacharya, 1954:31).The achievement of the absence of significance in social system results in a fall for Kalo “Something was gone and Kalo,”something was gone and kalo blacksmith of Jharna town could never be whole again” (Bhattacharya, 1954:32).As Kalo “rides a tiger” (Bhattacharya, 1954:85) of his false personality, he also increases the question of who counts as a person:”The hungry destitute-are they not people?” (Bhattacharya, 1954:138).Bhattacharya builds as many as bitten a sharp critic of greed and its hypothesis of disposable bodies essential to the progress of society. The rectify in accordance with Bhattacharya is not sedition patriotism as we as understand and Creativity.

Conclusion

In both “So Many Hungers” and “He Who Rides a Tiger” referentially is shattered by imperialist rule and social bias. The predicament was both a cause of the famine in conditions of hypothetical financial plans and consumptive social constructions and a possibility to reorganize society to permit for a attention of the external lives for those at the base of the social hierarchy. Bhattacharya incorporates pragmatism with deterritorialized forms of phrase to both voice dreadful misery and provide a dream of reform.

References

1. Bhattacharya, B (1947) So Many Hungers! Bombay, India: Hind Kitab.
2. Bhattacharya, B (1954) He Who Rides a Tiger. New York: Crown publishers.
3. Chatterjee, P (1998) Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World.Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota press.

4. Foucault. M (2003) Society must be Defended (trans.Macey, D).New York: Picador.
5. Glissant, E (2010) Poetics of Relation (trans.Wing, B).Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan press.
6. Nancy, J (2000) Being Singular plural.Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
7. Sen., A (1981) Poverty and Famines. Oxford: Clarendon press.