

# The Blurred Lens: Postcolonial Perspective of 'Nationalist' discourse and Partition of India



**Divyajyoti Singh**

Assistant Professor,  
Deptt. of Humanities,  
YMCA University of Science &  
Technology,  
Faridabad, Haryana

## Abstract

An earnest academic probe into the contribution of 'nationalistic' discursive practices towards deepening of the schisms amongst Indian communities is required so that the events, their causes and their import become clearer. Whether this discourse aided and abetted political interests of elite classes resting on communal rifts, took the material form of Partition of India is a hypothesis that needs investigation. This study explores the soundness of contention that the hegemonic group or hegemonic discourse is necessarily that of the colonizer but excavates the link that ties the elite classes amongst the colonized to the colonizer and creates a more nuanced hegemonic model than one which the colonizer-colonized dialectic suggests. While the colonizer blatantly claimed to give supreme regard to their own concerns, it was the elite amongst the colonized that claimed to represent all the colonized including the classes they exploited. However, even though this hegemony is indisputable with regards to taking an ideological and cultural lead yet the Gramscian idea of concessions and compromise is not completely met in the context of Hindu politics. This is because the leading group does not have to sacrifice any of its interest to make the subaltern or depressed groups/classes/castes believe that they are being represented. This special brand of hegemony emerges in India due to the system of caste prevalent amongst Hindus which is incomparable to any other hierarchical system, offering as it does systematic and precise social gradations while still retaining the mystique of spirituality. Here, political, social and cultural leadership overlaps with visible economic interests but only occasionally challenged since it is sanctified by the Hindu religion, never overtly admitted to be an economic system. While secular forces in Punjab worked by highlighting common economic interests of underprivileged groups and underling their disjunction from those of the forward castes, the communal forces worked by dismissing economic question focusing on shared communal agenda of diverse castes within the Hindu fold. The study embarks on a fresh quest to seek the cause of Partition and why it precipitated contextualized in a larger panorama of political alternatives available. Above all, the paper attempts to find the efficacy of nationalist discourse in British India and its instrumentality in the penultimate decade to partition in creating and sustaining conditions congenial for *realpolitik* to work.

**Keywords:** Partition, Discourse, Narrative, Cultural Hegemony, Colonized, Fallacies, Propaganda, Punjab, British India.

## Introduction

This exploratory paper that launches a probe into the connection between the nationalist discourse and partition of India. Throughout the 'nationalist' phase of freedom struggle there was a stress on historical presence of a unique 'civilization' reigning in the Indian subcontinent 'evident' from a glorious ancient Indian past. Sanskrit epics *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* (that are also suggestive of Hindu 'dharma' or duty) were considered prime examples of this 'itihās' and *Rig Veda* as the text par excellence pre-dating every other composition. The paper investigates whether this dominance of upper-class Hindu narratives in the articulation of 'nationalist' consciousness, the choice of classical past, the glorification of a specific language, investment of value in mythology proportionally led to distancing from approaches that were inclusive, secular, egalitarian and scientific. Whether this nationalist discourse had a decisive upper-caste and communal-orientation that worked by exclusion of diversity of cultures

within the mainland is a question worth exploring. An excessive value laid on a defined and narrow period of history with focus on patronage to literary and aesthetic endeavours rather than prevalent socio-economic conditions led to the neglect of material realities and cultural dynamism of the various regions. A lack of critical approach and lopsided perspective on past did not grant a fair assessment of the 'civilization' or contribute to realization of shortcomings in the established order formation of a development plan that could be holistic or democratic. In fact, there is an apprehension that the very choice of narrative and discourse in the nationalist phase definitely prepared the turf for a paradoxical political scenario that marginalized the masses for whom 'freedom' was being demanded. Nationalistic consciousness was less a critique of colonialism and more a position that claimed equivalence with the colonizer to affect a transfer of power.

#### **Aim of the Study**

This paper aims to undertake an earnest academic probe into the contribution of 'nationalistic' discursive practices towards deepening of the schisms amongst Indian communities so that the events, their causes and their import become clearer. It investigates whether this discourse aided and abetted political interests of elite classes resting on communal rifts, took the material form of Partition of India. This study aims to explore the soundness of contention that the hegemonic group or hegemonic discourse is necessarily that of the colonizer. The paper excavates the link that ties the elite classes amongst the colonized to the colonizer and creates a more nuanced hegemonic model than one which the colonizer-colonized dialectic suggests.

#### **Review of Literature**

In the recent times many works have appeared on partition literature as well as postcolonialism. The most recent book in postcolonial studies is *Postcolonial Studies: A Materialist Critique* (2004) by Benita Parry. Many scholarly papers have appeared on the theme of caste in recent times. The most important and recent paper the researcher came across is "U. R. Ananthamurthy's Crusade against Caste: the Text and Context" (2017) by Virender Pal. His another paper entitled "Religion, Caste and Modernity: a Study of U.R. Ananthamurthy's Samskara." on same theme is also relevant.

#### **Postcolonialism: Missing the Trees for the Woods?**

In its insistence and pointed agenda of offering a critique to colonialism, postcolonialism has fallen into the trap of subsuming differences and shoving them to suit the dialectic of colonizer-colonized so as to create contrasts and present a neat picture of exploited versus exploiters. Missing the trees for the wood, it renders limited help in understanding how colonial juggernaut worked at the grassroots. A closer look does not corroborate the clear cut polarization and in fact, reveals several rungs over which both power and exploitation are distributed. In Indian context, the colonizer-exploiter was followed by an upper caste Hindu (colonized-exploiter) who was again followed by other colonized-

exploiters who also were victims to those above themselves in the caste hierarchy. A postcolonial critique on Indian condition often ignores this more intricate reality where colonized-victim may also be a colonized- exploiter and many a times the colonizer-exploiter may be even a savior-in-disguise. For instance, the British colonizers introduced many laws that loosened the stranglehold of suffocating caste-religious laws that prevailed in India of which the replacement of *Gentoo Law* with *Lex Loci Act* is a significant evidence.

Simon Daring offering a view on limitations of Postcolonialism notes that the readings are positioned as 'reconciliatory rather than a critical, anti-colonialist category' (qtd. Benita Parry. 'Beginning, affiliations, disavowals' p.4). Benita Parry herself refers to 'a negotiatory cultural politics' derived from 'partial readings' that 'displaced the record of repressive political processes, the contradictory, volatile but all the same structurally conflictual positions occupied by the heterogeneous categories of colonizer and colonized were muted, and the incommensurable interests and aspirations immanent in colonial situations conjured into mutuality' (Parry. p. 4) There is a realization of the need to challenge the relegation of 'social explanations' (Parry p.4. )and 'political economy' in 'critical theory'( Nancy Fraser qtd. Parry p.5).

#### **Knowledge-Power Nexus: Episteme, canons and historiography**

Michel Foucault's understanding of 'episteme' and relative value placed on knowledge held by different groups helps understand power relations as well as the alliance between power and knowledge. How knowledge is withheld, shared, limited and used to enhance power or deprive other groups of power. He elaborates upon the idea: 'This episteme may be suspected of being something like a world-view, a slice of history common to all branches of knowledge, which impose on each one the same norms and postulates, a general atage of reason, a certain structure of thought that men of a particular period cannot escape- a great body of legislation written once and for all by some anonymous hand.' (191). He develops the idea further, ' By episteme, we mean, in fact, the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalized systems'(191).

In his essay 'The formation of the Intellectuals' Antonio Gramsci notes:

Every social group, coming into existence on the original terrain of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates together with itself, organically, one or more strata of intellectuals which give it homogeneity and an awareness of its own function not only in the economic but also in the social and political fields(Ed Anand Prakash. 54).

The nationalist intellectual and the nationalist discourse were meant to preserve the establishment or at least work out a desired transfer of power from British to the Indian elite.

Parry quotes Terry Eagleton's insistence on importance of analyzing 'superstructure' as 'it at least

succeeds in powerfully *dislodging* culture from its idealist supremacy' (qtd. Parry p.5.). Here, it Gramscian underlining of 'cultural hegemony' is illustrative as what is of 'interest' to the 'leading' group is considered to be an 'ideal' or utopian situation for all that the group claims to represent. Parry points out that 'the inventions of cultural activity kept the ideological world in movement' and ideology supported the dominant group because the dominant ideology was invariably related to dominant group. Here, the dominant group is not the only group as at any point as Raymond Williams notes there are 'residual', 'dominant' and 'emergent' cultures at any historical juncture.

Episteme edits out the 'vulgar', the 'plebian', the 'mundane' and the 'local'. The canon does not include them. The historiography is neither directed by them nor does it recognize them. In his essay 'Faulty Perspectives' ED Hirsch Jr. points to 'three relativistic fallacies' from the 'perspective of history'. The first is recognized as 'the fallacy of the inscrutable past' (251), the second, is the 'fallacy of the homogeneous past' (252) and the third is 'the fallacy of the homogeneous present-day perspective' (252). In discussing the second fallacy ED Hirsch comments, 'to assume that any cultural environment is homogeneous', even on the very abstract level at which literary history is conducted, is to make an assumption about human communities which experience contradicts' (252). Consequently, he piques at the 'implausibility' of the 'major premise about the Medieval Mind, or the Greek Mind, or the Victorian Frame of Mind' (252) of 'monolithic cultural perspectives' (252). In fact, existence of a Hindu Mind would actually seem an uncanny idea to even critics and historicists who indulge in monolithic views of ancient Indian past, given the idea of caste. There can be no Hindu mind but a Brahmin mind. The idea of intellect is dissociated from all other castes in mainstream Hindu epistemology. So, Hinduism can be monolithic only if Hindu is equated with Brahmin and this is the regular approach to any exposition on Hinduism. Also, a significant part of Indian history is only dynastic history rather than the history of people. These dynasties have been sanctioned, supported, recognized and eulogized by Brahmins. The recognition given by Brahmins was carried over in modern historiography that relies for most part on written records including mythography and to a lesser degree on archaeological records. Here, an uncontested view prevailed till mainstream historical records were given importance. As Hirsch Jr. stresses, the point is not to 'dispute' the meaning of the texts but to differ in 'significance' attached to the texts (254). This historical orientation began with the *Orientalists* and remains the dominant inclination in present day historiography. Furthermore, the tendency influences fiction and non-fiction alike where the Indian literary turf is concerned. Thapar asserts that to recreate a 'complete picture' of the past the historian has to rely on 'passing references' to understand the lives of the commoners (Thapar, 29). The historians in more recent approaches have realized that aesthetic activities are superficial and

have a substratum of numerous labour-intensive economic activities that make leisure and patronage of arts possible. Thapar talks of recent endeavours that stem from a 'recognition of labour as an essential precondition to activities that are admired from the past' (Thapar, 29).

While many discuss the scientific method and objective approach of historians, Hayden White in *Metahistory* stresses the 'art' involved in historical writing. The chronicle is open-ended but there is a tendency to 'narrativize' the past, to tell it like a story with a beginning, middle and end. This precludes omissions and inclusions so that a cohesive and convincing tale is told. At the same time, however, every historian seeks to achieve what White calls diverse kinds of "explanatory affect (sic)" (X. Preface). He delineates the strategies as 'explanation by formal argument, explanation by emplotment, and explanation by ideological implication' (x). He further analyses 'four principle modes of historical consciousness' namely, Metaphor, Synecdoche, Metonymy, and Irony (x). He comments: 'we are indentured to a choice among contending interpretative strategies in any effort to reflect on history-in-general' (xii). But he maintains that a claim to greater authority cannot hold for any given mode as each mode only represents reality (xii). White also speaks of the eighteenth century division of historiography into 'fabulous, true, and satirical'. First, was fictitious and inventive, next aimed at truth avoiding prejudice, and last, ironic. The present paper identifies and apprehends these strategies and modes that inform biographical accounts. The objective of the paper is to unveil the politics of image-building and observe the manipulations whereby these texts are circulated. Louis A. Montrose in his influential essay 'Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture' discusses the historical and cultural determination of texts. He emphasizes the 'history of textuality' and 'textuality of history'. There is an 'acknowledgement that our analyses and our understandings necessarily proceed from our own historically, socially and institutionally shaped vantage points; that the histories we reconstruct are the textual constructs of critics who are, ourselves, historical objects' (23).

It is observable that much of what is considered as 'itihas' or important in Indian knowledge system is rendered in Sanskrit, the language that is exclusively associated with the Hindu ecclesiasts and court. The prominent Indian historian Romila Thapar admits that a myopic view riddles the whole articulation of mainstream Indian history. Thapar points out, 'The Golden Age was either the entire Hindu period that was seen as unchanging and universally prosperous, or else the reign of the Gupta Kings which historians, both Indian and British, had associated with positive characteristics and revival of Brahmanical religion and culture' (Thapar 17). Thapar further asserts, 'Cultural achievement was measured in terms of the arts, literature and philosophy, with less attention to description of social realities. It also put a premium on Sanskrit sources compared to those in Pali, Prakrit or other languages. Sanskrit had been

the language of courts and of upper-caste Hinduism. What were regarded as lesser languages were assumed to have been used by people of lesser status, Sanskrit texts were given priority even where there were variants of the same narrative in other languages. In fact, she links the nationalist phase of Indian history and its contribution to nationalist phase of Indian history as usefully linked to political mobilization but also rising divisive and vainglorious discourse. Thapar offers a critique of such ideological 'tendencies, because their appeal is to emotion and to faith, can threaten the intellectual foundations of historical discourse'.

#### **Language Politics, Elitism and Revival of Sanskrit**

The present study stems from a recognition that an understanding of 'power relations' prevalent in India is intrinsic to an understanding of prestige posited in a language like Sanskrit that kept fuelling elitist historiography. The hegemonic power of Sanskrit also ensured what Louis Althusser following Marx would have recognized as 'reproduction of conditions of labour'(See Anand Prakash). Though these economic conditions are not the same as those in industrialized Western world, yet the Marxian perspective remains a valid one in recognition of how 'ideology' and state apparatus may help retain the status quo so that the equilibrium of power or the social hierarchy remains undisturbed. In the case of India, Sanskrit was the hinge on which accessibility to knowledge and hence power rested. By corollary, the inaccessibility to Sanskrit also rendered first communities, and then by extension the individuals powerless. In fact, the economic condition of 'haves' and 'have nots' could be easily equated with those who were licensed users of Sanskrit- usually, by birth, seldom by mere merit. Thus, a majority of Hindu population covering many castes and hence a large chunk of Indian population were denied dignity, economic status and socio-political status as they were disinvested of Sanskrit and disinherited from any share in historical achievement. Their only claim to past achievements could be only unmerited claims to glorious past of caste Hindus as their own endeavours were not even recognized; there was no importance attached to the struggles of their own ancestors.

#### **General Economic Model of Hinduism**

The Brahmin actually did not have to run or conceptualize a neat or cogent economic model with a concrete trope like a factory, rather he just ensured that the most significant dividend/share of every activity economic or routine came to him automatically. The fear of punishment in this world(that could wll continue into next birth was enough) to ensure a steady flow of tokens towards the Brahmin at all points- birth, christening(namkaran), marriage, death and all other junctures in the infinity of little/great rituals identified and ordained by Brahmin Shastras , smritis and shrutis held sacrosanct in Hindu society. All ceremonies were exclusive preserve of Brahmins who had exclusive right to chant Sanskrit and receive donations for conducting rituals. Many punishments also required doing penance in terms of monetary benefits to Brahmins. A devastatingly exploitative model of

economics was touted and recognized as a 'spiritual' model as the language in which this was encrypted was considered celestial or divine. It was a language that granted both legitimacy and sacred status. Here, sacred and secret have close associations as Sanskrit is not a shared code even amongst Hindus. Had it been shared, it could not have retained its mystic aura, its intelligibility to all would have made it commonplace, its use in routine would have made it a language with utilitarian dimensions something inferior to that which was 'aesthetic', sophisticated, exclusive and elite preserve rather than vulgar or plebian to be shared by all castes. In this sense, one can even assume Sanskrit to be associated with an iota of artificiality, and lack of robustness and evolutionary/development trajectory that overlaps/mars purist sustenance- a matter to be explored. Gramsci notes 'the cultural hegemony of the dominant class' which according to Sreedharanis defined as 'political, intellectual and moral leadership. It consisted in the capacity of a dominant class to articulate its interests and the interests of other social groups, and to become in that way the leading force of a collective will'(Sreedharan 279). The 'collective will' works to promote the interests of the dominant class as the marginalized groups cannot svere their interests/concerns from the dominant ones that claim to representative for all or all that is legitimate.

This model so fruitful for the Brahmin was critically viewed by Hindus who were on the receiving ends. The 'intellectual' who could not share the perspective or interests of the caste Hindus had his own analysis and reading to offer: 'Caste does not result in economic efficiency. Caste cannot improve, and has not improved, race. Caste, has, however, done one thing. It has completely disorganized and demoralized the Hindus' (241), notes Ambedkar in his book *The Annihilation of Caste* advocating the extermination of caste.

Caste with its gradient was an automatic system for sustaining Brahmin hegemony as the inter-caste divisions were all hierarchical and so many that the subordinate groups could never come together especially as they saw the divide and hierarchy as god-ordained/destined/fateful.

#### **Such Indignity of Labour: solely in India**

The economic model based on birth rights ensured that labour was available for free generation after generation as some people were born to labour for the caste –Hindus. As Althusser points out: 'individuals are always-already subjects' (p.199) The 'unborn child' is born in a certain ideology with his role/responsibility and orientations already defined according to his birth. This is true for Hindu State as well where Brahmanical order prevailed as socio-economic and political condition. Here there was division of labour but no dignity of labour and correspondingly no value of labour though exploitation of labour was to an infinite scale. Class struggle was completely avoided as upward social mobility or change of profession was completely forestalled by the fact of caste being ordained by birth. Severe injunctions monitored this social structure where the status of hybrids was also presumed. Dharma/duties

and samskaras-ensured discipline and obedience. It was a transactional society where severity, method and type of punishment, reward and penance was dependent on birth. Manusmriti, again written in Sanskrit was considered the authoritative text in this regard. The importance of this text can be understood from the fact that the British had accorded it the status of legal text in context of Hindu subjects and the Brahmins had indisputably agreed to implement it for the British as the approved code for Hindus. *The Code of Gentoo* law continued to rule Hindus till *Lex Loci* came into force which was vehemently opposed by Brahmins who saw the liberal law as a threat to their supremacy.

Only in the case of slave trades run by Europeans there was no investment by the exploiting class but then the slave models may not be considered illustrative of hegemony as the European running the factory system did not claim to represent the exploited race. In case of India, however, during the nationalist struggle the Brahmins claimed to represent the interests of the nation. They also claimed to understand what was in the best interest of the depressed classes and outcastes. For an outsider, including the orientalist, the Hindus were one race despite the nebulous theories of Aryan-Dasadjunct. It was a stark paradox that the identification with and alienation of the lower classes could be so simultaneous and yet not found incongruent.

Central to the issue is BR Ambedkar's *Annihilation of Caste*. The Gandhi-Ambedkar debate must also be invoked here and read in tandem with the unsettling episode from post-independence India-the Grand Conversion in which Ambedkar chose to convert to Buddhism. The paper highlights the tug-of-war between the 'Swaraj' frontguard and the Dalit emancipators. The debate is about the attempts of British and indigenous social reformers to undermine the debilitating caste system and tensions that riddled the general wish from liberty from foreign rule without succumbing to historical incapacities nurtured under caste system. For this, freedom should be found but not without first ensuring that social inequities related to caste were exterminated. So mental slavery, not just from colonial rule but from the reigning Hindu doxa of internal inequities and suppression was required. BR Ambedkar had speculated about it and rightly saw the interests of the underprivileged compromised still further in a free country dictated by Hindu ideology.

Katherine Mayo, an American journalist recorded her observations on the disparity and exploitation in *Mother India* that appeared to have its roots in caste system but emerged in worse form when gender and caste intersected. She draws attention to the irrational obsession with caste pollution and untouchability, especially as to her there was apparently complete lack of cleanliness and little sense of personal hygiene that could distinguish the Indians of upper castes from the lower castes. In fact, the superiority of the upper castes was hinged only on this exaggerated idea of caste pollution and relied primarily on social alienation of the lower caste.

Ambedkar in *Annihilation* remarks that 'in no civilized society is division of labour accompanied by this unnatural division of labourers into watertight compartments' (234). He further comments, 'In no other country is the division of labour accompanied by this gradation of labourers' (234). He notes furthermore that in India the division is not 'spontaneous' or based on natural aptitude' but on the 'social status of the parents' (234). The professions also have 'stigma' attached to them and thus, some important occupations are not found desirable. Hence, Ambedkar contends that 'as an economic organization caste is therefore a harmful institution' (236).

He asks an astute question pointing to the inaptitude of Socialist thought to India. 'Can it be said that the proletariat of India, poor as it is, recognizes no distinctions except that of the rich and the poor?' (232) He finds that the proletariat of India cannot put up a 'united front' as they are divided by caste (232).

#### **Samskara, Sanskriti and Political Economy of Caste: Limitations and Scope of Dharma doctrine**

However, what does the Brahmin do for his living? Katherine Mayo in her iconoclastic *Mother India* observes, 'Each Hindu in India pays to the Brahman many times more than he pays to the State. From the day of his birth to the day of his death, a man must be feeding the Earthly God' (147-8). The Earthly God is the Hindu Brahman. She lists out the 'vested rights' of Brahmins to perform various big and small, periodic and contingent ceremonies defined for each gender separately (148-9).

While mainstream Hinduism recommends joint families disciplined around central patriarch with properly laid out rules with respect to division of property, there are other peripheral and parallel families having no rights or recognition nevertheless as normative as legitimate families as the readers witness in Sharan Kumar Limbale's *The Outcaste: Akarmashi*. Families of outcastes were illegitimate yet socially sanctioned. These fringe families symptomatic of upper class hegemony and clout ensuring new outcastes and regular supply of free labour force. In fact, one family usually brings up or abandons a bevy of children who are step brothers or sisters to each other related by uterine blood or otherwise. This is because; it is common for high-caste men to 'keep' the lower caste women as their concubines. Prevalence of this practice is recorded by Mayo and also invoked in fiction by writers like UR Ananthmurthy as in *Samskara*. This may not be out of consent of the woman but is quite paradoxically socially sanctioned in Hinduism despite the woman being an 'untouchable'.

Mayo asserts that the forward castes were afraid that the privileges granted to them under Hinduism would be compromised under the British Raj and only self-rule perhaps could guarantee the complete enjoyment of grants ordained according to caste hierarchies. This 'freedom' that the nationalists propounded was a limited, exclusive one; it would have only relieved the high caste Hindus from subservience to the British but brought all the rest back under the uncompromising regime dictated by

orthodox Brahmanism that demanded servility to caste.

#### **'Performative' power of Sanskrit**

In fact, Brahmins could operate by consent of Kshatriyas and Vaishyas who also benefitted in the exploitative regime where their privileges, sole rights and high-caste status was advertised by Brahmins and in turn they recognized the Brahmins as supreme as they were thought-leaders of this odd meritocracy where merit came as birth –right. The Brahmin order was supported by Brahmin intellectual who had the leisure as they were to be dedicated to pursuit of knowledge and 'beg' for their subsistence( this begging was hallowed, not a despised activity and had a syntactical order that could help people differentiate between Brahmin/Kshatriya and Vaishya mendicant. This helped them 'create the conditions most favourable to the expansion of their own class(p.54). The gurukuls or Hindu system of education also operated in Sanskrit and to propound duty to dharma. The 'dvijas' or the 'twice-born could be Hindu equivalents of the 'civil society' identified by Gramsci. They readily consented to this dharma and agreed to the Brahmanical ideology being the ruling ideology, in case of dissent the repressive means and coercion also were employed since at this time the Civil Society and the State- the temple and the political power could hardly be separated. In fact, the political power derived its sanctity from the temple just as in pre-industrial West where the Church and the State were one. The temple here even had "juridical" power. The words uttered in Sanskrit/ words uttered by a Brahmin had 'performative' power. In contemporary times, the sentence passed by a judge can define the destiny of a prosecuted person, similar was the power of a pundit in ancient/ sanskritized/ Brahmanical India who could pass a sentence that was in those social conditions actually executed. An often repeated trope in Hindu epics is the curse of Brahmin that materializes actually. This could have been actually so as Brahmins indeed had the clout to get their intentions carried out by the state machinery. Otherwise, the psychological influence of these Sanskrit utterances is also great. This is how marriages are resolved or sins absolved by Brahmins as the individual/community/ subject had become attuned to their power.

Hindu idea of civilization supports rigid caste hierarchies. By corollary, Hindu nationalist politics also could not extend the idea of freedom and liberation to 'freedom' of depressed classes/ underprivileged castes. Sanskrit, the language that articulates that caste hierarchy, remained instrumental in giving a mystical and spiritual status to the economic and material reality of caste. It is a powerful language with grammar so neat that it seems refined rather than natural/ routine/biotic as languages usually emergent in any region are. It has been the heirloom of Brahmanism that has been hegemonizing Hindu society using both the repressive state apparatuses and ideological state apparatuses. It sustained an economic model as it helped it work through inaccessibility to knowledge – it being the sole channel and repository and source of knowledge.

It even helped define category of canonical and marginal texts; the sacrosanct and important and on the other hand the insignificant and unimportant views/versions/events and narratives. It coloured not just reality but also representation of reality in terms of history. It also exerted great psychological power, almost the equivalent of capital in modern day. It was 'the' currency for the Brahmanical economic model. But a currency that was least used for most gains. The least shared or circulated and yet the most powerful. It articulated the scriptural idea of caste and retained it making it unquestionable.

The Brahmin and Sanskrit used by the Brahmin had also the opposite power of elevating the mundane to spiritual /divine or supernatural status. Marx in *Das Kapital* has talked of 'commodity fetish' where objects gather more than their use-value. He talks of mystification and demystification. The idea is useful in regard of not just post-industrial consumer societies because an enchanting parallel is obvious in Brahmin's ability to give mystic status to material objects- he can transform a pot of water with coconut top into Goddess Laxmi by mere chanting of Sanskrit verses.

The achievement of Brahmanical order was in complete obliteration of the fact from the observation of general populace that they were primarily privileged in a model of economic production rather than as mere premium sect of a religious community. This obliteration could not have been something that benefitted just Brahmins unless the other classes also benefitted in some ways from this blindness to an economic model. That is, the system worked not merely by the gross division into four varnas but further multi-level hierarchical order with a large gradient of power and knowledge that kept on decreasing from top to bottom. The most interesting and persistent feature that distinguishes Brahmanical order/Hindu order from other social formations at different times was the absence of any investment or 'wages' (Althusser. P. 162) in the system. In most models that Marxist scholars study there is some investment and hence, compromise of some sort that allows the hegemonic forces to keep leading the rest. Here, the leading class has to share some of its power or resources with the followers to make them feel represented or their interests taken- care- of. Here, Althusser in 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' speaks also of English workers need for beer and French workers need for wine(p. 162). The Hindu bonded labour worked not by getting either wages or the most non-biological needs fulfilled but by the more extreme 'opium' of religion itself that somehow worked on spiritual as well as material level- promise of deliverance in next birth , if one remained dutiful till the end or immediate fear of physical punishment. There was no concept of trade unions in most pre-industrial societies including India though merchant guilds were there. The ideological apparatus worked massively by ideology and only if need be also used repressive state apparatus like the Army, Police or Courts (Althusser, Ed. Anand Prakash. P. 176).

**Elusive Integrity of India**

Were the *Maharsand Dhedsunpatriotic* in cooperating with the British? Probably, not more than the Congress or any other emergent political outfit or traditional caste/community serving the British in dispensation of justice/administration or cooperating merely as subjects during colonial times. No, in fact, the upper-castes also supported the British and accepted posts/positions from them. The idea of India as a single integrated nation emerged with the colonial rule as the British subjects in the subcontinent realized that they were viewed as a single entity (not as separate castes or creeds) by this occidental race. Also, the subjects of the Princely states felt akin to their brothers in British India, sometimes worst as they were doubly depressed under the native hereditary monarch who owed his allegiance to the British supremacy. This consciousness of India and Indians as one nation was an outcome of imperialist perspective rather than emerging organically to the expansive land.

Mayo points out that in 1917 Montagu, of the famous Montagu-Chelmsford reforms received several objections to granting the Home Rule mostly submitted by the 'depressed classes' like the six million Dravidian aborigines of Madras Presidency represented by *Madras AdiDravida Jana Sabha*. She quotes a submission at length:

'We shall fight to the last drop of our blood any attempt to transfer the seat of authority in this country from British hands to so-called high caste Hindus who have ill-treated us in the past and would do so again but for the protection of British laws (171)'. In fact, the constitution of India is becoming weaker with the rise of right wing Hinduism.

**Conclusion**

Postcolonialism is timed to the end of imperialism and independence of nations in the event of the colonizers leaving the colonized territory. A postcolonial orientation presumes sharing of and awakening to a nationalist consciousness during the colonial era but marked by a quick falling into disenchantments that freedom brought with it. This psychological shock or symptom expressed in postcolonial writings and attitudes is rather uncanny because the nationalist consciousness by its very nature presaged the kind of 'independence' or postcolonial existence that materialized in the aftermath of colonial emigration. The terms of transfer clearly favoured few to the exclusion of a majority of populace though constitutional formalities at the same time retained an aura of modern egalitarian nationhood recognizing the tenets of French Revolution. It was not a surprise that the political shift to a being a sovereign power or socialist republic at independence did not automatically end exploitative system that rested on colonial system as well as pre-colonial socio-economic model of exploitation sanctioned by caste division granted under Hinduism that adapted itself to colonial times and remained functional despite foreign rule and bureaucratic impositions.

**References**

1. Austin, J.L. 'Illocutionary Act'. *How to Do Things with Words*.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illocutionary\\_act](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Illocutionary_act). visited on 13 November 2018.
2. Aloysius, G. *Nationalism without a Nation in India*. Oxford UP.: New Delhi, 1997.
3. Ananthmurthy, UR. *Samskara*. Translated by A.K. Ramanujan, Oxford University Press, 1999. Print.
4. Ambedkar, BR. *Annihilation of Caste: the Annotated Critical Edition*. Introduction. 'The Doctor and the Saint' by Arundhati Roy. Navayana Publishing, 1936. Print.
5. E. Sreedharan. *A Textbook of Historiography. 500BC to AD 2000*. Orient Longman: New Delhi, 2000
6. Eco, Umberto. *The Search for the Perfect Language*. Apr 1997, Wiley-Blackwell
7. Hirsch Jr., ED. 'Faulty Perspectives' (249-258). Ed. David Lodge and Nigel Wood. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Pearson: 1988.
8. Limbale, Sharankumar. *The Outcaste: Akkarmashi*. Trans. From Marathi. Santosh Bhoomkar. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2003
9. Mayo, Katherine. *Mother India*, Blue Ribbon Books, 1927. Print
10. Parry, Benita. *Postcolonial Studies: A Materialist Critique*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis. London and New York. 2004.
11. Simon During, 'Postcolonial and Globalisation: a Dialectical Relation After All?' in *Postcolonial Studies*, vol.1, no. 1(1998), pp. 31-47,31.
12. Nancy Fraser, 'Recognition and Redistribution', *New Left Review*, vol. 212(1995), pp. 68-93.
13. Terry Eagleton, 'Base and Superstructure Revisited', *New Literary History*, vol. 31, no. 2(2000), pp.231-241, 239.
14. Thapar, Romila. *The Penguin History of Early India: From the Origins to AD 1300*. Penguin Books: New Delhi, 2002.
15. Montrose, Louis A., "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." (15-36)
16. Pal, Virender. "Religion, Caste and Modernity: a Study of U.R. Ananthmurthy's Samskara." *Journal of Literature, Culture and Media Studies*, Vol. 3, Issue 5/6, pp.95-102. EBSCOHOST, <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/literary-criticism/85205074/religion-caste-modernity-study-u-r-ananthmurthys-samskara>
17. Pal, Virender. "U. R. Ananthmaurthy's Crusade against Caste: the Text and Context." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, Vol. IX, no. 4, 2017, pp. 179-188, doi: 10.21659/rupkatha.v9n417.pdf. Accessed 14 Dec. 2017.
18. Prakash, Anand. Ed. *Approaches in Literary Theory: Marxism*. Antonio Gramsci. 'The Formation of the Intellectuals'. 54-64. Worldview: BookLand Publishing Co.: Delhi, 2002.
19. Prakash, Anand. Ed. *Approaches in Literary Theory: Marxism*. Louis Althusser. 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)' (159-209). Worldview: BookLand Publishing Co.: Delhi, 2002.
20. White, Hayden. *Metahistory*. 1973. The John Hopkins University Press: London.
21. Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. 1958. Random House: 2015