

## **“PALANQUINE BEARERS” BY SAROJINI NAIDU IN THE LIGHT OF DISSENT AND MODERNITY OF GLOBALIZATION**

**Chandra Shekar Pendoti**

*Dept of English, Osmania University, Telangana*

---

**Abstract:** Since the civilization social groups selected on eminent physical and mental personality to represent them. He presented the entire group for socio, economic, political, cultural, traditional and philosophical life. In the course of time, he became dictator to the people and neglected his fundamental duties. In the same way, the poem “Palanquin Bearers” by Sarojini Naidu is a presentation of the dictatorship in dissent and modern thought of liberalization, globalization, privatization and glocalization. In the context, the “Bearers of Palanquin” are happy in accordance of the poetess’ thought. In fact the bearers are labours and unhappy. In the modern context of globalization, liberalization, privatization they are unaccepted by the society. In this way in the modern context of globalization, liberalization, privatization they are unaccepted by the society. The modern thoughts brought out the concepts of equality, fraternity and liberty and the society thinks of the equal society in democracy.

**Keywords:** Palanquin Bearers, Globalization, Liberalization, Privatization, Happy, Dictatorship.

---

**Introduction:** In the human civilization there is a natural process of continuation with struggles. In this aspect Charles Darwin quoted the significance of “the fittest of the survival” in his book *Origin of Species* in 1859. In this way in the beginning of the civilization one group of social community fight with each other in order to have control over the natural resources and human beings. In this process they fought each other for food gathering. It was happened in internal way as and hegemony in the external way others dominate their superiority. In the course of time, there was development in the society. The society was classified into several groups. In this way they occurred in the all the kingdoms of the world such as the birth of “caste” system in India based on the colour and profession. In European countries the same was occurred based on the theory of ‘race’ Because of these occurrences of classification of the society many wars were happened for instance Napoleon Bonaparte did many wars with the pride of race. In the case of Hitler the same was happened and it led to the Second World War was in order to resist and destroy the Jewish superiority over the world.

In the same way Indian society was divided into several “Varnas” (colours) and professions. This led some marginal groups into inferiority levels. In the Indus civilization these aspects were occurred The major theories regarding this classification of the society are the arrival of the “Aryans” from European countries or Asia and it is generally considered that he “Dravidians are the natives of this land. The critical caste system was originated and was developed with the integration of religious elements with the secular aspects. Because of these developments some groups of the society experienced and suffered under the social and religious dictatorship of the other groups for example Indian sub-continent people were divided into four major groups and they were later on divided into “religious beliefs” such social groups are called “Caste” such as Kshatriyas, Brahmins, Vyshas and Sudras. This Caste system led to the inequality in all aspects of the society. It also encouraged the “feeling of enmity between one group to another group”. This fundamental philosophy of religion subordinated some social groups to become partial slaves to the other social groups and it also commanded and ordered it as the religious duty as the divine Gods plan.

“Palanquin Bearers” are one of such suppressed groups. They were bound to the religious beliefs and social political control. In those days the society was controlled by the kings and emperors. After their gradual eclipse from the society due to the advent of foreign forces such as French, Dutch, English and

Portuguese the power was partially shifted from the foreign forces to the local kings because of these reasons the continuity of human bondage and partial slavery was active. "The Palanquin Bearers" are the representation of the entire Indian lower historical caste, social groups suffered in all aspects. The hierarchy of Kshetriys and Bramhins always enjoyed the privileges of the society. Kshetriyas enjoyed the political power and the luxurious and rich life. Most of them did not take the common man into an account even though they enjoyed the fruits of labour in the form of payment of taxes. The Brahims social community enjoyed socio, political and economical status in the form of gifts of the lands and led the luxurious life.

The Vyshyas enjoyed the control over the entire land with the partial payment of the taxes to the king for the provision of safeguarding the kingdom and governing it. These are people of privileged of the society. But the lower caste were deprived all kinds of privileged from the society. The Sudra didn't meet the basic needs such as food, shelter and clothes even though they are their products. This fundamental idea made to invert the situation into modern thought. This context can be compared with the British people, French people and king, Russian

Jars and comrades, American freedom fighters and British authorities, Indian people and British administrators. The gifted equality, liberty, fraternity of French revolution was wide spread throughout the world and encouraged and inspired the revolutionists to fight for their birth rights. In this context, "Palanquin Bearers" are also part of labour group in India. They are not as they were in the poem the "Palanquin Bearers".

In carrying the Palanquin they have their labour with great difficulty to carry the queen or the higher group of privileged women or men for the lower caste community people. The similar idea was disclosed in the writings of Kancha Ilaiah is in his reputed book, *Why I am not a Hindu*. There is a design of special chapter on Production of goods and role of the castes, was published a special book with the title of *Social Smugglers Komotollu* (Social smugglers-Businessmen) became a controversial book because of its title. In this Ilaiah's idea the internal transport of goods and services within the same group/s with the high profit as it was explained by Karl Marx as the "Economic Surplus". In this context the production of business man is zero or nothing. The common services or wages were theft that is why Karl Marx described it as the a "Legal Robbery". The same can be applicable to the "Palanquin Bearers" in the modern context.

Sarojini Naidu is the 20<sup>th</sup> century Indian poetess. Her "Palanquin Bearers" is a matter of thinking of both olden and modern days. "The Palanquin Bearers" labored for small wages or some times without wages as a social duty. But the modern days are just opposite to that idea. The concepts of globalization, liberalization, privatization are for free relationships for trade and human development. The term liberalization stands for free trade throughout the world and obtained profits wherever the natural resources are available. The term "privatization" is for accumulation of wealth and if possible colonizing and controlling the natural resources indirectly through the international and national organizations. In this context the common men are the natives of the land will have no benefit but wealth reaches into the hands of a few rich people. In this way the common people will have only the disadvantages of the trade. Sarojini Naidu explained about the "Palanquin Bearers" as the happy people while carrying the Palanquin. She compared Palanquin with flower in the wind, bird, laugh in a dream, pearl on a string, star in the dew, beam on the brow of tide, tear of the eyes of a bride but Palanquin is a hard job to carry. In this context the modern thoughts disagree with the traditional way of saying "Palanquin Bearers" are happy. The modernity brings the thoughts of liberty, equality and fraternity in democracy but the not the tyranny in the tears of the common people.

## References:

1. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalization> (Globalization)
2. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalisation\\_in\\_India](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Globalisation_in_India) (Globalization India)
3. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Privatization> (Privatization)

4. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main\\_Page](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Main_Page) (Liberalization)
5. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glocalization> (Glocalization)
6. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History\\_of\\_the\\_world](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_world) (History of the World)
7. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kancha\\_Ilaiah#References](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kancha_Ilaiah#References) (Kancha Ilaiah)
8. <https://theannihilationofcastereadinggroup.files.wordpress.com/2013/03/why-i-am-not-a-hindu-fr10.pdf> (*Why I am not a Hindu* by Kancha Ilaiah)
9. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialism> (Socialism)
10. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialiscommunism> (communism)
11. Christensen, *Globalization*, Springer Nature, Berlin, 2017.
12. Christopher Wilk *Modernism*, Vioctoria 2008.
13. Gaudry Mayes, *Taking Stock of Air Liberalization*, Springer Us, US, 1999.
14. Gerard Roland, *Privatization Success and Failures*, Columbia Univesity Press, 2008.
15. Ilaiah, K. *Why I Am Not a Hindu: A Sudra critique of Hindutva philosophy, culture and political economy* (Calcutta: Samya, 1996)
16. Meluyn P. Leffer *Specter of Communism*, Simon and Schuster New York, 1994.

\*\*\*