CONCLUSION

The origin of the institutions which have become the biggest obstacle in the development of the individual can be traced back to the ancient time. Though we can give different factors that originated the institution, no definite date for the origin of the institution can be given. As man is a social animal, in response to the need to satisfy all the needs which he has from birth to death he created institutions. Man created and joined different institutions for the achievement of his different objectives and to coordinate numerous interests of the individual.

The institutions are thus a group created by man for the achievement of some or other objectives. They are the expression of man's urge for sociality. He determined the nature of the institutions by the objectives which he wanted to pursue. Therefore on the basis of his psychological, economic and political objectives man created social, economic and political institutions.

In order to fulfil his psychological objective of association and companionship man created the social institution of 'family'. Family is an institution which is most expressive of human nature. The institution of family has to facilitate normal, legal and stable sex relations and to legalise procreation. He wanted family to provide him with a sense of security. The emotional and psychological function of the
institutions of family is to give love, affection, sympathy and understanding to man. It has to provide parental love, guidance, readiness to share man's privations and assistance in the moments of emotional breakdowns when he was a child. The family should also give him economic support to help him to acquire skills for earning livelihood when he becomes a man. The institution of family slowly paved the way for the political institution as it became a political training institution. The basic attributes of government like command, authority, obedience, common interest and cooperation had their seed form in the institution of family.

Man's instinct of self-love and self-preservation forced him to create the economic institution. The necessity to perform some economic activity in order to acquire his basic needs like food and shelter prompted him to establish the economic institution. His economic activities which provided him with food and shelter later created an urge to accumulate property.

The emergence of property and man's desire to establish peace and order generated the political institution. In order to achieve the welfare of the individual and offer an opportunity to pursue his economic activities the institution of government has been made significant. The institution of government thus formed is a means of promoting the interests of the individuals. Therefore if it fails in its basic objective of protecting the interests of the individual, he has a right to revolt against it.
Religion had always been an important factor in the evolution of the human brain. Hence, man created the institution of religion to shape his ideas and psychological development.

As the centuries passed man's horizons are widened and he achieved immense progress in the fields of science and technology. However, with the development of science and technology, modern life became very complex. And gradually the institutions which were created by man for safeguarding the interests and the freedom of the individual became all powerful and gave preference to their own interests over the individual interests. The instrument whose duty is to promote the happiness of the individual, in the name of order and discipline abandoned the objectives of its creator and sacrificed his freedom in order to secure its eternity.

The institutions created peculiar circumstances which are beyond the control of the individual. As a result his freedom is threatened and his life became insecure. The institutions were started by man with a sense of expectance but they began to rule him. Though man is able to master nature with his intellectual power and progress, he has become a mere cog in the hand of the inhuman institutions. The commercialism, collectivization, government and institutionalization started transforming the world slowly. The political and economic institutions with their
selfish ends caused world wars. The results of the institution of war are senseless violence, alienation from the self and dehumanization.

The horror and terror, disaster and sordidness of war swept away the confidence and isolated the individual. The havoc caused by the two world wars suggested a need for a literature which will bring a change in the existing order of things. The people who witnessed slaughter in and near the battle zones, the suffering and the injustice done at home had to change the mood and attitude. It is believed that after the Second World War everyone who has seen combat carried a war novel in his barracks back. As they had tasted the bitterness of war through their participation in the actual war, their works attained authenticity. These writers feel that war is responsible for the plight of mankind in the Twentieth Century. The Americans especially dreamed of a Golden Age characterised by freedom and absence of war. Hence the American writers tried to bring the rights of man, his perfectability and the new doctrine of progress together. These writers took clue from the philosophy of the Transcendentalists.

One of the forces that created an interest in the great problems of the individual and his destiny is Transcendentalism. The Transcendentalists believe in the spiritual potentiality of man. They suggest that in man alone one can find the clue to nature, history and ultimately the cosmos itself. They also
believe that the structure of the universe depends upon the individual self. So they suggest that all knowledge begins at self-knowledge. And the freedom of the individual depends upon self-realization. The individual can attain this self-realization when he brings a harmony between his desire to know himself and to remain unique and to be responsible only to himself.

The post war literature presented the bitter account of cultural determinism or repression. They have drawn their subject matter from the turbulence of the individual as a result of institutionalization. This literature has sought to unite a hope of redefining the American self and individualism. The ideal of character and action, dream and reality, symbol and myth in their literature acquired a new point of view. They made man's ageless conflict with the institutions appear in a sharp new light. They are required to deal with facts and solutions to institutional tyranny. As a result writers like Ken Kesey, Norman Mailer, Bernard Melamud, Joseph Heller and others after the second world war accelerated the breakdown of the formerly dominant institutions.

Heller and his contemporaries came to the realization that it is not man's nature but his faulty and myopic institutions that are responsible for his slavery and unhappiness. So they have started their quest for freedom and happiness. The idea of
freedom is a revelation and they did not want to let it rust upon ancestral institutions and traditions. The main problem for these writers is how to preserve the freedom of the individual against all kinds tyranny, whether it is the tyranny of the institution or of the majority. Despite many deficiencies, they tried to represent a promise to respect the individuality and their main aim is freedom. The ill effects of cut throat competition, the power of business monopolies and the sacrifice of human freedom for the sake of the institutional supramacy made these writeres present an inquiring, exploratory and a questioning literature.

The thought that the spiritual self of the individual can be realised only by adjusting himself to the institutions made him a subordinate to the institutions. The individual is made to believe that his security and destiny lay in his willing subordination to the dominant institutions. But Heller rejects this idea saying that though the individual is an indispensable part of the society he is endowed with a moral will and independence which makes him unique. Heller is convinced that the route of trouble in United States is the ruthless methods of competition and the strong hold of institution on the individual. Therefore Heller emphasizes the voluntary and active aspects of individualism. He tries to make room for the individual capacities and values. He gives hope to the individual to free
himself from the constant obstacles and vexing conflicts of the institutions.

Heller passionately protests against the encroachment of the institutions into the life of the individual. He feels that the modern institutions cover their wastefulness with all sorts of rationalization. Heller, through his novels advocates that war and patriotism had become functional to institutions, so they are equally hostile to the life of the individual. He hates all forms of tyranny and power. Heller celebrates the potential energies of the individuals. He says that the individual can realise his potentiality when there is no outside regimentation in his life. According to Heller, the individual is morally a free agent determining his own destiny. He emphasizes the freedom of choice and action of the individual.

The main problem in Heller's age is the threat to the life of the individual by the dominance of big business and manipulation of the government by special interests. Heller with his strong faith in the freedom of the individual, points out at the decay and sterility of society which pretends to live on conventions and institutions which lack the force of underlying convictions.

Heller's main concern in his fiction is the freedom of the individual. As the contemporary institutional exploitation and oppression obstruct the individual either to attain or retain
his freedom, Heller takes it upon himself to show the ways to keep the institutions in their place. He tries to show what happens if the individual fails to exercise his freedom of choice, decision and action. He favours the persons who endeavour to maintain their freedom. Freedom in the positive and common sense means ability to do the things the individual chooses to do. Freedom in the negative sense means absence of constraint or restraint from any kind of external forces. Heller in his fiction tries to show how the individual struggles to attain and retain his freedom while the institutions try to restrain him from his freedom. When the individual has a conflict with any external forces and there is a threat to his freedom, Heller preaches that the individual should not let the outside forces empower him, but try to find his true free self and assert it. Heller stresses that if the individual exercises his free will and accepts his self responsibility, he will certainly succeed in regaining his freedom. Everyone of Heller's heroes save one, succeeds in regaining and retaining his freedom through exercising his free will, freedom of choice, decision, action and self responsibility.

Heller in Catch-22 holds the institution of war and military Bureaucracy responsible for all the cynicism and disillusionment and the feeling of their ruthlessness. He debunks the romantic aspect of war and questions the sacrifice of the young lives. He
shows how war demoralizes the individual and how reason and common sense are shaken by the whirling confusion of the war and by the life of the military bureaucracy which are responsible for the degeneration of moral values. Heller also moans that war has reduced the individual to the level of animal, killing all the fine emotions he once had.

Heller says that religion almost reaches its lowest ebb in the war striken society. He describes the cruelty and authority of the Military bureaucracy in leminously grotesque form. He expresses the individual's weariness and hatred of war and his eagerness for peace and freedom through many a character in the novel.

Heller through his protagonist reveals that modern warfare and military institutions are no test of individual's skill or strength and glory has no meaning when an individual is pitted against death. He feels that war is a regular butcher and that death in war is called a sacrifice to make the survivors look like fools. Heller in the novel strongly stresses that spiritual injury caused by war is more dangerous than the physical injury because mental recuperation is a difficult task.

Catch-22 presents the inherent instinct of freedom in the man. Yossarian in the novel though trapped by the institution of military bureaucracy struggles to free himself from the military junta. Yossarian through most part of the novel tries to adjust
himself to the norms of military bureaucracy. When he gradually realises that the military bureaucracy will never let him be free from its clutches, he starts rebelling against the institution in order to gain his freedom. Even in the initial stages he tries to complete his quota of the required number of missions as he believes that he can have his freedom if he performs his duty to the military and the country. But when he comes to realise the real nature of both Colonel Cathcart who keeps on raising the number of missions for purely personal reasons and the military bureaucracy which does not like to let anyone free from its reign, he protests against the threatening institution that impairs his freedom. Yossarian begins his struggle for freedom by trying to avoid the combat duties on the pretext of a bad liver condition. But the monotonous task of censoring the letters of the enlisted men, and the Texan's stay in the ward drive him away from the hospital. Then he tries to take refuge in the pleasure houses of Rome. Both the tricks do not help him much as he is again assigned the combat duty. So he tries to complete the required number of missions the institution says he has to fly in order to be free. But each time he comes close to the 'magic number' the Colonel increases it by five. His disgust and frustration with the constant increase makes him fly six missions in six days but Cathcart racks ante again when he is about to finish. He realises that there will be no way out of the complex military bureaucratic system unless he protests.
against it. He tries to take support from Major Major Major, quoting the Twenty-Seventh Air Force which regulates the rules of the Twenty-Sixth squadron. But Major Major Major who had been made squadron commander, but had no idea what he was supposed to do as squadron commander fails to help him. He then tries to seek the help of Doc Daneeka to ground him on the grounds of craziness so that he can be taken off his combat duty. But the omnipresent law of "Catch-22" dispels his hope of getting his freedom by deliberately supposing himself to be crazy. Yossarian's dissatisfaction with the constant raise in the number of missions speaks of the underlying principle of military bureaucracy that does not like anyone to get out of its hands.

He never sends anyone home, anyway. He just keeps them around waiting for rotation orders until he doesn't have enough men left for the crews, and then raises the number of missions and throws them all back on combat status. He's been doing that ever since he got here.

The absurdity of the military bureaucracy which gives importance to records and reports than to the lives of people and the deaths of his close friends make Yossarian firm in his decision and his protest takes a vehement turn of receiving the medal from General Dredle stark naked when he is given a medal for going over Ferrara twice, and marching backward with his gun on his hip. Alarmed by Yossarian's refusal to fly more missions

the Colonels try to lure him to their side with a deal because Yossarian's refusal not only helps him to gain his freedom but would give hope to others also to strive for their freedom. Yossarian, disillusioned by the lack of support from his friends and his lonely struggle accepts the Colonels' deal. But when he gets admitted to the hospital when he receives a wound from Nately's Whore's knife he weighs the goodness and badness of his acceptance and realises his moral obligation to his friends and to himself. He decides to reject the deal and he deserts to Sweden to free himself from the absurdity and tyranny of military bureaucracy.

John Wain criticises Heller that he side-steps the moral issues when he makes his hero desert" and John Greenfield argues that from the perspective of Ninteen Sixty Eight the protest of Yossarian is relatively mild3 as Yossarian does not overthrow the military bureaucracy or upset M & M enterprises, he simply tries to stay alive and save himself. Whether a coward or the only sane man on Pianosa, Yossarian acts on the same perceptions through out the novel. The inadequacy of Yossarian's earlier point of view is that he thinks that he can forebear the evil done by the institution. The fact that Yossarian does nothing until the end of the novel, suggests his wrong assumptions that

he can do nothing about the insanity of the system and the world because he 'does' something that will affect the system, he ceases to serve it when he deserts it. Though many question whether Yossarian's desertion is a responsible action, Heller's comment in one of his charts "In making the decision to desert, Yossarian accepts the responsibility he now knows he has towards the other men" gives no doubt that he intends it (Yossarian's desertion) to be a responsible action as Yossarian himself says in the end that he is not running away from his responsibilities but towards them

'I'm not running away from my responsibilities. I'm running to them. There's nothing negative about running away to save my life. You know who the escapists are, don't you, Danby? Not me and Orr.'

Yossarian has been criticised for not having done anything to prevent the death of Nately but at the end Yossarian through his rejection of the Colonels' deal, does act to help prevent the deaths of all Natelys as his desertion reveals hope. This hope and Yossarian's protest on behalf of others as well as himself lies behind Heller's description of Catch-22 as "an optimistic novel with a great deal of pessimism". Yossarian's desertion has been condemned as the irresponsible behaviour of a hedonist, someone who believes that "The only real horror is his physical

pain and ultimately death. Though Yossarian never denies the importance of physical pleasures, his main concern is not survival at any price, for Yossarian rejects the odious deal which gives him an opportunity to return to the United States as a 'live' war hero. Instead, he decides to desert which endangers his life, but offers the other men the right kind of moral example. Heller himself explains:

He has deluded himself into thinking that all he wants to do is survive. He has the opportunity and accepts it in despair. In the hospital he finds that he can't accept it because there's a moral life inside him. As scared as he is of dying, he doesn't want to live if it has to be in terms of calling those colonels by their first names. Being on a first-name basis with the Establishment. He would rather be a fugitive.

It is not a selfish instinct for survival but his urge for freedom, his 'final' understanding of Snowden's secret and the exploitation of military bureaucracy motivates him to desert. The example for the fact that Yossarian's desertion inspires others also is the character of Chaplain, while supporting Yossarian's desertion, he realises that he can and ought to fight on Pianosa "If Orr could row to Sweden, then I can triumph over Colonel Cathcart and Colonel Korn, if only I preserve.".

Yossarian through his desertion and his search of Nately's

Whore's Kid sister, preserves the ideal of freedom by not only saving himself but the future generation from the oppression of the institutions.

Yossarian with his moral values and rebellion against the institution steals our sympathy and offers an optimistic hope for an escape from the oppressing situation, but Slocum in *Something Happened* is a contrast to Yossarian. While Yossarian's rebellion against the institution shows an existential faith in human freedom, Slocum yields himself to the institution and holds a deterministic faith that man is a 'helpless and irresponsible pawn of fate'. The main difference between *Catch-22* and *Something Happened* Heller says is that

*Catch-22* is concerned with physical survival against exterior forces or institutions that want to destroy life or moral self. *Something Happened* is concerned very much with interior, psychological survival in which the areas of combat are things like the wishes a person has, whether they are fulfilled or not.  

It is a very bleak book, a melancholy illumination on the part of a man in his forties who looks at his past and looks at his present and tries to see some kind of future, and sees not much of any.  

The only character that tries to offer a little hope for

---

A meaningful future in the novel is Slocum's boy. He is a counter check to Slocum's standards and corporate philosophy in the novel. He is the only person who hates to take part in the race of 'competition' and thereby falls a victim to the cruel system. He is a marvel at math and good in science, but his shy unaggressive nature does not gain favour with any one in the contemporary corrupt world of aggression. He constantly faces difficulties both in school and outside. His belligerant playmates torment him and his competition minded gym teacher despises him as he does not try to win:

He doesn't want to beat the next fellow."
"That's his nature, I guess," I murmur apologetically.
"That's not his nature, Mr. Slocum, "Forgione persists sententiously. "He wasn't born that way."
"That's his nature now."
"He doesn't have the true competitive spirit."

When he runs a race at school, he heartily slows down his pace and waits for others to catch up. His non-competitive nature which is the most appealing thing about him is a weakness in Slocum's aggressive adult world in which innocence has no place. He is a quick, intuitive learner but he is inhibited to make a public speech (contrary to his father who longs to make a three minute speech at the company convention) as he is afraid to be wrong, while his elders do not care whether they are right.

Though the sense of insecurity he makes him suffer as a result of Slocum's behaviour and Derek's fate, he tries to be free of anxiety and be happy. The discussions both Slocum and his wife have on the fate of Derek makes him afraid of his own future. After he gets his tonsils operated, he tries to sneak into his parents' room when he is frightened to sleep alone in his room, but they yell at him to go back to his room and their intimidation makes him timid. He never sleeps properly as he is frightened that his parents may send him away while he is asleep.

His parents' displeasure over Derek's presence makes him suspicious that they might want to get rid of him also, so he is persistant in his questions "If you do want to get rid of me how will you do it?" to which Slocum answers "with hugs and kisses" and that is exactly what he does in the end. He gets scared to death when his parents delay a little in collecting him form the camp.

He was convulsed with grief by the idea that we had abandoned him, just because we were a little bit late, that we had left him there purposely because we were dissatisfied and disgusted with him, and that he was never going to see us again or have anyone to take care of him.

He is endearing, he forebears all his suffering with endurance. He takes the blame unto him when ever his parents

12. ibid., p. 235.
13. ibid., p. 316.
quarrel and when he thinks that he is responsible for anyone's unhappiness he is always ready to receive the punishment and do the penance "should I go for a walk again? To the amusement pier? Is that why Daddy's unhappy?". He is trusting and forgives very easily. Whenever his father apologizes and promises to be kinder after oppressing and brow beating terribly, he readily forgives him "You are the best daddy in the whole world" and though his father breaks his promises many times, he continues to trust and love his father. Though Slocum fails to have any kind of freedom, the boy enjoys psychological freedom as he does what he wants despite the threat of his father's anger. He gives away the nickels and dimes he has despite his parents' displeasure and his answer to his father reveals his simple, generous and innocent nature.

I was happy," he states with a shrug, squinting uncomfortably in the sunlight, looking a little pained and selfconscious. "Yeah?"

"And whenever I feel happy," he continues, "I like to give something away. Is that all right?"

He is happy because he is generous and he wants to share that happiness with others. He is a complete contrast to his father who submits his freedom to money and position and who does not mind robbing of other man's happiness in order to come up in life. He dislikes disagreements, hates to make enemies and

14. ibid., p. 335.
15. ibid., p. 300.
He does not like people to be unhappy and sullen. He has wit and the talent for giddy and unimaginative tricks. He makes jokes and tries to seek safety and invisibility in humour. Instead of being afraid of ghosts and monsters as is normal for his age, he is frightened of heights, kidnapping, drugs, strangers with mean and sinister faces and adults who stare and yell. He is uncertain of his future and this uncertainty puzzles and tortures him "who besides himself he is supposed to be" 16. The conversations, discussions and confrontations his father and he has always show his better self. Though his extreme goodness embarrasses Slocum, his innocence fills him with remorse and makes him hate himself for being so "cruel, so rotten, depraved and inhuman". He makes Slocum aware of being trapped by the corporate spirit and bondage. But the corporate man in Slocum makes him hate the boy for his virtues. His virtues are unreal and unpalatable in the insensitive, hypocritic world and they moan "he's not real, he is never mean. He never gets mad. Nobody is that good all the time" 17 and this unreal boy who is a complete contrast to every thing the contemporary corporate world believes and practises, and the boy who remains free by distangling himself from the corporate competitive spirit must be eliminated. And Slocum makes the boy's fears come true when the latter meets with a car accident and receives injury. He hugs the boy deep into the crook of his shoulder and the death of

16. ibid., p. 305.
17. ibid., p. 165.
boy, according to the doctor is "due to asphyxiation". Slocum kills the boy as he tends to consider people in terms of dimension, his tendency is to think of people - as having a single aspect, a single use. When they present more than that dimension, he has difficulty in coping with them. But when Slocum kills the boy he also kills the spirit and urge for freedom that is within him.

Slocum fails to achieve real freedom as he possesses a consciousness that resists its own freedom and responsibilities. Unlike the other heroes of Heller Slocum lacks the courage to rebel against the institution to gain his freedom and he fears to act against the authorities even if he knows that he is right.

I have this thing about authority, about walking right up to it and looking it squarely in the eye, about speaking right out to it bravely and defiantly, even when I know I am right and safe. (I can never make myself believe I am safe.) I just don't trust it.

and

He comes to the very pessimistic conclusion - as much as he can see at all - that there's nothing he will do. Not that there's nothing that can be done, but that there's nothing that he, being who he is will do.

Slocum is "utterly unset, undefined ambivalent" in his

18. ibid., p. 552.
thoughts and actions. He misuses his free will and fails to accept his responsibility to achieve his psychological and social freedom, as Heller says "He 'd not be working for that company" if he has the potential freedom to resist any kind of encroachment into his freedom.

While Yossarian risks his life for his freedom, Gold sacrifices a higher position in order to retain his freedom and self-respect and while David keeps on fighting the tyranny of God to maintain his individuality and freedom, Slocum hates to disturb his so called well adjusted and well settled company life. Though Slocum achieves a kind of pseudo freedom in his professional life, he fails to achieve either the psychological, social, or potential freedom.

Like in the corporate world of Slocum, even in Good As Gold efficiency fails to gain success

Gold was not sure of many things, but he was definite about one: for every successful person he knew, he could name at least two others of greater ability, better character, and higher intelligence who, by comparison, had failed.

and a sense of failure haunts the people

Certainly, nothing proceeded according to desire. In the long run, failure was the only thing that worked predictably. All else

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
22. Good As Gold p. 76.
was accidental. Good intentions had miscarried, and bad ones had not improved.23

The society in which Gold lives is filled with racial descrimination, disruption of families, hypocrisy and the government which he wants to get in exploits the ignorance and guillibilty of its citizens. Heller exploits the reputation of Henry Kissinger to present the oppression of the bureaucratic government. Heller makes Henry Kissinger as a model for Bruce Gold and shows that the present political leaders serve as models of what not to follow. Bruce Gold tries to follow the foot-steps of Kissinger to outwit him and become a first Jewish Secretary of State but the more he tries to imitate what he assumes Henry Kissinger has done to get to the top, the more he detests Henry Kissinger and himself and the conclusion he draws is that such leaders are not worthy to serve as models for anyone with a spark of conscience.

The letter which the Kurdish Rebel writes to Henry Kissinger shows how the Government diplomats play with the lives of the human beings and make them victims of indifference and inhumanity. The kurdish general writes to Kissinger pleading for help when all the aid was suddenly stopped, as it was the American government which fomented and financed the rebellion against the Iraqui rule. But the response he receives is silence. When he is accused of misusing his former government petitions

23. ibid., p. 77.
for money, Kissinger feels that it is right to make millions, he argues.

In his view, said Henry A. Kissinger, it's okay for him to make millions. 'I think one has to consider that I was deeply in debt when I left office as a result of my public service.'

Heller presents Henry Kissinger in the role of superman whose easy success annoys Gold and always makes him jealous of Henry Kissinger as he doubts that whether it is possible for a Jew to be a successful Secretary of State in United States where there is a lot of anti-Semitism. Gold's obsession with his hatred and jealousy for Henry Kissinger's career and character not only brings out the racial discrimination but also makes Heller's satire of government more interesting.

Gold wants to become the Secretary of State, so that he can command the respect of others through the money and power he will get through his office and this desire makes him hold Kissinger in contempt and his jealousy drives him to the point of proving Kissinger not being Jewish, so that he hopes that he can become the first Jewish Secretary of State. Heller, through the portrait of Kissinger presents the idea that all the great figures of the state in fact are not great but cruel victimizers and enemies of humanity, who carelessly pass their worthless policies and programmes as state diplomacy and make the innocent people victims of war and Kissinger is the best example of the ------------------------ 24. ibid., p. 372-73.
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oppressive political power that creates catastrophe in the lives of helpless human beings. Heller through Gold's despising of Kissinger presents Kissinger as a great villain whose interest is only power and position with which he causes untold misery to the people and make them helpless victims of the Vietnam war. Throughout the history the government representatives like Hitler and Kissinger want to make everyone mean and servile. While mocking the career of Kissinger Gold understands his own situation and the futility of his own ambition. The image of Kissinger in the minds of the officials and other people makes Gold abandon his temptation for a high office, his engagement to Andrea and makes him return to his wife, family and to his personal integrity.

Despite his deep desire to hold a high office in the government, Gold realises how futile his quest for power, and with his insight into reality his myth of higher power begins to get cleared and he is able to see the inhuman functioning of the glamorous government and he outgrows the ruthless distinction that is created by the government between Jews and Gentiles, in the end he rejects the prospect of authority and high position to assert his self respect and freedom and he accepts himself as a Jew.

Gold in the end of the novel realizes that his quest for power in government will make him a slave of the bureaucratic institution which not only encroaches into his personal life.
but also impairs his freedom. Gold also finds a gap between his motives and incidents that actually occur in his life and when he realizes that everything will be determined for him by the government without his consent if he accepts the government job, Gold weighs his personal, psychological and social freedom and a government position and social status. With the help of his potential freedom he decides to check and resist the manipulation of the institution and rejects the president's offer. Gold with his rejection of the government position and thereby its tyranny and with his acceptance of himself as a jew, achieves both psychological and social freedom.

David in God Knows suffers greatly. When David is a shepherd boy, the scorching sun in the day time and freezing cold in the night, his companions' lack of interest in his music depress him and make him unhappy. He wages wars with Philistines and serves Saul faithfully, but God's decision of making him the successor of Saul makes David fall a victim to Saul's wrath. Though Saul constantly tries to have him killed, David at first finds it very hard to believe that anyone would want to kill him, especially Saul his king whom he respects as his own father. Saul means more than God to David and he loves Saul like his own father, so Saul's suspicion and jealousy make him suffer. His affair with
Uriah's wife makes him fall a victim of God's silence. David never receives any justification from God for the killing of his infant child, instead He imposes heavy silence on him. This sudden silence makes David suffer and he comes to feel that though he never needed any mediators to talk to God and though God had always answered him, his relationship with God has always made him tense. He Says that God might have set things for his encounter with Goliath, but it is his potentiality that enabled him to kill the giant Philistine and David says that he had to work and suffer like a dog almost all his life. David proudly declares that God would not have got a chance to build up His reputation, if it is not for people like Moses, Joseph and himself.

David feels a child like jealousy towards people who speak for God. He resents Shimei's speaking for God as he feels he is more close to Him than Shimei. But he loses his God when He makes him lose his infant child. Helpless wrath fills him when his infant child dies and God's inhumanity drives him to the point of shrieking. In his old age, he falls a victim of the conspiracies of his sons and the indifference of his wife Bathsheba. The chaos and disorder around him frustrate him. The deaths of his infant child, his beloved son Absalom, Saul and Jonathan fill him with immense grief. But these hardships fail to suppress his fighting spirit, individuality and his spirit of freedom. He forebears Saul's
assault on his life, ascends the throne of Israel, suppresses the rebellion against him and though he repents his mistake of getting Uriah killed, his self respect does not allow him either to forget God's inhumanity or beg His forgiveness. The cruelty of God in allowing his innocent child die for 'his' faults makes him question the so called kindness of God and he rebels against His oppression, even in the end though he longs for a reunion with His God, he does not lose his principles and through his rejection of a compromise with God he retains his freedom and individuality.

David is a 'vigorous, courageous and enterprising soul' who with his potentiality never allows any external force to influence either his choices or decisions or actions. Even if his wrong choice affects his life adversely, he is courageous to accept the consequences of his actions. He never submits his freedom to the institution and retains his psychological and social freedom.

Heller in his novels uses Black Humour to make the intensity of the situation sink in the minds of the people. Heller in accordance with Black Humour novels which deal with certain systems and institutions deals with the institutions of military bureaucracy, corporation, Government and religion which are responsible for the dehumanisation of man.
Heller through his mocking of the commonly glorified concepts like patriotism, tries to present the absurdity created by the institutions in the life of the individual. Yossarian, for example rejects the ideal of fighting and sacrificing his life for the sake of his country. He declares

Don't talk to me about fighting to save my country. I've been fighting all along to save my country. Now I'm going to fight a little to save myself. The country is not in danger anymore, I'm.  

When he is convinced of the existence of the reality of the evil, Yossarian tries to protest against the military institution by the very absurdities that characterise 'Catch-22' and his situation in the squadron is very much likely to one suggested by Albert Camus's concept of the absurd

Man stands face to face with the irrational. He feels within him his longing for happiness and for reason. The absurd is born of this confrontation between the human need and the unreasonable silence of the world.  

Heller through his use of the violent twist of cliches, exaggeration of reality and reversal of expectations, not only evokes laughter but also attacks this absurdity. His statement of patriotism shocks the readers when he inserts an unexpected sentence "....boys were laying down their lives for" what they had been told was "their country". That means they

have been so brain washed that they accept it without question. Heller makes the reader believe one thing in the first part of the sentence and then confuses him in the next part of it. "When I grow up," he vowed, 'I'm gonna fuck a girl.' instead, he went to college."27 "The Texan turned out to be good natured generous and likeable - in three days no one could stand him"28,

Heller's humour not only presents blackness but also brings a smile to the lips of the readers, one of such episodes is Dunbar's invention of the dream about fish:

'He dreams he is holding a live fish in his hand.'
'What kind of fish? the doctor inquired sternly of Yossarian.
'I don't know,' Yossarian answered.
'I can't tell one kind of fish from another.'
'In which hand do you hold them?'
'It varies,' answered Yossarian.

'It varies with the fish,' Dunbar added helpfully. The colonel turned and stared down at Dunbar suspiciously with a narrow squint. 'Yes? And how come you seem to know so much about it?.'
'I'm in the dream,' Danbar answered without cracking a smile.29

Though Heller through his humour makes the reader smile that smile disappears when he realises at what he is laughing Heller himself says that "I wanted people to laugh and then look back

with horror at what they were laughing.*30*

Heller alludes to one of the oldest texts in the west, the Judeo-Christian myth of origin. He presents resemblance between Yossarian and Adam in the Chapter named "Milo". Heller's allusions to Genesis suggest distinctive characteristics of intermingling of texts - The Bible and Catch-22. Heller derives meaning and irony of the novel from his allusions to Genesis but undermines the first Text's historical status as he creates a new parable of origins. The first law of the God "You may freely eat of every tree of garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it, you shall die" seems to grant Adam freedom to do what he wants but immediately deprives him of this grant with a negative check. This first law sounds similar to that of the Colonel's promise to Clevinger that he will not be punished if he speaks out the truth but immediately after he speaks the truth out they bring him to trial and court-martial him. The helpless condition of man for whom there is no way to defeat the system of "catch-22" either through obedience or disobedience as long as he believes that the law originates in an inherent higher authority, resembles the helpless situation of Adam - if he remains in innocence he shall live without

30."So They Say: Guest Editors Interview Six Creative People" With Anne Hoene, Victoria Lewis and Judith Innes, Mademoiselle, 57 (August, 1963), p. 235.
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knowledge, if he chooses knowledge, he has to live in pain and suffering. Either way God imposes His will. Adam's blind acceptance of the first law resembles the squadron's acceptance of the law of "Catch-22". Adam's obedience to God's law prevents him from gaining knowledge and meaning and the people's belief in "catch-22" prevents them from realizing the fact that the military bureaucracy uses "catch-22" as an oppressor. The entire story of God Knows is Biblical. He presents the actual incidents and persons of the first and second books of Samuel and the early part of the first book of Kings in the Old Testament.

Heller deliberately uses many 'anachronisms' in his novels to extend the action and themes down to the present. For example: IBM machines which promote ranks in Catch-22 were not yet in use in world war II. Loyalty Oaths "flourished in the fifties", agriculture subsidy abuse was in the sixties. The accumulation of Chaplain's hiding secret documents in a plum tomato refers to a famous case of fifties, when some notorious papers were allegedly hidden in a pumpkin. In God Knows Heller makes David speak about the dramatists and poets like Shakespeare, Oscarwilde, Milton, Keats, and Shelly of later ages and he also narrates about his women using extravagant cosmetics which were no where in ancient times, David says

I liked my women yellow, blue, and crimson, and I loved the scarlet lipstick, azure eye shadow, and dark mascara that came into use as our economy moved us into an era of
luxury, leisure, and decadence, all of my wives, thank God, were concerned with being beautiful and spent most of their hours with attire, cosmetics, combs, mirrors, and hair curlers²¹.

Heller also shows how treacherously language discomfits through the very ambiguity of its own meaning and perpetrates chaos and disorder. Patriotism in _Catch-22_ not only means loyalty to one's own country but also perversion and excess of the loyalty in the name of which the military commits every form of brutality. Heller shows it not simply as loyalty to the country but to the tyrannical institutions and exploitation. In _Good As Gold_, the government uses Gold's phrases like 'Nothing Succeeds as Planned', 'We are not worth Our salt' to evade explanation for their inefficient policies. Gold in his conversation with Ralph unconsciously uses the phrase "You are boggling my mind" and it becomes popular with the government and his title "Nothing Succeeds as Planned" provides an excuse for the President

God, Bruce,' Ralph began. 'I can't tell you how you're boggling our minds. If nothing succeeds as planned - and you really present such a strong argument - then the President has just the excuse he needs for not doing anything³².

Heller's exuberant variety, on every level of language usage contributes immeasurably to the excitement of the story in his novels.

31. _God Knows_ p. 36.
32. _Good As Gold_ p. 80.
Heller's distinguished style enables him to present individual's struggle to free himself from his depressing state of affairs under the weight of institutions.

The central problem in Heller's novels is the individual may survive against hostile oppressing institutions, find methods of changing it or beating it to retain his freedom and individuality. Through presenting the rebellion of his heroes, Heller stresses that even in helpless situations, the individual if he accepts his self responsibilities can keep his human dignity, self respect and freedom. And Heller in his novels seems to echo with Santiago's observation that "Man can be destroyed but can never be defeated".

---<>---