

**COLONIAL NARRATIVE ON INDIA
COUNTER NARRATIVE AND
COLONIAL EXPERIENCE
IN GANDHIAN ERA**

**Thesis
submitted to the University of Calicut
for the award of the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in English**

AJAY KUMAR M.P.

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT**

2003

Dr. Sankaran Ravindran, M.A., M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D. (Univ. of Kansas)
Professor and Head
Department of English
University of Calicut
Calicut University P.O., 673 635.

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled **Colonial Narrative on India, Counter Narrative and Colonial Experience in Gandhian Era** submitted to the University of Calicut, for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, is a record of bonafide research carried out by the candidate, **Mr. Ajay Kumar M.P.**, under my supervision. No part of this dissertation has been submitted earlier for the award of any degree, diploma, title or recognition.

C.U. Campus,




Dr. Sankaran Ravindran

DECLARATION

I, Ajay Kumar M.P., hereby declare that this thesis **Colonial Narrative on India, Counter Narrative and Colonial Experience in Gandhian Era** is a bonafide record of research work undertaken by me, and that it has not previously formed the basis for the award of any degree, diploma, associateship, fellowship or other similar title or recognition.

C.U. Campus,


Ajay Kumar M.P.
Senior Research Fellow (UGC)
Department of English
University of Calicut.

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Postcolonialism	20
Chapter 3 Colonial Narration	65
Chapter 4 Colonial Narrative on India : Condescending and Bemoaning	115
Chapter 5 Resistance Literature	230
Chapter 6 Indian Counter Narrative	273
Chapter 7 Conclusion: The Colonial Experience	369
Bibliography	392

Preface

The search for the familiar in the unfamiliar, and the search for the unfamiliar in the familiar is research. Research is a synthesis of various thesis and antithesis that are available in the cultural milieu. The re-organizing of thesis and antithesis is done in such a way that it creates a wholeness to that has already been told: sometimes a new thesis evolves out of all these. My research in the postcolonial realm of ideas for the past four years has yielded its fruit: this dissertation is a proof to that end.

I joined Calicut University as a Junior Research Fellow (UGC), after clearing the UGC net (Junior research fellowship) examination in June 1998. I joined the university in May 1999 under the guidance of Prof. Dr. Sankaran Ravindran sir. The journey into the realm of theoretical enterprise was interesting and within the stipulated period of nine months, in January 2000, I submitted my preliminary thesis, and later, I cleared the viva-voce too. After, two years I was promoted as Senior Research Fellow (SRF); after proper evaluation of my work done for the first two years.

The search was not easy, sometimes the familiar became too familiar or unfamiliar; and sometimes the unfamiliar remained unfamiliar. However, the invigorating support and the proper directions given by my guide directed me to explore new vistas. The discussions I had with scholars and the presentations I made in the Departmental Research Forum were very

useful for me to better my grip over the subject and methodology. During the four years of my research I presented as many as ten papers in the Departmental Research Forum, Dept. of English. I used to engage classes for MA students. I also published an article in the International Journal, *PUSH*, Vol. 2, No.1, 2003. The title of the paper is "Social oppression and uncanny resistance: A Reading of Two Folk Tales." I translated eleven articles in the book, *Vadakkenpattukkal Padanangal*, edited by Dr. Raghavan Payyanad, from Malayalam to English. (The University of Calicut entrusted me with the job and the publication division, University of Calicut will publish it).

Group discussions, traveling to various libraries in Kerala, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, paper presentations, reading, writing, editing, attending and conducting seminars, taking classes, occupied me for these three years. It was with the benevolent blessing and graceful help from various quarters that I could produce this thesis.

I bow before the grace of the Infinite.

My mother has been an inspiration and support in all my trials of life: I bow before her love, support and grace. I remember in gratitude my father's grace upon me.

My guru, Prof. Sankaran Ravindran Sir, is much more than a guide to me. It was his inspiration, support, and guidance that helped me complete the

project in time. I cannot express my gratitude in words to this punctual, meticulous, hardworking disciplinarian.

Sri. Visudhanandapurj Swami, Sree Ramakrishna Ashram, Cherur, Trichur gave his blessing during the final stages of my work: I thank him whole-heartedly.

Dr. Anitha Ravindran, wife of S. Ravindran sir, helped me in many ways during these four years: I remember with gratitude her blessings. Gayathri and Malini, daughters of my sir, also deserve special mention on this occasion.

I acknowledge my sincere gratitude to all the teachers, former and present, of the Department of English for their useful advices at crucial junctures. I thank Dr. N. Ramachandran Nair, former Head of the Department. I thank all my friends, of the Department and in the University for providing me four years of memorable experiences. I thank the office staff of the English Department, PLD, DCDC, Finance section, Pareeksha Bhavan and Men's Hostel for their services offered to me.

I remember with sincerity Mr. Jayaprakash and Rev. Sr. Jesme, Vice-principal, Vimala College, Thrissur for proof-reading some parts of the thesis.

I thank the library staff, Department of English, University of Calicut. I owe much indebtedness to the staff of CHMK Library, University of Calicut. I thank library staff of School of Letters, M.G. University, Institute of English,

Kerala University and University Library, Kerala University. I acknowledge the services of Staff of British Council Library, Trivandrum and Central Secretariat Library, Trivandrum. I appreciate the services of Staff of Connemara Public Library, Madras, British Council Library, Madras, Librarian, Madras University, American Consulate Library, Madras and Theosophical Society Library, Madras.

I acknowledge the services offered by Sri. C.D. Narasimhiah of Dhvanyaloka, Staff of Mysore University Library, Staff of Bangalore University Library, and the Librarian CISIL, Mysore. I thank the staff of Indo-American centre for American studies, Hyderabad for sending me materials. I thank the staff of Central Secretariat Library, Bangalore and Library Staff Department of History Library, University of Calicut.

I remember with gratitude all the teachers who have taught me. Some deserve special mentioning here like Prof. Ravindran, Sri. Vinay Kumar, Sri. Vijay Nair, Sri. Vijaya Mohanan, Smt. Sheela Vijayan who taught me in Government Victoria College.

I thank all my family members for their support.

Last but not least, I thank Baluettan, Jayan, Sandeep, Smt. Malathi, Smt. Parimala, Smt. Shyla, Rajesh and Ajiesh of Bina Photostat who helped to set the whole thesis.

Ajay Kumar M. P.

Introduction

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 1

Introduction

So there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that civilization existed fourteen hundred years before Christ. It is not settled whether civilization has always come from the lower to the higher. The same arguments and proofs that have been brought to prove this proposition can also be used to demonstrate that the savage is only a degraded civilized man.

Swami Vivekanda. "Hints on Practical Spirituality".

Her freedom is ensured if she has patience. That way will be found to be the shortest even though it may appear to be the longest to our impatient nature. The way of peace insures internal growth and stability. We reject it because we fancy that it involves submission to the will of the ruler who has imposed himself upon us.

Mahatma Gandhi. *Non-violence in Peace and War*

Non-violence in its dynamic condition means conscious suffering. It does not mean meek submission to the will of the evil-doer, but it means putting of one's whole soul against the will of the tyrant.

Mahatma Gandhi. "The Doctrine of Sword"

Malcom and Frere, Colebroke and Elphinstone,
the life of empire like, the life of mind
'simple, sensuous, passionate", attuned
to the clear theme of justice and order, gone
(.....)
India's a peacock-shrine next to a shop
selling mangola, sitars, lucky charms,
heavenly Buddhas smiling in their sleep.

Geoffrey Hill. "A Short History of British India".

The Indian struggle for Independence is a unique one in many respects. Two cultures, strong and well coded, came under a site of ideological confrontation; it was pregnant with traditional and novel ideas. It gave birth to cultural reorientation and redistribution in both the Indian consciousness

and the British consciousness. Nehru in his *An Autobiography* pronounces a unique aspect of human nature when it comes to the question of power:

National psychology is a complicated affair. Most of us imagine how fair and impartial we are; it is always the other fellow, the other country that is wrong. Somewhere at the back of our minds we are convinced that we are not as others are: there is a difference which good breeding usually prevents us from emphasizing. And if we are fortunate enough to be an imperial race controlling the destinies of other countries, it is difficult not to believe that all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds, and those who agitate for change are self-seeking or deluded fools, ungrateful for the benefits they have received from us (500).

A colonized citizen makes this highly remarkable observation; in fact, that deserves special attention. It reveals the encompassing nature of the dialectics of the Indian mind. It attempts at the consciousness of the ruler, guards the self against the acquiring of the same attitude. It is the Indians who made the Indian colonial experience, or the experience that developed in its encounter with the colonial, different and not the British attitude, from other colonial experiences around the globe.

As Gandhi observes, given in the epigraph, patience pays more dividends than hasty actions. The cultural strong-holds that India had in its well documented ^{and folk} and folk narratives, and the consciousness, I don't mean national, that was there – an indefinable aspect – made India counter the British cultural intervention in an unparalleled manner. Ashis Nandy in, *The Intimate Enemy* mentions that, "India has tried to capture the differentia of the west within its own cultural domain, not merely on the basis of a view of the west on politically intrusive or as culturally inferior, but as a subculture meaningful in itself and important, though not all-important, in the Indian context" (76).

The Indian colonial experience was thus rather a predominant^{ly} ideological play rather than a mere regaining of ^{the} geographical terrain. Nehru says in *An Autobiography*:

It is that rule, that domination, to which we object, and with which we cannot compromise – willingly – not the English people not on by all means have the closest contacts with the English and other foreign peoples. We want fresh air in India, fresh and vital ideas, healthy co-operation: we have grown too musty with age. But if the English come in the role of a tiger they can expect no friendship or co-operation. To the ages of

imperialism there will only be the fiercest – opposition, and to day our country has to deal with that ferocious animal (482).

The British were fighting a different battle altogether, they couldn't really grasp the colonial situation; a new paradigm of resistance was on the horizon. Gandhi and his non-violent, non-co-operative *Satyagraha* disturbed the British consciousness and determined the developments that shaped the struggle. Albert Memmi in his much-acclaimed work *The Colonizer and the Colonised* observes that the colonized people who were waging a war against colonial authority hoped that they would "be considered (. . .) soldiers and treated in accordance with the rules of war. There is profound meaning to this emphatic desire, as it was by this tactic that they laid claim to and wore the dress of history; and, unfortunately, history today wears a military uniform" (95). Indians waging their war against colonialism did not desire to wear soldier's uniforms, in the western military clan, instead they wore the Khadi. The replacement of Khaki with Khadi really disturbed the English consciousness. Where they expected and wanted violence to erupt they found their own image as brutal. This was a moment of realization which disturbed and compelled their consciousness to give political freedom to India, all other claims are essentially escapist, though we may find certain realities in them too.

Ashis Nandy states in *The Intimate Enemy* that: "Ultimately modern oppression, as opposed to the traditional oppression, is not an encounter between the self and the enemy, the rulers and the ruled, or the gods and the demons. It is a battle between dehumanized self and the objectified enemy, the technologized bureaucrat and his reified victims, pseudo-rulers and their fearsome otherselves projected on to their subjects" (xv). The modern oppression, in my opinion, is none too different from the earlier ones, but the human mind that understands the technology of the enterprise of oppression can understand the inner dynamics of oppression in a more sophisticated manner. This is conspicuously facilitated by the expansion of knowledge as a result of colonialism and postcolonialism. Colonial narrations began on certain assumptions and attitudes. It began even before colonialism began on a geographical level. The western imagination conceived colonies even before colonies came to existence.

The British narration on India, which was essentially multifaceted, and which proliferated, flourished and guaranteed colonialism created two identities: the West and the Indian. It is on this differentiated cultural premise that colonialism engraved the rules of colonial existence in India. This is a double-edged weapon. Though it helps in identification of two different images, it is always negating the reality, that of hybridity. The attempt is to camouflage certain undesirable realities. Nandy observes in *The Intimate Enemy*:

"In retrospect, colonialism did have its triumphs after all. It *did* make Western man definitionally non-eastern and handed him a self-image and a worldview, which were basically responses to the needs of colonialism. He could not but be non-eastern; he could not but be continuously engaged in studying interpreting and understanding the east as his negative identity" (71).

The British narration confronted the Indian image on two levels, spiritual and materialistic, always perceiving the image of India in the negative, which was contextual and inconsistent. Nandy makes an important observation that when the British saw the Indian as exceedingly materialistic, -"shrewd, greedy, self-centered, money-minded" (80) they were narrating themselves as loyal and sacrificing. When they were narrating Indian as spiritual, they were denying access to Indians to "modern" science and technology and denying the ability to be rulers. "They demystify the ordinary Indian on a pseudo-alternative to the Western man: hypocritically spiritual while being shrewdly materialistic, violent and self-interested" (80).

Once the narration entered the track of dichotomization, it continued in various forms and disguises. Apart from narrating the Indian as inferior and negative – spiritually and materialistically - there emerged a narration of self-justification. The British perception of themselves was that they were in India not as self-seeking, greedy, self-centered pirates; nor conquerors but as God-sent

emancipators of civilization for the general improvement of the pathetic condition of India. As Albert Memmi says in *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, "A colonialist is, after all, only a colonizer who ^{agrees} ~~agrees~~ to be a colonizer. By making his position explicit, he seeks to legitimize colonization" (45).

It takes only a moment of recognition for the Indian mind to understand the condition from ^{the} colonized people's perspective. To his distress he recognizes that it is the British who are progressing and the Indian exploited and India's development is arrested. He sees the hidden agenda behind the roads, railways, carts, police and military actions. What was done in the name of progress, historical advance can be seen now as backward, degrading, reactionary: the Indian recognizes his enslaved situation. This moment can be called the postcolonial moment.

The colonized Indian recognizes that a foreigner had come to his land by the accidents of history and has wrought catastrophe upon him. He perceives that the British have created a space for themselves in India and ^{and} also taking away his rightfully entitled rights and it functions to the detriment of the Indian people. The first attempt is to regain the geographical terrain as Edward Said declares in *Culture and Imperialism*: "If there is anything that radically distinguishes the imagination of anti-imperialism, it is the primacy

of the geographical element. (. . .) Because of the presence of the colonizing outside, the land is recoverable at first only through the imagination" (271).

The colonized, in my opinion, has two levels of identification in the postcolonial moment. On the first level of identification, he is a part of the imagination of the colonizer and here he assumes a subjective position in the imperial narrative. To this position he offers resistance. The second level of identification is being to his community. These are only states of consciousness that one acquires. He assumes the second level to fight the first level; of course, he may recognize the need for emancipation and enlightenment of the self. The colonized is attempting a vision of a free society. In his attempt to overcome the colonial situation the natural tendency on the part of the colonized is to oppose the colonizer blindly. In the Indian condition, for the Indian psyche being a special one, which believes in *Vasudevakudumbakam*, the choice is different. As Nandy observes in *The Intimate Enemy*: "The imposed burden to be perfectly non-Western only contradicts his, the everyday Indian's cultural self, just as older burden of being perfectly Western once narrowed – and still some times narrows – his choices of in the matter of his and his society's future" (73). Nandy believes that the Indian becomes selective in his choice of cultural artifacts and *that*, westernizes him more: "The pressure to be the opposite of the West disrupts the traditional priorities in the total view of man and the universe and destroys his culture's unique gestalt. It, in fact, binds him even more irrevocably to the

West" (73). This is an attempt to be with the aggressor, "an ontogenic legitimacy for an ego defense" (7). Colonial narration compels the evolution of such an Indian, as Nandy says, the emancipation of a crypto-barbarian: "The Raj saw Indian as crypto-barbarians who need to further civilize themselves in Western terms. It saw British rule as an agent of progress and as a mission. Many Indians in turn saw their salvation in becoming more like the British, in friendship or in enmity" (7).

Colonialism is a permeable site of cultural distortion because the knowledge of the West determines the evolution of the Indian civilization. Here is the point where the state of hybridity, the colonized has gained, becomes a menace to colonizer's recognition of the colonized's identity, as Homi Bhabha says in *Location of Culture*: "When the Muslim is coerced into speaking a Christian truth he denies the logic of his sense, the Hindu denies the evidence of his eyes; the Bengalee denies his very name as he perjures himself" (138). The culture thus assumes unheimlich(uncanny) narratives, because from this moment all narratives only defer or cannot regain the essence of cultural identity (in fact, cultural identity is always construed and defers understanding). The Indian struggle for Independence in the Gandhian era operates in this unheimlich narrative struggle to arrive at meaningful meanings. The colonial narrative, with its assumptions and attitudes of dealing with a crypto-barbarian, continued to hold on to the tradition of colonial narratives. Indians on the other hand attempted everything possible

to arrive at a new conceptualization of world order. The site of contestation is replete with dramas and excitement in the streets, jails, court rooms, government houses, close ts of leaders, meetings, hartals, lathicharges, *Satyagraha*, arson, strikes and so on.

My study of selected novels, with their heteroglossic, polyphonic diversity in their narrative structure, from selected British writers and selected Indian writers, enabled me to find out the scope of expansion of knowledge that colonialism provides. The picture that the two sides reveal are contradictory and contrasting yet they form parts of ^{the} discourse. The correlation between the two narratives, particular "truths" that each encloses, transforms the unity of the discourses from one epistemological level to another.

Colonialism provides a backdrop to both the coloniser and the colonised to which both could find recognition of their respective consciousness. The experience as such, for both parties appear as being different, essentially the difference is on levels of position they had to take, and it does not mean that transformation is limited to the colonised alone. The cultural osmosis in the colonial condition creates a hybrid society, though the coloniser and the colonised try to negate this reality. Essentially, this negation questions the consciousness: and the colonizer and the colonized mentally arrive at a split: that is, they gain a double identity. The cultural

scenario thus appears and is complex: the complexity can only be discerned through thorough readings with a specific intention of arriving at a conclusion. My re-reading of ^{the} colonial condition of India during the Gandhian era is a re-examination of the colonial patriarchic attitudes and assumed realities. The redistribution of cultural artifacts available in ^{the} selected novels enabled me to arrive at the conclusion that colonialism produces an unnatural human society, unnatural in any sense of the word. The intention or motive of the coloniser remains in his mind camouflaged under the pretext of cultural emancipation. The contrasting elements of the factual situation and those of the narrative disrupt the mindset of the coloniser, especially during the period of national liberation movements in the colony. In his endeavor to understand the "new" world, that the coloniser has become a part of, he is compelled to imagine and reproduce the context in narratives. The narrative will provide the ideological imperatives of such imaginings.

Critics like Leela Gandhi criticized Edward Said for using Gramscian Marxist criticism and Foucaultian discursive analyses together in his analysis (*Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, 69-80). In my view, my attempt to find the ideological permutations helped me to distinctly study the colonial narrative and the counter narrative as such. When the experience as such is studied, these tools of analyses were found wanting, therefore I have resorted to Saidian poststructuralist (may be, we can call it Foucaultian analyses) and Bhabhaian psychoanalytic and deconstructive theorizations.

The analysis is not to find out who is wrong and who is right, but to find how ideas are generated in order to capture power and essentially how in essence the condition is an unnatural condition where, fear, threat, desolation regret, pathos, indiscriminate violation of human existence are carried out making colonial site a grotesque one of life.

The particular configuration of knowledge that colonialism produced limited all concerned sections of the society. The production of knowledge about colonialism ^{was} historically determined and the limits can be examined in the available text. Indian civilization is an epic phenomenon that can encompass the transcendental and the material simultaneously. From time immemorial India has remained a fascination for all. European invasion of India changed the very course of Indian history. I believe that Indian consciousness as such began to realize its existence with this historical event. The study of Indian consciousness is a demanding task but it always remains a backdrop against which other civilizations can be analyzed which will eventually help in the understanding of Indian civilization also.

The Europeans arrived in India with certain fears and complexes. The grand civilization that India was considered to be, the spiritual heights that it had achieved, the immense wealth it hid in its bosom etc. invited the European aspirations. The Europeans having all these ideas in their mind set forth on an imaginative narrative on India. The Europeans were very

selective in choosing the ideas; inevitably the desire to control the ungraspable Indian consciousness became a challenge to them. Geographically they gained complete control over India, but on the cultural level it rather helped the emergence of an Indian consciousness. The British neglected or discarded as insignificant very many aspects that they could not grasp. The complex series of historical and cultural developments that occurred during the time of Gandhi in India is a very pregnant site for the analysis of Indian mind and the British mind. The psychological complexities that accompany colonial presence also deserve probing.

The expansion of knowledge due^{to} the emergence of postcolonial theoretical formulations permits us to see the British writing on India as British narration. This narration was multifaceted which proliferated, flourished and guaranteed colonial hegemony. During the Gandhian era it had begun to lose certain grounds of its assumptions, however the tradition of colonial narrative continued. Novel as a cultural product, essentially with its polyphonic heteroglossic nature of reproduction of cultural artifacts as a discourse, permits it to become a site of ideological constructions. The ideas shaped by the novelist generally allow critical analysis to reveal the cultural context from which it emerged: and the ideology that the novelist has inculcated and how he and the novel are a part of the ideology it depicts. Colonial novels show strong influences of the colonial imperatives and colonial project. It is beyond the novelist to escape the cultural and

ideological framework to which he belongs. Therefore, I have attempted a study of selected British writers to show the British ideology and selected Indian writers to show the opposing ideology to understand colonial discourse in totem.

The colonial novelist recreates the colonial context to evolve a picture that shows the mental operation of various assumed subjective positioning, as well as the guiding principle that compelled the creation of this form of art. The novels include an India, created in a mental operation. Their India was their narration. This is only part of the total narration, which included the writers, administrators, defense ~~personnel~~^{off}, police forces, missionaries, historians and philosophers. They all, through their goal oriented thinking tried to fix India intellectually and functionally. The ideas shaped by people from all these sectors were basically functional and contextual. Many aspects of this narration, its ideology, desire and aspirations, fears and doubts, presumptions and assumptions are analyzed and reflected in the novels. What I have done is to make a reading of E. M. Forster's much acclaimed "sympathetic" novel on India, *A Passage to India* (1924), to reveal how the humanist, Forster, was also a part of the colonial ideology. How much he is caught up in the discourse of British colonialism is studied. I have also attempted a reading of Paul Scott's novel *The Day of the Scorpion* (1968), to understand how the tradition continues even after the historical ending of colonialism.

In contrast with and contrary to the British narration, there emerged in India a counter narrative in the Indian Novels in English. Inspired by Gandhian values and socialistic aspirations, these novels give a totally different picture of the situation. This counter narrative was a response to the British narration. *Kanthapura* (1936), a novel by Raja Rao and novels by Anand, *Untouchable* (1936), *Coolie* (1937) and *Two Leaves and a Bud* (1942) are critiqued to show the Indian consciousness working during the Gandhian era. Postcolonial attitude was the basic conditioning and control behind the counter narrative.

Both British narration and Indian narration are mental processes, process of signification or meaning-making process, that has got definite political overtones clearly aspiring for acquiring power and its maintenance. That no writing or narrative is ^{an}innocent act devoid of aspiration for power is established. How discourse of colonial experience is formed out of colonial narrative and counter narrative is analyzed. How the two main modes of narration generate an agon is also discussed. How ideology functions in these narratives and how war of positions to gain hegemony ^{is made,} is also discerned. What makes the Indian struggle for independence a unique enterprise is critically evaluated. The question of reality in the consciousness rather than quest for "truth" is attempted, the creation of image structures, its values, falsities of assumed ideologies, the overhanging flexibility of culture to assimilate, reproduce and repeat is also made out.

Six chapters follow my introduction, the first one being on postcolonialism. To define postcolonialism, as it has become^a contested site in such a short period, is complicated. Colonialism is defined referring to opinions articulated by famous critics. Likewise, postcolonialism is also defined. The ambiguity of chronology and the question of hyphenation are deliberated, both being essential to arrive at a critical perspective. Who is postcolonial is an important question in the global scenario. At the level of the greatly expanding archive of books and articles on post-colonial discourses, the question of who makes the statements assumes importance, especially in the cases of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, where the debates of postcolonialism are more complex. These issues are deliberated and solutions are attempted.

The **third chapter** is an analysis of colonial narration. The various narrative contours that established colonial hegemony are (like the trope of discovery, the concept of Orientalism, the question of representation, the process of Othering, the concept of hegemony, and the assumption of universalism) interrogated. How hegemony is maintained in the colonial context is discussed. The assumptions on the part of the colonizers that they are superior enabled them to maintain their control and enhance their authority over the colony. How creation of knowledge is used to capture and maintain power is deliberated.

The **fourth chapter** looks into the various aspects of colonial assumptions: the special case of India is delineated. How the British created a concept of the need of English to emancipate the cryptobarbarians, as Ashis Nandy says in *The Intimate Enemy*, that Indians were conceived as, is delineated through the reading of the novel, *A Passage to India*, by E. M. Forster and how the pattern continues in the novel, *A Day of the Scorpion*, by Paul Scott is also shown. How certain strategies like feminization of India, marginalization of the middle class, suppression of nationalism etc were adopted by the British to marginalize and control India are discussed. While the novel, *A Passage to India*, created a discourse within its structure it also generated a more vibrant discourse, more complex, in the colonial context outside the text, contributing to ^{the} growth of colonial discourse. The generation of serious discussion around this particular piece of fiction reveals how cultural productions through literature assume profound "truths". Both Forster and Paul Scott, in the above-mentioned novels, were bemoaning the failure on the part of the Anglo-Indians to govern and emancipate India. The dialogic nature of the genre, fiction, permits the author with amplitude of space to delineate the context vividly and, therefore, the question how novel serves the special purpose in the colonial context requires discussion and I have attempted it. The internal contradictions within a novel can reveal a hidden and ambivalent mentality and a critic can carefully discern it, and my humble attempt has been the same.

Resistance narratives always have an inbuilt vigor and can entertain the dream of a liberated world. In the colonial situation the suppressed colonized figure has much to resist. It is a counter discourse, opposing the assumption of the coloniser, attempting a delineation of a different reality. Resistance narratives throughout the world contain and carry ideas like, protest marches, protest literature, conception of a liberated land, outright crimes, militant activities, recourse to Marxist-socialist ideologies etc. Resistance narrative is a violent appropriation of a context to regain certain lost values and geographical terrains. The cultural aspects demand attention in the colonial situation since it is a violently created hybrid society that wages the struggle. The past and the present, the native and the intruder, become intertwined and the colonial situation reveals a complex picture. My **fifth chapter** records some of the aspects of resistance narratives.

The Indian resistance to colonialism under the charismatic image of Gandhi is a unique one. The **sixth chapter** reveals how powerful the Gandhian narratives were and how his narratives opposed and subverted the colonial hegemony. Gandhian consciousness, which attempted social revolution and national liberation simultaneously, engulfed India and manifested itself in the novels that were written during that age. Novel with its polyphonic discursive structure enabled the writer to create a consciousness for the nation at large. Novels written in native languages and novels in English by Indians served different purposes, which complimented

each other and blended quite well into the colonial context. The novels, *Kanthapura* (1936), by Raja Rao, and *Untouchable* (1935), and *Coolie* (1936) by Anand served the Gandhian cause and the development of a national consciousness. The special aspects of such fictional discourses are classified and clarified in this chapter.

Seventh, the final chapter tries to rediscover the Indian colonial experience during the Gandhian Era. I have found out through my analysis that colonialism not only makes a colonized personality spilt but also ~~spits~~ splits the colonizer's personality. The British consciousness and Gandhian (Indian) consciousness contested to gain hegemony and both sections underwent radical changes during the period. Psychology of colonialism reveals a neurotic condition, fear and anxiety compels repression and projection of violence on the self and the other: colonialism is violence. Both the coloniser and the colonised undergo neurotic experience. The psychology of violence that colonialism creates reveal an "unnatural" space of human existence, unnatural since neurosis is a bizarre reality. My conclusion is that colonial experience is violent and destructive, therefore to resist colonialist tendencies one must understand the inner dynamics of colonialism: my humble effort is to contribute to this understanding.

Postcolonialism

Ajay Kumar M.P. “Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era ” Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 2

Postcolonialism

Larry Collins and Dominique Lapierre begin their work *Freedom at Midnight* by quoting from Rudyard Kipling. The quote runs thus:

The responsibility for governing India has been placed by the inscrutable decree of providence upon the shoulders of British race.

Our authors strangely give the title to the first chapter as "A Race Destined to Govern and Subdue". They quote a former officer of the Indian Civil Service, and that quote is also very relevant to us.

A cherished conviction shared by every Englishman in India, from the highest to lowest, by the planter's assistant in his lonely bungalow, and by the editor in the full light of his presidency town, from the Chief Commissioner in charge of an important province, to the viceroy upon his throne – the conviction in every man that he belongs to a race which god has destined to Govern and subdue (9).

The text is highly colonial, provocative and to an extent wide from the mark in creating a true picture of India during the period of attainment of freedom, which was won after a long drawn out hegemonic struggle with imperial

Britain.¹ The authors' attempt was to create a historical document, may be business motive was behind the endeavor, and they collected data from Lord Mountbatten to draw conclusions about the situation. They were ill equipped to give a fair picture for they had only a partial view of the situation. Michel Foucault argues in *The Archeology of Knowledge* that,

Recurrent redistribution reveals several past, several forms of connection, several hierarchies of importance, several network, for one and the same signs, as its present undergoes change: *Thus historical descriptions are necessarily ordered by the present state of knowledge, they increase with every transformation and never cease, in turn, to break with themselves* (emphasis mine 5).

Postcolonialism is a new field of knowledge, which gives ample scope to redistribute former knowledge structures. A Postcolonial has to make a re-reading of *Freedom at Midnight*, to reveal certain facts discussed in it in a new light. The text is rich, with respect to the basic assumptions and attitudes out of which colonial narratives arose from. And in reading the text one may come across the assumption that the "giving" of freedom to India was the greatest historical blunder because Indians cannot rule on their own and are destined to perish in internal struggle.

What is Postcolonialism? Is it a new "ism" formed to counter an older one? If it is, then it has an antecedent, which, of course, has to be colonialism. The word postcolonialism posts many ambiguous questions like, when does postcolonialism come into existence. Is it after colonialism or along with it? One may define postcolonialism as an "ism" that opposes the "-ism" of colonial and exists along with colonialism. Colonized people as soon as they come to recognize their position, as a colonial subject, become postcolonial: such^{an} recognition is a mental resistance to assumptions and attitudes of the colonial authority. Bill Ashcroft et al. in their work *Post-Colonial Studies Reader* state that the very essence of postcolonialism is resistance:

As a result of complex development something occurred for which the plan of imperial expansion had not bargained: the immensely prestigious and powerful imperial culture found itself appropriated in projects of counter - colonial resistance which the many different indigenous local and hybrid process of self-determination to defy, erode and sometimes supplant the prodigious power of imperial cultural knowledge. Postcolonial literatures are a result of this interaction between imperial culture and the complex indigenous cultural practices. As a consequence, "Post-colonial" theory has existed for a longtime before that particular name was assigned to describe it (1).

In my opinion, realization of being a colonized is the time when one gets the awareness of having been colonized mentally. It is ^o a great moment because, till then the condition was taken as something natural. The process of acquiring the knowledge that one is colonized makes one resistant to it. Foucault's hypothesis in *Power / Knowledge* is that, "Power is co-extensive with social body. There are no spaces of perniat liberty between the meshes of its network (. . .) that there are no relations of power without resistance" (157).

One becomes a postcolonial subject, being aware of the fact that one is subjected to a colonial master and has become a subject to one's own body, which one identifies as being a subordinate state to that of the colonizer. The term "subject" is used here in the Foucaultian sense as he argues in his essay, "Subject and Power", that one is "subjected to by someone else by control and dependence; and is tied to his own identity by a conscience or self - knowledge" (781). In this respect a colonized/postcolonial subject is controlled by the colonial power and he himself subjectifies his own identity or self-knowledge as a colonized. Postcolonialism is thus a struggle against the colonial power and a reassessment of one's own identity.

Colonialism

Colonialism is essential to originate postcolonial. We may define Colonialism as a violent intervention into an alien land and that it operates with multiple strategies. Elleke Bhoemer in her work *Colonial And*

Postcolonial Literatures, argues that: "Colonialism involves the consolidation of the imperial power and is manifested in the settlement of territory, the exploitation of development of resources, and the attempt to govern the indigenous inhabitants of occupied lands" (2).

Ania Loomba defines colonialism, in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*, "as the conquest and control of other People's land and goods"(2). She also argues that colonialism "was not an identical process in different parts of the world but everywhere it locked the original inhabitants and the new comers into the most complex and traumatic relationships in ~~human~~ history"(2). In Ania Loomba's opinion, forming a community in the new land "meant unforming or reforming the communities that existed there already, and involved a wide range of practices including trade, plunder, negotiations, warfare, genocide, enslavement and rebellions"(2).

Edward Said opines in *Culture and Imperialism* that colonialism "is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territories"(8). In his neat analysis of the terms - like colonialism, postcolonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism - in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* Robert J. C. Young concludes that colonialism was not just, "any old oppression, any old form of injustice, or any old series of wars and territorial occupation," but, "an empire developed for settlement by

individual communities or for commercial purposes by a trading company" (16).

Ashis Nandy in his work *The Intimate Enemy* defines European colonialism, as neatly as is possible from a native Indian point of view which can be extended to colonialism around the globe: "Colonialism (. . .) is the name of a political economy which ensures a one-way flow of benefits, the subjects being the perpetual losers in a zero-sum game and the rulers the beneficiaries. This is a view of human mind and history promoted by colonialism itself"(30). Colonization is neither a series of chance occurrence, Nandy continues, " nor the statistical result of thousands of individual undertakings. It is a system which was put in place around the middle of the nineteenth century, began bearing fruit in about 1880, started to decline after the First World War, and is today turning against colonizing nation" (31).

Aime Cesaire resorts to a negative dialectics to define colonialism. For him, what it is not defined is what it is. In his article, "Discourse on Colonialism" he states:

To agree on what it is not: neither evangelization nor a philanthropic enterprise, nor a desire to push back the frontiers of ignorance, disease, and tyranny, nor a project undertaken for the greater glory of God, nor an attempt to extend the rule of law. To admit once for all, without flinching at the

consequences, that the decisive actors here are the adventurer and the pirate, the wholesale grocer and the ship-owner, the gold-digger and the merchant, appetite and force, and behind them, the baleful projected shadow of a form of civilization which at a certain point in its history, finds itself obliged, for internal reasons, to extend to a world scale the competition of its antagonistic economies (75).

In her article "Angels of Progress," Anne McClintock metaphorically describes colonialism thus:

You enter a passage (. . .) you find a dark anti-chamber, where one White word invites you forward, COLONIALISM. To enter colonial space, you stoop through a low door, only to be closeted in another black space - curatorial reminder, however fleeting, of Fanon: "The native is being hemmed in " (254).

In her view Colonialism is ^{the} White mans' enterprise and the native is the sufferer of this history.

POSTCOLONIALISM

Anne McClintock graphically argues, in the article mentioned above, that "the way out of colonialism (. . .) is forward", she means that one has to move through colonialism to approach "a second white word,

POSTCOLONIALISM, which invites you through a slightly larger door into the next stage of history." Since colonialism used multiple strategies, as I have mentioned earlier, postcolonialism has to develop multiple strategies to comprehend and counter it. The complexities of colonial relationships make it compulsory for postcolonialism to evolve multiple strategies to dismantle colonial strategies. Due to permeation of varying critical stands, postcolonialism has become a vague condition of people anywhere and everywhere. Colonialism brought to clash many ideologies and the clash created complex and complicated agons between the colonizer and the colonized. The colonizer brought to the "new" land "new" ideas, belief systems, customs, traditions, economic structures etc. These forms attempted to forcefully replace the original or "native" forms. Almost always the times of conquest were much painful, tormenting and depressing to the colonized. In most cases the military supremacy crushed almost all native belief systems and as Albert Memmi argues, in *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, that the colonized is removed from the history though "he carries its burden often more cruelly than others, but always as an object. He has forgotten how to participate actively in the history (. . .)" (92).

The physical subjugation, which was most tormenting, was followed by the mental subjugation. Hegemony, the creation of the consent, which creates a sense of belonging to the ruling class in the colonial situation, paved

way for further destruction of native systems. Ania Loomba in *Gender Race and Drama*, argues that:

A central feature of hegemonic ideologies is their projection of the dominant viewpoint as universally true, transcendently valid and non-political. In this way, they claim to represent all humanity and fix their "other" as inferior and finally non-human. (. . .) They also claim that racism implies not only that European culture is superior but that it is the only kind of culture there can be; by exclusion from it the non-European is necessarily non-human, barbaric and animalistic. Knowledge of the East is a specialization for the European; but knowledge of the West for the Asian or African becomes synonymous with education, knowledge, culture, peace. (23)

Vivek Dhareshwar also argues, in "Fortunate Traveling: Location, Theory and Post-colonial Identity", that symbolic violence is more devastating, because "It often remains invisible and hidden and because it is self exercised (. . .) the nature of the domination involved in the subjectifying process the colonial intellectual undergoes" (38). Colonialism thus has two aspects to it: the physical and the mental, the latter more complicated and destructive than the former.

European Colonization

European colonization was the most extensive colonization of the world. Extracting data from Fieldhouse, Ania Loomba has stated that by the 1930's colonies and ex-colonies covered 84.6% of the world (XIII). Elleke Boehmer's opinion is that, as she makes in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures: Migrant Metaphors*, is "On few other occasions in human history did so many encounter such diversity of geography and culture in a short span of time" (13). In the history of mankind, European colonization of the rest of the world changed the course of history. Always capitalism and imperialism has paved the way for colonialism, as Robert Gidding propounds in *Literature and Imperialism*:

Imperialism refers to the economic and the consequent political relationship that have developed between the advanced industrial nations and the underdeveloped societies with whom they have come in contact. The race for colonies, to possess in the name of the nation state territories discovered and explored overseas, began as soon as European travelers and voyagers were able to cross land and Sea (192).

Imperialism develops into colonialism, which means exploiting, subjugating, and destroying the colonies in many forms. The spreading and the maintenance of colonialism, being a complicated matter, which make the very

facts of its existence, inherently complex and demand appropriation of sophisticated strategies of analysis. To discuss colonialism, one has to urge oneself to go beyond the traditional historical narratives and develop a more strategically well equipped one. Postcolonial critics have been, to a great extent, successful in shaping concepts and other tools of interrogation for an effective reading of imperial/colonial narratives, reading in the sense of radical analysis. Postcolonialism, which is a resistance to the exploitation, subjugation and destruction in many forms by the colonizers, has to go beyond the reading of texts (texts, in the widest sense of codes, practices, assaying etc), and has to evolve an idea that every act of the colonization has to be analyzed to expose the situation.

Theoretical Complications

Postcolonial theory, developed as a distinct genre of theoretical enterprise, gained prominence only in 1990's. However, postcolonial criticism has still not been able to resolve much theoretical confusions. The question "Who is postcolonial?" itself is complicated. Many critics group Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, ruled by the British Queen, the colonial monarch, under postcolonial countries. In two ways these colonies are still colonized. One is that (as I have already mentioned) the British Queen is their ruler and the other is that these countries have the native population marginalized and suppressed by the white settlers even now. Ania

Lomba in her work, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* has stated that "the politics of decolonization in parts of Latin America or Australia or South Africa where White settlers formed their own Independent nations is different from the dynamics of those societies where indigenous populations overthrew their European masters. Anna Rutherford in her Introduction to, *From Commonwealth to Postcolonial*, states that "In Australia and New Zealand the prior right of the indigenous dispossessed to their land and the role played by the migrant population in the creation of the wealth of country (little of which is returned to them) is generally unacknowledged" (8).

Homi Bhabha in his introduction to *Nation and Narration* says, "Nations like narratives lose their origins in the myths of time and fully realize their horizons in the mind's eye"(1). The White settlers of Australia, New Zealand or Canada are in an attempt to create the myth of being a postcolonial country as Lomba opines these settlers may have a feeling of, "estrangement from Britain (or France) that they want to be considered postcolonial subjects "(9). Thus, the myth of these countries being postcolonial is achieving prominence even when it is questioned.

Postcolonial spirit of a settler will never be the same as that of a native. In order to understand the difference, we will have to explore the internal differences within these countries. The discussion gets more complicated

when we include Achebe's argument that the Black Americans are also postcolonial.

Third World Literature, Commonwealth Literature, New Literature

There is a general notion that postcolonial is an umbrella term which brings under it terms like, Third World Literature, Commonwealth Literature, New Literature and Neo-colonial. Arif Dirlik is of the opinion that Third World cannot include what the expression postcolonial can, for Postcolonial is a discursive aspect. In his article "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Capitalism in the Age of Global Capitalism" he states:

The contrast between *postcolonial* and its predecessor term, *third world*, may be revealing. The term *third world*, postcolonial critics insist, was quite vague in encompassing within one uniform category vastly heterogeneous historical circumstances and in locking in seized positions if not geographically, societies and populations that shifted with changing global relationships. Although this objection is quite valid, the fixing of societal locations, misleadingly or not, permitted the identifications of, say, Third world intellectuals with the concreteness of places of origin. Postcolonial does not permit such identifications (. . .). Now that postcoloniality has been released from the fixity of third world locations, the

identity of postcolonial is no longer structural but discursive. Postcolonial in this perspective represents an attempt to regroup intellectuals of uncertain location under the banner of postcolonial discourse (332).

Arif Dirlik agrees that postcolonial is a mature form of third world, and that it encompasses heterogeneous historical circumstances. Postcolonial in this sense breaks the fixity of origin. Third world is, in the global capitalist scenario, the less developed countries and it is safe to demarcate it from postcolonial countries. Many postcolonial countries have become first world nations or second world nations. Second World Nations refer to communist countries. The indigenous peoples of the settler colonies who are the most marginalized group are identified as "Fourth World". Elleke Boehmer deliberates that,

The collective term third world is used as it is by the non-alignment movement to signify its difference from the West. Initially used (in French) by analogy with "third estate" meaning dispossessed, third world came to designate those states distinct from the West, the first world, and the second world, the Soviet bloc, in the context of cold war. Although the phrase is used as a crude generalization, it has been taken by decolonized and/or neocolonial governments to refer to their economic and political

difference; some might say deformation in a post-imperial world (9).

Thus postcolonialism and Third World Literatures are not the same. The Third World generally refers to economic aspects while the term postcolonial is extensive and resistive. Terms like Commonwealth and New Literatures are identified as the same. The expression New Literatures was used to avoid power inequalities inherent in the term Commonwealth. The word commonwealth shows the tendency to show the binary situation, England and its others. Nilufer E. Bharucha opines that the word Commonwealth Literature retains or struggles to maintain the position of England as an erstwhile colonial country. He, in "From Commonwealth to Postcolonial Literatures: Old Wine in New Bottles?" argues that the term "Commonwealth Literatures" retained the supremacy of Britain and that it obscured the negative aspects:

They felt that the term commonwealth reinforced the old power structures; with Britain in a superior, privileged position and the erstwhile colonies are subordinate subaltern positions. It was also thought that the term "Commonwealth" stressed only the positive image of the former Empire and elided the exploitation and trauma which is the result of colonization. Such persons sought to focus on the commonality of shared negative

experiences and subsequent attempts to overcome the handicaps of the colonial past. Hence the term favored by writers such as Salman Rushdie, academics and critics like Edward Said, Gayathri Spivak, and Homi Bhabha is "Postcolonial" which immediately draws attention to the colonized past and indicates that the effects of colonization do not cease with decolonization but continue to haunt postcolonial societies in diverse ways or a long time after political sovereignty has been achieved (61).

The term New Literatures had the inherent meaning embedded in it that the literature of the colonized country is new or rather came into existence with the contact of the colonizer. It denied literary history to the pre-colonial periods of the colony and can be seen as an extension of colonial ideology. My arguments have their base in the idea that many critics like Suvir Kaul propose. She in "Colonial Figures and Post-colonial Reading" argues:

In its unproblematic coalescing of Australian, Canadian, West-Indian, African and Indian writing as equally post-colonial, the field of Commonwealth Literature occludes by the very principles of its constitution the asymmetrical relations of power between metropolitan countries and the so called Third World. It is only too obvious that, although there are some non-western scholars

working in the area, institutional power in the field of Commonwealth Literature rests with the metropolitan centers (75).

The Pitfalls of the Term Postcolonial

Postcolonialism is a problematic term due to its paradigm shifts in various contexts. Even about its punctuation, there is much confusion and overlapping. Before analyzing what postcolonialism is, we have to be aware of the problematic of its punctuation first.

Post-colonialism / Postcolonialism

The word is used in two forms currently, with a hyphen: "post-colonial" and without a hyphen: "Postcolonial" with subtle changes of meanings; and the critics are under constant debate as to how to differentiate between the two. Mishra and Hodge suggest in "Dark Side of the Mind", that "Post-colonialism, the one with a hyphen, is found "in its most overt form in post-independent (i.e., independent?) Colonies at the historical phase of "post-colonialism." The latter, the one without a hyphen, is more inclusive and is a "complicit 'postcolonialism' (. . .) can always present underside within colonization itself" (284).

Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iverson in their introduction to *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*, mention that they have

"distinguished between 'postcolonial' used as temporal marker [,] and 'postcolonial' etc. to indicate the analytical concept of greater range and ambition, as in 'postcolonial theory' or "postcolonial criticism" (4). What I think is that they are in an effort to affect a compromise. They are bewildered because of the diversity of colonial experience, the vastness of the area, the time or period under consideration and the confusion created out of too much of ideas being thrown up from different parts of the world. According to their view, postcolonial is only in its infancy and gradually there will be a development of critical and theoretical vocabulary, which can deal with problematic analytical concept of postcolonialism. Nilufer E. Bharucha comes out with a similar opinion in the above-mentioned article, he suggests that:

The term "postcolonial" is seen to have at least three main uses. At the most basic level it is used to refer to the formerly colonized countries in Asia, Africa and the Caribbean, which have since the end of Second World War become independent nations. Used in this sense, it is usually written with a hyphen and denotes what chronologically came after colonialism i.e., "postcolonialism" (. . .) the beginning of 1980s, the term "Postcolonial" this time without hyphen, has acquired ideological overtones and has become a rather problematic construct. The term since then has been used to refer to literary

texts, arts, and cinema produced in countries, which were once colonized by Europe (61-62).

According to Bill Ashcroft et al, "Post-colonial" had a clearly chronological meaning, designating the post-independent period. Like the above-mentioned critics, they too believe that, since the late 1970s literary critics have been using the term to discuss the various cultural effects of colonization. The dispute persists even when the interweaving of the two approaches is considerable. Ashcroft et al. in *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Theory* use in combined form ("Post-colonialism/postcolonialism") separated with a slash and enunciate that it is "now used to include the study and analysis of European territorial conquests, the various institutions of European colonialisms, the discursive operations of the empire, the subtleties of subject constructions in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects" (187)

"The semantic basis of the term post-colonial", write the authors of *The Empire Writes Back*, "might seem to suggest a concern only with the national cultures after the departure of the imperial power" they continue and suggest that "the term post-colonial, 'covers' all the cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day" (1, 2). Harish Trivedi objects to this view of postcolonialism encompassing both the colonial period and the independent period under the umbrella term "post -

colonial" in his work *Colonial Transactions*. He finds another form of cultural hegemony working beneath the creation of such a knowledge:

To bracket together the colonial and the post-colonial in India is to condone and erase the Empire and all its many enormities, and to talk strictly of the Empire "writing back". (. . .) To indicate not so much any real resistance or rejoinder to forms of continuing neo-colonialism as a complicity with and on going dependence with them (. . .) (124).

Confusion created due to ^{the} convergence of postmodern theories on every field of knowledge, along with the vastness of the subject, the term "Postcolonial" tries to bind together, has given birth ^{to} too much doubt and antagonistic viewpoints even about its punctuation. As Harish Trivedi has pointed out, the term ~~must~~ itself be questioned; it shows the hegemonic tendency of the West to create knowledge in such a way that they could control this field of knowledge creation so as to enable them to continue cultural domination. A doubt persists as to why we cannot use a word like anti-colonial in place of postcolonial.

The Ambiguity of Chronology

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

George Santanya

Like punctuation, another confusion prevalent in the study of postcolonialism is the question of time. There appears to be much doubt whether there is any chronological movement in the study of the postcolonial. Anne McClintock judges in the same article that:

The "Post-colonial scene" occurs in an entranced suspension of history, as if the definitive historical events have preceded us, and are not now in the making. If the theory promises a de-centering of history in hybridity, syncretism, multi-dimensional time and so forth, the singularity of the term effect a re-centering of global history under a single rubric of European time. Colonialism returns at the moment of its disappearance. The term confers on colonialism the prestige of history proper; colonialism is the determining marker of history other cultures share only chronological, prepositional relation to an Eurocentred epoch that is over (Post -), or not yet begun (Pre -). In other words, the world's multitudinous cultures are marked not positively by what distinguishes them but by a subordinate, retrospective relation to a linear, European time (255).

Colonialism as a cultural aspect left back traits that were unidentifiable and unerasable feelings. The question of time thus poses a problem, since it is very difficult to discern time in cultural contexts. ^{The} West has left marks that are so very thick that it is impossible to avoid or by-pass them; the desire to understand is the essence of postcoloniality. Colonialism is thus a permanent marker in the history of the world at large, the West and East are engulfed in its discourse. The postcolonial discussions achieve complications, since it is not very easy to destroy the colonial history that created a new world order. We have ~~got~~ to discuss the colonial period and it will inevitably evoke the colonial past. In recalling the past what is to be done is to take a stance apart from the Euro-centricism, (a desire to wrestle with western historiography) and ^{to} read history or archeology in a Foucaultian paradigm from a colonised people's perspective going into pre-colonial and colonial periods. As I have already stated it is not easy to come out of ^{the} Euro-centric conceptualization of the world. The desire to do so, the deepest wish to countermand and create a new world is in essence the postcolonial struggle. The struggle certainly envisages a universal human being.

In the mean while, I agree with Harish Trivedi in his warning that we can find a subtle strategy behind reversing or destroying the chronological moment: which is to erase the revolting remembrance of the colonial past. He finds a creation of Euro-centricity amidst clamor of protest and negation of its values:

The line of continuity between the colonial and the post-colonial is not a matter of simple chronology. Rather, it has, through a strategy which lies at the core of postcolonial theory, been turned into a kind of reverse chronological flow, and been used to accomplish a *post facto* extension of colonial history. As a consequence, there is now a theoretical claim to the effect that there is and was no such historical phase and phenomenon on the "colonial" outside the "post-colonial" and that the two are virtually one and the same thing (121).

According to the assessment of Bart-Moore Gilbert et al. the postcolonial possess a "problematic temporality". They maintain that postcolonialism can undo neat chronology, in their work *Postcolonial Criticism* (1997). They caution against the process of ordering postcolonial inside neat historical times, following postmodern theories: "Clearly an entrenched periodization is as dangerous as the claim that postcolonialism represents nothing, but culture, by virtue of its fragmentation and repetition, is anachronistic. The time of postcolonial is out of joint"(2). It is a problematic view according to them, because the "post" in postcolonial can mean an end, "actual or imminent to process"(2). The end here is the end of colonialism, which can never be, because its hangovers are too long. Postcolonial period is a period of suspicion, if at all it is a period.

Anne McClintock conceptualizes in the aforesaid article that:

"Post-colonial" *theory* has sought to challenge the grand march of Western historicism with its entourage of binaries (self-other, metropolis-colony, centre-periphery, etc.), the term "post-colonialism" none-the-less re-orientes the globe once more around a single binary opposition, colonial\postcolonial (254).

But she is apprehensive that postcolonial is haunted by the very figure of linear development that it is trying to unwrap. Metaphorically the term "post-colonialism" makes history a series of stages along an epochal road from the "pre-colonial" to "the colonial" to "postcolonial"(254). Therefore, as far as she is concerned the binary system of conceptualization remains at the core of postcolonial theory:

This theory is thereby shifted from the binary axis of power (colonizer/colonized itself inadequately nuanced, as is the case of woman) to the binary axis of time, an axis even less productive of political nuance since it does not distinguish between the beneficiaries of colonialism (the ex-colonizer) and the causalities of colonialism (the ex-colonized)(254).

Criticizing the views of the authors of *The Empire Writes Back*, in the same work, she argues that "the authors decided idiosyncratically to say the least, that the term 'post-colonialism' should not be understood as everything that

has happened since European colonialism but rather call the cultures affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day"(254).

Postcolonial Critics

The scramble for maintenance and extension of cultural terms is crucial to the academic world. The colonized people, who were and are modelled by colonial knowledge creations by the European maggots and white colonizers of the settlers' colonies, have to develop self-realization of how they have become prey to colonial hegemonies. It is a necessity, to distinguish between the native postcolonial, (who were and are strangled under colonial atrocities), and the others who wear the wardrobe, decorating it with narratives, perplexing the field of postcolonial knowledge creation. Harish Trivedi is of a similar opinion and warns in his article "India and Postcolonial Discourse", that the profuse inflow of theories from the Western academia, by the Western intellectuals, Diaspora, from the settler colonies, is to sweep us from the floor. A new method is evolved from the West to take possession of the field of postcolonial knowledge:

As we in India hear the distant thunder and watch the high tide surge on the Western horizon, we soon begin to realize that it is for us that the scramble is for and it is over our head that these waters seek to flow. Unlike with feminism or poststructuralism

or even Marxism the discourse of postcolonialism is ostensibly not about the West where it has originated but about the colonial other. For the first time probably in the history of the Western academic, the non-West is placed at the centre of its dominant discourse (120).

Harish Trivedi is right in pointing out that it is for the colonies that the scramble is for but it would be wrong to decide that it is not about the West. The space of creation of knowledge in theoretical field is crucial since it is a sharpened tool that will be used to analyze the society with an assumed scientificity: to become a part of the discourse is essential in order to make our voices heard. The word theory is enticing and carries a lot of credibility and validity in the academic world. Many Indian academics assume that it is beyond them; therefore they remain out of the discourse and destroy valuable knowledge production. The Indian Diaspora, in the Western academy, is far removed from the changes that have taken place in India and regrettably the Western intellectuals and the intellectuals of the Diaspora are still concentrating on the colonial narrative, thereby again studying the Western colonial enterprise, as if the resistance is insignificant. A new struggle is taking place, as Anne Maxwell argues:

Recent debates are divided on the issues of whether or not the post-colonial intellectual should be engaged in the attempt to

recover an autonomous form of subjectivity for the others of Europe that will allow them to "speak for themselves" (81). (. . .) The shifts which have taken place (. . .) would have to include the attempt on behalf of Western intellectuals to restore themselves to a position of global supremacy through the deployment of increasingly subtle methods of cultural appropriation, as well as the efforts of post-colonial intellectuals to respond in equal wily fashion (82).

The situation is quite intriguing, many lay claim to this field of knowledge, from different communities they belong to, making it a Herculean task to find out the grain from the chaff. The position of the colonies and the colonized is ambivalent. The colonizer and the colonized figure in the discourse, the Western colonizer dominates and the colonized remains marginalized, and it would be wrong to fore-say that the non-West is at the centre of postcolonial discourse made by the Western academia or the settler academia or even the Diaspora.

A thorough analysis of the colonized people's situation and their anguish, as in Fanon's, *The Wretched of the Earth*, or Albert Memmi's, *The Colonizer and the Colonized* is rarely done. A strong critical position from an Indian perspective is lacking: it is true that Indian writers are receiving attention under the umbrella term postcolonial. The postmodern global

scenario, where publishers play a crucial role, has facilitated the growth of non-Western writers in the global market.

Postcolonialism, in the analysis of the colonial situation must move in a more systematic manner, showing resistance to colonial and neo-colonial susceptibilities. The modern global scenario is where publishers, who are corporate managers of the world, play an important role in projecting "postcolonial" texts. We are carried away by the attention the Diaspora and native writers gain in the global market. It is true that getting the attention of the world at large, or to say being famous, is a wish that everyone cherishes. But one must remember that getting attention is not all that matters, one has to understand what kind of attention one is gaining. When we consider the case of India we can understand it; India was a centre of attention for Europeans for many centuries and unfortunately for her, their attraction and interest helped them or rather induced them to come and colonize the land. The present attention that the Indian Diaspora and native writers get has its own pitfalls; generally, an Indian who depicts India that suits Western conceptualization gets acclaim in the Western World. Therefore, my contention is that though postcolonialism has given a new image and prestige to the colonized in the cultural context of the world at large, it has not been able to bring out the colonized from the cloisters of Western dominance. Mere participation in the postcolonial discourse is not enough, because bulk of such discourse is controlled by Western scholars and is based on Western

controlled scholarship. We have to be more accurate historically and factual sociologically.

The overflow of theories has made this field of knowledge problematic and confusing. In my opinion, postcolonialism is a self-realization of being in a subject position by a colonized. As Leela Gandhi has asserted, Gandhi and Fanon were the earliest postcolonial critics. The recognition of being in a subject position by the colonized compels him to resist the power structure that has subjugated him. Therefore a postcolonial first recognizes his position of being a subject and resists the suppression offered by the colonial.

Ambivalent Postcolonial

The White settlers in Australia, New Zealand and Canada, who were either White conquerors or exiled criminals, exaggerate their humanism to work their position of being postcolonial. Using their position as ruling class, they manipulate this hegemony to assimilate themselves into the settled colony. The native population or, in postcolonial terms, the indigenous inhabitants, are the marginalized. Postcolonial indigenous critics from Australia and Canada have raised strong voices against this very idea. The ruling class of Canada and Australia still recognize the Queen of England as their sovereign head. Therefore, it is too baffling to consider Australian and Canadian critics as postcolonial for they are technically and mentally a part of the colonizing structure.

Modern global scenario has one positive quality about it. It recognizes plurality and offers space for the marginalized communities, who struggle to voice their experience. Essentially it is the development in the postcolonial mould, resisting and demanding space and the advancement and plurality of transmission of information have compelled the world to recognize the voices of the marginalized too and it help, them to fight for their rights. One of the tools used by the dominant class to place ~~itself~~^{themselves} as humane is to show assumed sympathy and give the fabricated space to the marginalized sections. Ranajit Guha in his essay, "Not at home in Empire," following Kierkegaard's ideas, shows that fear and anxiety are the causes of tension between human beings. Isolation is another factor that he discusses. And the fear of being isolated compels everyone to side with the dominant. Ranajit Guha finds that:

In the register of anxiety (. . .) the emphasis shifts to the colonized on the loss of freedom. He has no will of his own any more and he is controlled "by the will of those yellow faces behind." Trapped in the image of sahib, fabricated by the sahibs themselves in order to impress the natives he is now forced to line up to it by doing what natives expect a sahib to do (492).

This is the manner in which the neo-colonial world nations act; they are compelled to recognize the marginalized groups. How they do it matters, for it brings back techniques of differentiation on a different plane. The West

become modern everlastingly and the Other world follows it. They "give" space because they assume that the Other does not have it or that they are the people who should listen and be aware of the position that they have gained out of the magnanimity of the White master. Incidentally, the modern West is compelled to act under the pressure of these new power structures. The West shows sympathy to reveal the poor and the desperate condition the "Other", the non-West is in. But the West attempts to obscure the history that made the colonized or the marginalized poor and desperate in its new language.

In the Bhabhian sense the space offered is the "third space of enunciation" which creates ambivalence and threatens the colonial project. What the neo-colonial elements are attempting at is, in the Gramscian sense, to create hegemony over creation of ideas in a universal mode. One such action on the part of Australia was to allow an aboriginal athlete Cathy Freeman to light the Olympic lamp at the 2000 Sydney Olympics. The settler conscience is compelled to show a token of honour. It is a well-known fact that the settlers have robbed the indigenous people of their land, honour and culture. After subjugating them physically and mentally, through which their identity was destroyed, the settlers, who still govern the country - though they have no right - are showing diplomatic gestures to cover the sordid past and present of colonialism in Australia. The aboriginals protested against the 2000 Olympics being held in Sydney; they were raising their voice for freedom (The Hindu Daily, June 23, 2000: 24).

Postcolonialism has to develop in a direction to counter the colonial ideas, which subjugated them, and to expose the designs of the neo-colonial enterprise, which is globalizing the world in the Western mode. Postcolonialism has to go through many intriguing alleys in this "much too much" complicating and ever enlarging preposition of the problematic that confronts it. Multiplicity of attitudes makes the domain of deliberation more complicated.

In the arena of academic deliberation also the Australian presence is intriguingly dominating. Bill Ashcroft, Helen Tiffin, and Gareth Griffiths, who teach at the universities of New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia respectively, are some of the major writers and compilers of postcolonial criticism. Their major edited works, *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* and books like *The Empire Writes Back* and *The Key-concepts in Post-colonial Studies* ~~take~~ strong ideological positions, which are to be seriously interrogated. They, in their work *The Empire Writes Back*, distinguish English - as English and english:

In order to focus on the complex ways in which the English language has been used in these societies, and to indicate their own sense of difference. We distinguish in this account between the 'standard' British English inherited from the empire and the english which the language has become in post-colonial

countries. Though British imperialism resulted in the spread of a language, English across the globe, the english of Jamaicans is not the english of Canadian , Maoris or Kenyans. We need to distinguish between what is proposed as a standard code, English (the language of the erstwhile imperial centre), and the linguistic code, english, which has been transformed and subverted into several distinctive varieties throughout the world. For this reason the distinction between English and english will be used throughout our text as an indication of the various ways in which the language has been employed in by different linguistic communities in the post-colonial world. (8)

The argument placed here is ridiculous. The writers assume that the imperial language is write-protected, to use a modern technological term, and will not be permeated by influence of other languages. The so-called British Standard English has also got transformed by being in contact with other cultures. The constant use of Indian words like *guru*, *karma*, *avatar*, *sahib* in Standard English shows that the English of this millennium in England does not remain the English of the 1800 or 1857, because of colonialism. The assigning of capital "E" to English of British people, cleverly the authors have missed out to discuss American English, and small "e" to English of colonies is itself from within the framework of colonial imperatives. When the question of cultural production in these "languages" are concerned the argument acquires

more colonial tendencies. Moreover, Kenyan "English" is not Canadian "English" or Australian "English". Indian English has subdivisions like South Indian English and North Indian English. A simple distinction of English and english will not work to show all these differences but it only helps to bring back the old dichotomy of ^{the} imperial centre and colonial peripheries. This again brings back the old dichotomy of Western imperialism, the colonizer and the colonized. The writers recognize it and are benevolent enough to recognize the importance of literature produced in these 'englishes'.

In practice the history of this distinction between English and english has been between the claim of a powerful "centre" and a multitude of intersecting usages designated as "peripheries". The language of these "peripheries" was shaped by an oppressive discourse of power. Yet they have been the site of some of the most exciting and innovative literature of the modern period and this has at least in part, being the results of the energies uncovered by the political tension between the idea of a normative code and a variety of regional usages (8).

The settler colony critics here give a privileged position to British English. Language is a system of signs to communicate ideas. Rendering power structures by dichotomic propositions again show colonial tendencies behind

the attempt of creation of this idea. The concept of abrogation, rejection of a "correct" or "standard" English, is an important political stance within postcolonial discourse: it in a way show a strong opposition to this attitude.

Harish Trivedi in "India and Post-Colonial Discourse" too shares my views, he writes:

What is new is that these deviant or variant forms of colonial English have now won an acceptance in the metropolis such as was hardly conceivable so long as British English, was the non-negotiate imperial standard. But this acceptance is perhaps still grading and patronizing as typified by the neo-orthography 'English' vis-à-vis 'English'. Thus, Indian, Australian or Canadian English in lower case english (in view perhaps of its many short coommings (sic)) while good old British English remain capital English (127).

Moreover, the writers are of the opinion that colonialism has helped the colonized countries to produce some of the "most exiting and innovative literature of the modern period", the colonial presence is of benevolence to the colonized to produce something better. In their opinion the mother country remains dominant and unaffected, I have strong disagreements to the argument that colonialism compelled them to create counter narratives: an attempt to justify colonialism in some terms become evident. Counter

narratives always tell tales of suffering and rebellion and are not songs of joy or praise. Helen Tiffin in her article, "Postcolonial Literatures and Counter Discourse" categorically attempts to establish that the day-to-day realities of the colonized people were in large part generated for them by the impact of European discourses" (17). The writer caught up in the colonial knowledge structure maneuver to establish that postcolonial countries had no pre-colonial past. She continues in the same fashion: "These subversive maneuvers, are characteristics of post-colonial text, as subversive is the characteristics of postcolonial discourse in general. Postcolonial literatures/ cultures are thus constituted in counter discursive rather than homologous practices, and they offer 'fields' of counter discourse strategies to the dominant discourse" (18).

Tiffin's attempt is to establish the fact that postcolonial discourses are just the counter discourse of the dominant discourse, which is ^{the} colonial discourse. It is true that postcolonial discourses subvert colonial discourses and for that, postcolonial discourses use various methods. But at the same time, in my opinion, the discourse also has a unique existence of its own, which remains obscured from the colonizer because he can never understand counter discourses completely. He sees it in comparison to colonial discourses. I strongly believe that colonial discourses do not always remain dominant. In the colonial history of every nation, which has gained freedom, there must have been a phase during which postcolonial discourses must have achieved the dominant position, that many achieved freedom from imperial

yoke is a justification of my argument. I believe that colonial narration become; dependent upon counter narration that evolves; in fact colonial narration began as a presumed opposition to counter narratives.

In the Gandhian era of India's freedom struggle there was a shift, which allowed postcolonial discourses to achieve the dominant position. When we analyze this period by comparing and contrasting colonial narratives and counter narratives we can comprehend as to how colonial narratives lost its zeal and how counter narratives evolved out of enthusiasm and as to how counter narratives created a sense of passion and vigor in the colonized. I have done a detailed study of the same in the following chapters of my thesis. It is a fact that postcolonial discourses had the hegemony over the colonial discourses during the Gandhian era. Bipan Chandra postulates in *India's Struggle for Independence*:

The basic strategic perspective of the national movement was to wage a long-drawn out hegemonic struggle or, in Gramscian terms a war of position. By hegemonic struggle, we mean a struggle for minds and hearts of men and women so that the nationalistic influence would continuously grow among the people through different channels and through different phases and stages of the national movement (507).

In his opinion, this was facilitated by “Understanding of the complex economic mechanism was further advanced after 1918 under the impact of anti-imperialist mass movements and the spread of Marxist ideas (518). (. . .) If the primary contradiction provided the material or structural basis of the national movement its grasping through anticolonial ideological basis” (519). In other words, Indians grasped the situation from a much better position and could win the struggle for production and maintenance of knowledge in the colonial atmosphere. The ideological apparatuses of the freedom fighters could effectively remove the colonial ideology of exclusion and suppression. The colonial narratives showed signs of erosion of ideological basis and the colonizer showed fears of being revealed of his colonial tendencies, and began to change their attitudes towards the scenario and began to realize the falsities of their basic assumptions of this land. The counter narratives challenged their assumptions and created new image structures and this was the greatest achievement of struggle for hegemony in the Indian context.

Colonial Discourse and Counter Discourse

Every text is a document, text in the sense of a meaning-making discursive concept. Every text documents many aspects of life; the creation of a document is a meaning-making process that has assumed authority and validity. Analysis of every text to read the aspects of life given in the text is another form of meaning-making process. Texts are to be looked into,

interrogating the validity of the claims in it and the vested interest in the creation of "truthful" narratives, to understand the interests behind the desire in the creation of a text. The truths revealed through the text, by representation of ideas, deliberately and accidentally, have an inherent desire of domination of the field of creation of knowledge. All the efforts of a scholar are to reconstitute the parts from which the text has emanated with decipherable traces of reality and fiction. In order to reanalyze, the situation or a text, the scholar has to organize the text, divide it up, redistribute it, order it, arrange it in levels, establish in series, distinguish the relevant from the irrelevant, discover incidents of importance, define units, and to describe relations, inter-textual and intra-textual.

Texts have played an important role in the colonization of the world

Elleke Boehmer states in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures*:

The empire in its hey day was concerned and maintained in an array of writings - political treatises, diaries, acts and edits, administrative records and gazetteries, missionaries reports, notebooks, memoirs, popular verse, court-briefs, letters "home" and letters back to settlers. The triple-decker novel and the best selling adventure tale (13).

The topic of the text and textuality has been central in all postcolonial studies. Ashcroft argues that text and textuality has played a dominant role in

the drama of colonialist literatures. His emphasis, in *Post-colonial Studies Reader* is that:

European texts, anthologies, histories, fiction, captured the non-European structures within European frameworks (...) within the complex relations of colonialism these representations were re-projected to the colonized - through formal education or general colonialist relations - as authoritative pictures of themselves (5).

Colonial discourse encompasses all these aspects of narration. Sara Mills in Discourse opines that colonial discourse is not just a body of text, "with similar subject matter, but rather refers to a set of practices. The rules which produced these texts and the methodological organization of the thinking underlying these texts reveal the desire to dominate. All these texts, generally, assigned the position of master to the colonizer and a position of an ignorant subject to the colonized, who is deeply dependent ~~to~~ the former. Ania Loomba too finds that this was a crucial feature of imperial hegemony. In *Colonialism\Postcolonialism* she argues:

A central feature of hegemonic ideologies is their projection of the dominant viewpoint as universally true, transcendently valid and non-political. In this way, they claim to represent all humanity and fix "others" as inferior and finally non-human.

(...) White racism implies not only that European culture is superior but that it is the only kind of culture there can be: by exclusion from it the non-European is necessarily non-human, barbaric and animalistic (19).

Colonial discourses were to an extent successful in creating the image of the imperial self as superior and the other as inferior. It invited a systematic resistance to dismantle its assumed superior position and it began long ago and traveled many crossroads and has arrived at the city of de-colonization. As Timothy Brennan states in her preface to the special issue of *Modern Fiction Studies* (Spring 1989), "The history of our times is, in a very real sense, the history of decolonization" (4). For her, resistance narrative is, "a mode of writing linked to a process of nation building and identity -formation that has been carried out at the expense of an empire consisting not only of occupation armies, World Bank ultimatums, and saturation bombing and a network of taste and values" (4). Counter narratives have multidimensional strategies to counter colonial narratives. Like Brennan argues, one of them is through an outspoken literary functionalism. The second is to subvert the previously valid generic conventions. It's an act of reclaiming a lost terrain. To achieve this aim, writers may take a radical stance, as taken by Fanon or Achebe, which is violent. The other is to take an oppositional stance to colonial one, in the ideological realm to reclaim hegemony, which I think is the most

suitable form. For, it replaces an old knowledge with a different one, and forming of Knowledge is a precedent to the gaining of power.

Therefore, postcolonialism is the gaining of knowledge of one being a colonial subject. This realization helps one to fix his position in this wide world; one needs ground to stand to offer a fight. Colonial discourses, with their assumed methodology and claim of scientific analysis of the colonized land created certain myths that helped them in overcoming many hurdles in their endeavor of colonization and creation of hegemony of necessity of colonial rule. Essentially, with its dichotomizing tendencies of narratives aimed at achieving power, it invited systematic resistance from the part of the colonized to dismantle various assumptions of the European narratives which had attained the status of "normal" realities. The narrative began to ^{take} shape long ago, the process still continues, and therefore, it becomes conspicuous that postcolonial narratives have to evolve new strategies because colonialism has permeated to the micro levels of the social set-up of the colonized land and even the so called mother land. There are no highways for postcolonialism, it inevitably has to travel through alleys and cut-roads to understand and negate colonial value system, as Timothy Brennan states, in her *Preface* to the special issue of *Modern Fiction Studies*, (1989), "the history of our times is, in a very real sense, the history of decolonization" (4).

Counter narratives have developed multidimensional, intertwined and overlapping strategies to counter the multifaceted, intertwined and overlapping colonial narratives. It can be achieved in two ways in the discursive plane. Timothy Brennan argues, firstly, through an outspoken literary functionalism and secondly, through overt social and political action subverting the valid generic convention of colonialism. It is not just an act of reclaiming a lost terrain but a regaining of a lost identity and self-respect also.

The opposition can be very violent and many take this path, countering the might of the imperial ruler on the physical level. It involves bloodshed and the ideology that it advocates is more destructive. The violence that is used against the colonizer later becomes the identity of the colonized and they will realize this reality very late. Many countries that achieved freedom through violent methods later had dictators to rule them, the condition ^{makes us} understand ^{how} dictatorship is non-too different from the colonial context. Nations, which sought out for ideological struggle for independence, later had democratic governments: in fact everyone knows it.

What makes the India's struggle for independence unique in its method of countering the imperial policy? The colonial ideological realm is shattered through ^{the} creation of narratives; it occupies the dominant position through various unique practices. It is a potential site of creation of new knowledge, pregnant with life-giving rather than life-taking ideas. The colonized and the

colonizers both changes simultaneously to acquire a new vision of life. Gandhi, the great symbolic figure of will-power and character, master-minded the whole approach. Studying the case of India's struggle for Independence, in the Gandhian era, gives one ample scope to understand how war of positions change in a long drawn struggle for hegemony.

Notes

¹ The text is rich with comments like, "While Mountbatten's features were always composed, Nehru's rarely were" (84).

In the chapter 13 the authors describe events of the days 4 September 1947 in Simla and 6 September 1947 in New Delhi through the narrative, the worst description of a race that cannot rule themselves is revealed. The writers are not ready to acknowledge that Mountbatten handed over the rule to the Indians without giving any clue to the manner in which the government functioned. The new government had little idea of how the system worked, and it was only the initial hiccups that the new government was facing. Mountbatten passed on the rule only when the British found it hard to retain the imperial hegemony and not out of any good will.

Colonial Narration

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 3

Colonial Narration

The affects of the cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environments, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance with other peoples languages rather than own (. . .) It even plants serious doubts about their moral rightness of struggle (. . .) The intended results are despair, dependency and collective death wish.

Ngugi Wa Thiongo, *Decolonizing the mind: The Political language in African Literature.*

Awareness, no matter how confused it may be, develops from every act of rebellion; the sudden dazzling perception that there is something in a man with which he can identify himself, even if only for a moment up to now this identification was never really experienced. Before he rebelled, the slave accepted all the demands made upon him very often he took orders, without reacting against them (. . .). He accepted patiently though he may have protested inwardly, but in that he remained silent, he was more concerned with his own immediate interests than as yet aware of his own rights.

Albert Camus. *The Rebel.*

Social existence admits play of positions. But when an alien socio-political system intervenes into another one, the play becomes very complex. The British socio-political system and the systems indigenous to India naturally set up a site of struggle in the colonial period. The play of positions includes the assumed superiority, economical security, repressive and conquering apparatus etc. The creation and manipulation of ideologies too form a grave aspect: passive ideologies will always be threatened by

aggressive ideologies. Whatever it may be, the struggle inevitably is to gain power - moral, psychological or political.

In the struggle between ideologies for supremacy, socio-political realities become extremely twisted. When an ideology gains supremacy, its values will be considered as being the truth and in the course of history when it is questioned, and when it struggles to hold on its assumed truth, a new truth will emerge to gain its place. So it is always a struggle that will go on and on generating constant changes in the society. The question, whether it is the right value or whether it is the truth is out of place in the struggle for dominance. The conditioning of the systems and historical incidents decides how certain ideologies gain supremacy.

The power and growth of colonial narrative is a manifestation of this concept. In colonial situations, colonial aggressiveness and native resistance go hand in hand. The situation is a clash between two ideologies, the colonial ideology and the native ideology, which counter each other. The effort of colonial narration was to narrate to gain supremacy, and counter narrative or the resistance narrative was born to counter it. Therefore, the colonial situation was a site of agon, generating ideological struggles. When counter narrative gained prominence colonial narrative was undermined and political colonialism had to give way to nationalism.

Colonial narrative begins in the imagination of the coloniser. The Renaissance European spirit which ventured to adventurous trips to the whole world began *its* journey with a hunger for more land and knowledge and the European adventurers carried their own fears, about the unmapped worlds to which ^{they} set off. Childhood stories of the demon beyond the wall, river, mountain, ocean coupled with the Christian view that those who did not conform to Christianity was Satan's party played a crucial role in earlier European colonial narratives, which were mainly travel writings, diaries and documentaries. The demon has always the character of being, wild, devilish and cruel, which can only be compared to Satan. The adventurer when he sees objects and people that are alien to his knowledge demonizes those relatives: and that remains as historical data for the coming generations. The fear of the demon in the subconscious mind compels the adventurer to imagine that all the new faces, codes and dresses that he encounters in the new lands, which are unfamiliar and alien to his system, is part of demon and demon's world order. Colonial narration begins on a similar situation, whereby the newly encountered becomes a devil. We may call this type of narrative as Calibanistic narrative, after the famous character, Caliban, of Shakespeare's play *Tempest*. Trevor R Griffiths writing about the complexity of Caliban in "Caliban and Colonialism" comments, "The play, however, written at the time of England's major overseas expansion and under the very direct influence of

accounts of the wreck of the *Sea Adventure*, is thoroughly imbued with elements (. . .) through its responses to colonial topics" (159-60).

The expansion of knowledge due to the growth of poststructuralism permits us to see the colonisers writing on the colony as colonial narration. This narration was multifaceted which proliferated, flourished and guaranteed colonial hegemony. By narrative what is meant is that the colonial writers, administrators, defense personnel, police forces, missionaries, historians and philosophers through their goal-oriented thinking tried to fix the colony intellectually and functionally. The ideas shaped by the people from all these sectors were functional and contextual. The ideas were functional because the ideas had to be shaped in such a way that they would guarantee a prolonged grip on the colony for the imperialist. Therefore, it was necessary, rather inevitable, for people in all these sectors to engage themselves in a mental operation through which they would create their colony: inevitably, their colony was their narration.

Numerous narrative strategies were invented and used during various stages of evolution and growth of colonialism. Colonial narratives matured from one form to another ideologically defending their position of being the master and functioned, as particular situations demanded. The trope of discovery is a very dominant one in all European colonial enterprises. In narrations during the beginning stages of colonialism, the land the European

arrives in becomes a "new" land, which is then described as being "discovered" by the European, for whom it is a discovery. This process is a very relevant issue in the postcolonial context. Though in the initial stages the discovery is for the European world, later through textuality it becomes a reality to the natives also.

The production of the discourse of discovery, as Foucault argues in "The Order of Discourse", was formed to gain access to the new land: "In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized, and redistributed by a certain number of producers whose role is to ward off its power and dangers, to gain mastery over it, chance events to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality" (52).

In *Colonial Narratives, Cultural Dialogues: "Discoveries" of India in the Language of Colonialism*, Jotsyna G. Singh gives significance to the "trope of discovery". In her opinion, since the early modern period:

This discovery motif has frequently emerged in the language of colonization, enabling European travelers/ writers to represent the newly "discovered" lands as an empty space, *tabularasa* in which they could inscribe their linguistic, cultural, and later, territorial claims. Geographically speaking, the English discovery of Indian territory was mostly accomplished in the seventeenth century. Rhetorically, however the trope of

discovery took on shifting, multiple meanings within British colonial discourse, being constantly refurbished and mobilized in the service of other colonizing enterprises, such as civilizing, rescuing and idealizing or demonizing their Indian subjects as 'others' (12).

The trope of "discovery" is a common feature ~~of~~ all colonial enterprises^{and} that gives an advantage to the colonialist, for it excludes native history and the colonialist has an assumed clean space to begin his narrative. The word "discovery" is defined by *Longman English Language Activator Dictionary* as: "to find out, especially something that is completely unexpected, shocking, exciting etc." (114). In the context of imperial hegemony the word discovery allows a narrative of imagination which springs from wonder and creates the other land as exotic; for the land 'discovered' is supposed to be unknown, uninhabited and devoid of a recordable past. Jotsyna G. Singh argues, "Christianity not only serves as the mask of normative, but also crucially provides the moral imperative for the discovery, and later conquest of the non-Christian, 'heathen' lands" (22). Jotsyna Singh further contends that;

In setting (. . .) moral boundaries between the Christian Europeans and the brutish Indians, the English narratives were simply recapitulating the Renaissance poetic geography, itself drawn from texts of ambiguity, whereby geographic distance

from the European/Christian centre implied a progressive degeneration and of a "loss of cultural, moral, and linguistic integrity" (23).

To sum up, the trope of discovery begins at the beginning of colonialism, as Jotysna Singh observes and this motif is used to deny history to the colony which in turn liberates the colonizer from the task of contesting the native history. The pretension is that native history does not exist. In a "fresh land" the colonizer sows seed of his cultures, uprooting the native ones with brutish attitudes. By its very inception the concept of discovery and all associated images allow superiority to the colonizer and rub off the past, tradition and culture of the colony. And when one society does not have tradition and culture that society is ripe to adopt a tradition and culture and the colonial powers appointed themselves as the initiators of the natives into new cultural realm. It is quite interesting to note here that it is on the surface level that all such cultural management have taken place. Primarily such narrations are for the colonial self, to satisfy their conscience that they are not invading a civilization or destroying a culture. The majority of native population is not affected by all these elements is a fact that escapes many analyses, but with the growth of colonialism penetrating into the inner depth of colonized society, these narratives creates disturbances in the native as well as the colonizer.

This violent 'discovery' creates Foucaultian mutations in the colony.

Foucault argues in *The Order of Things* that history has mutations:

That suddenly decide that things are no longer perceived, described, expressed, characterized, classified and known in the same way, that is no longer wealth, living beings and discourse that are represented to knowledge in the interstices of words or through their transparency, but being radically different from them? (. . .) It is a radical event that is distributed across the entire visible surface of knowledge and whose signs, shocks, and effects it is possible to follow step by step (217).

The knowledge of the colony began before the "discovery" as such, fantasy, travel notes, text, theory and practice, all these contributed to the knowledge creation about the colony. But the event of 'discovery' created a historical mutation that shocked the colony; it was now being rewritten, remodeled, and resystematised by another, an alien who claims to know the colony. It was a historical mutation for the colonizer too: here he gains an assumed superiority that permits unforeseen use of his resources of power.

The Europeans began their journey to "other" worlds which they claimed to have discovered in order "to civilize" those societies. Elleke Boehmer states in her work *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures: Migrant*

Metaphors that the beginnings of colonial enterprise in those “discovered” lands were through narration that the coloniser imposed on these lands:

So, in essence, colonial expeditions, inspired by reading, became themselves exercises in reading, or interpretational. Mythic and narrative patterns, such as the quest for promised land or biblical rivers, gave to uncertain journeys a direction and a path. Amidst the unpredictable novelty of things, metaphoric connection or the syntax of a journal plotted lines of orientation in so-called "record less" space (15,16). (. . .) To colonize the world, British writers both in the field and at home projected their images, like the lantern's plates of colored glass, on lands they claimed as new (59).

The trope of European colonial history had its base in Christian values as Metcalf writes in *Ideologies of the Raj*:

The medieval Christian worldview envisaged the “East” as a fabulous land of miracles and monsters, of gold and heroism. For many it was the location of paradise; for others the abode of the terrible Gog and Magog, perhaps even of anti-christ (sic) himself. Despite this often fearsome vision of a land utterly different from the known world of Christendom, the “East” was paradoxically, part of that known world (. . .) The “East” was

always described through the forms of Western iconography. Partha Mittar has shown how Hindu Gods, conceived as inventions of the devil, took shape in Western paintings as monsters and demons (4, 5).

During the early stages of the "discovery", with all its ambiguity and absurdity, a new narrative was emerging. The narrative was an attempt to deprive the colonized with a commendable past in its rhetoric and to create a new world order that they could easily manage and that would give them reasons for their colonial enterprise. Frantz Fanon could see through this strategy, and he deliberates in *The Wretched of the Earth*: "Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying their brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people and distorts, disfigures and destroys it" (169). Colonialism thus began with a historical mutation, so to call it, which changed the course of almost all people on the surface of earth. Edward Said had analyzed these aspects, which helped these discoveries and quest into interiors of the Orient in his famous work *Orientalism*.

Orientalism

A term by Edward Said, which he deliberated in detail in his work, *Orientalism*, and he, in it examines the manner by which the "Orient" was constructed and is maintained by European/Western epistemological

deliberations. In Said's view, as he deliberates in *Orientalism*, "Operates in the service of the West's hegemony over the East principally by producing the East discursively as the West's inferior "other" a maneuver which strengthens, indeed even partially constructs, the West's self-image as a superior civilization" (23).

On a broad basis, Edward Said discusses Orientalism as the corporate institution for dealing with the orient, dealing with it by making statements about it, authorising views of it, describing it, teaching it, setting it, ruling over it, in short Orientalism was a Western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient. His analysis of Orientalism gave a new impetus to postcolonial readings. The publication of *Orientalism* in 1978 by Edward Said was a turning point in the study of postcolonial literatures. It has become a kind of unofficial Gita of postcolonial theory. Said argues in his thesis that the Orient is not only adjacent to Europe, it is also the Europe's oldest colonies, the source of its civilization and languages, its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and recurring images of the other. He contends,

The most readily accepted designation for Orientalism is an academic one and indeed the label still serves in a number of academic institutions. Anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient - and this applies whether the person is an

anthropologist, sociologist, historian or philologist - either in its specific or its general aspects, is an Orientalist and what he or she does is Orientalism (2).

He examines Orientalism as a discourse to understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage, and even produced – the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively - during the post-enlightenment period. He authoritatively suggests *in Orientalism* that:

So authoritative a position did Orientalism have that I believe no one writing, thinking, or acting on the Orient could do so without taking into account of the limitations on thought and action imposed by Orientalism. In brief, because of Orientalism the Orient was not (and is not) a free subject of thought or action. This is not to say that Orientalism unilaterally determines what can be said about the Orient, but that it is the whole network of interests inevitably brought to bear on (and therefore always involved in) any occasion when that peculiar entity "the Orient" is question (...) the European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self (3).

These lines categorically confirm that the project of a postcolonial critique is designated as deconstructing and displacing the Euro-centric theory of a narrative method which constructed the third world; not only for the West, but also for the cultures so represented.

Ziauddin Sardar in his work *Orientalism* (2002) observes,

The problem of Orientalism, what makes the dissection and display of its skeletal being a tricky matter, is the very fact of its existence. Because Orientalism exists we have a world where reality is differently perceived, expressed and experienced across a great divide of mutual misunderstanding (...). There is nothing about Orientalism that is neutral or objective. By definition it is a partial and partisan subject (vii).

He further states "The Orient, the land to the east of the West, is a realm of stories. Its actuality has always been encapsulated in form of storytelling as fact, fiction and fable. It invites the imagination" (vi). These lines are related to the concept framed by Edward Said about the Orient. Said states in his *Orientalism* that, "the Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting beings, haunting memories and landscapes" (1).

Orient was an actuality for Sardar, and Said states it being a creation of the imagination, an invention. The land was there but the "actuality" was created

by a biased imagination. In Robert Young's opinion this is one of the most disputed aspects of Said's thesis. He questions Said's assumptions of self-generating discursive construction of Orientalism, i.e. it is just an imaginative enterprise and actual elements did not bear any semblance to the description. Young argues, in *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*, that,

The important point here is that Western knowledge of the Other can be seen to be constructed as a part of the whole system of Orientalist discourse: "such texts" can create not only knowledge but also the very reality that they appear to describe." This knowledge has no necessary relation to the actual at all. It is for this reason that there is no *alternative* to the Western construction of the Orient, no "real" Orient, because the Orient is itself an Orientalist concept. Orientalism, according to Said, is simply "a kind of Western projection on to and will to govern the orient". This has been the most disputed aspect of his thesis and the most difficult for his critics to accept (160).

Robert Young further contends that if that is the case then,

Such colonial-discourse analysis has meant that we have learnt a lot about the fantasmatics of colonial discourse, but at the same

time it has by definition tended to discourage analysts from inquiring in detail about the actual conditions such discourse was framed to describe, analyze or control (160).

The argument that Young proposes is true, for lack of certain actualities no ideology can exist or can have a prolonged existence, nearly four hundred years of European colonialism existed on this ideology. Some of the concepts of the Orient that was created by the West were true and they cease as soon as extensive imagination is made to play a major part. Again I see relevance in Young's query, "How (...) can Said argue that the 'Orient' is just a representation, if he also wants to claim that 'Orientalism' provided them necessary knowledge for actual colonial conquest" (161). Bill Ashcroft and Pal Ahluvalia, in their work *Edward Said*, by citing Dennis Porter ask the same question, they say that;

Denis Porter, for instance, argues that the employment of the notion of discourse raises overwhelming methodological problems, not the least of which is the manner in which Said deals with the question of truth and ideology. On the one hand, says Porter, Said argues that all knowledge is tainted because the Orient, after all, is a construction. On the other, Said appears to be suggesting that there might well be a real Orient

that is knowledge and that there is a corresponding truth about it that can be achieved (73).

They further contend that, "The discourse of Orientalism in this Saidian sense is unable therefore to offer alternatives to Orientalism in the past. This combined with the manner in which Gramsci's notion of hegemony is deployed, renders the possibility of counter hegemony impossible" (74). Whether Said's conceptualization about the creation of Orient is true or false requires attention, however, what is important is to remember that the intention behind Orientalism was to gain supremacy over the Orient. It was the White desire that propelled the sail of these creations of knowledge of the Orient. It was not impartial and was made to gain and maintain the White supremacy. Ziauddin Sardar conceptualizes that, "The pathology of the Orientalist vision is based on two simultaneous desires: The personal quest of the Western male for Oriental mystery and sexuality and the collective goal to educate and control the Orient in political and economic terms" (2). Thus Orientalism, maturing from these desires, was both accidental and intentional. The power behind it was hidden under the practices that were followed. For Said it was not an airy European fantasy about the Orient, He maintains in *Orientalism* that orientalist discourse has a method:

Created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment.

Continued investment made Orientalism as a system of knowledge about the Orient, an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness, just as that same investment multiplied – indeed, made truly productive – the statements proliferating out from Orientalism into the general cultural (6).

Another contested dispute about Said's Orientalism is its totalizing vision. India and Arab world are juxtaposed. This juxtaposing creates anachronism in the whole discussion. Although Said studies India and Arab in different chapters, all are made a flux with too much of generalizations, which disrupt his arguments. As Leela Gandhi opines, a social and historical analysis which does not consider the complicated nature of discursive operations that it employs will only reproduce the elements it is seeking to remove. When Said creates a counter narrative theory of Orientalism, he was submitting himself to the European vision of the Orient as being a homogeneous section. But the Orient has its own plurality, which has manifested itself in his own statement in *Orientalism*, "India itself never provided an indigenous threat to Europe. Rather it was because native authority crumbled there and opened the land to inter-European rivalry and to outright European political control that the Indian Orient could be treated by Europe with such proprietary hauteur – never with the sense of danger reserved for Islam" (75).

As Ziauddin Sardar argues "It was in its encounter with Islam that the West first developed its vision of the Orient as an unfathomable, exotic and erotic place where mysteries dwell and cruel and barbaric scenes are staged" (2). Therefore, a study of India and ^{the} Islamic world as a homologous unity would have its own pitfalls. India had its own weakness, failures and strategical blunders, which facilitated European invasion and dominance in its territories that were in no way similar to the Arab ^{ian} case. But in the course of history Indians realized the fact and regained hegemony and overthrew foreign rule. Since then India has been creating knowledge of its own to resist the colonial knowledge, to say in brief India was becoming postcolonial. The creation of knowledge has its base in representation and representation has a unique space in postcolonial discussion.

Representation

The world we live is a contested site of representation, of ideas, values, images and symbols which form a site of complex social creation of meaning. Man - compelled by his basic instinct to form an ideology, to visualize the world in a coherent form, acquiring certain basic assumptions and values from the society he is a part of - recreates or re-visualizes the world through various semiotic tools to comprehend and control the created world. Thus creation becomes goal oriented, desire being the driving force. Conscious, subconscious and unconscious desires fill in the semiotics of all narratives,

expecting certain valid results. Thus creation becomes ideologically closely wedded to power.

For Althusser ideology is a system of representation, which has a social function to perform, and it emanates from social functions. Referring to Marxist theory of history in *For Marx* he states that,

The 'subjects' of history are given by human societies. They present themselves as totalities whose unity is constituted by a certain specific type of *complexity* (...) the economy, politics and ideology (...) *So ideology is as such as an organic part of every social totality.* It is as if human societies could not survive without these *specific formations*, these systems of representations (at various levels) their ideologies (231-2).

Colonial ideology was a creation of a colonial system of representation, which requires discernment through rigorous reading. Such a rigorous reading is both a dismantling of an ideology and a formation of a new one. The images and concepts of colonial representation, which is highly structured and which got infused itself on people, are to be reanalyzed to reveal the inherent false ideological basis of colonial representations. Elleke Boehmer argues, in *Colonial/Postcolonial Literatures*, "Within the terms of colonialist representation, it was possible to style any incident of conquest as

demonstrating the power of the invader and the inferiority of the conquered” (80).

Texts are representations of numerous views on aspects and we therefore call the interwoven views a discourse. The author's words can be analyzed, as Ania Loomba says, in *Colonialism / Postcolonialism*, in textual discourses "To reveal not just an individual, but a historical consciousness at work. Words and images thus, become fundamental for an analysis of historical process such as colonialism" (37). All these representations inevitably extend the ideology from which they have evolved and matured and necessarily affect the society. My analysis of colonial narration is to understand the effect of these representations on the colonial world, not just to prove whether these representations are true or false – which would be a near impossible task considering how far removed I am in time and space from the actual context.

The situations were so represented that they created knowledge necessary to rule and dominate the colony. The discourses were inevitably of hegemonic nature, selecting, organizing, redistributing and controlling the ideas generated "by certain number of producers" as Foucault asserts in *Power knowledge* "whose role is to ward off its dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to grade its ponderous, formidable materiality" (52).

The idea of representation had many shifting paradigms, constituting a condescending narrative from the colonizers' perspective. Edward Said and his theory of Orientalism discuss this idea of representation with a wider scope to show how certain hegemonic strategies are evolved in order to silence the colonized. According to him the Orient was represented or interpreted as a land of "romance, exotic beings, haunting beings, haunting memories and haunting landscapes (...) the main thing for the European visitor was a European representation of the Orient and its contemporary fate, both of which had a privileged communal significance (...)" (1). The production of this knowledge of the Orient served the purpose of demeaning the orient whereby the occident automatically gained supremacy. These knowledge structures later became data for furthering of orientalist learning and these assumptions served the creation of hegemony over the orient. Thus, representation of the orient became politically oriented, trying to hegemonize the orientalist field of discourse. Further, Said argues that orientalism was an enormously systematic discipline of discourse by which European culture was able to manage, and even produce the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-enlightenment period. Edward Said claims that he analyzed many texts and by placing emphasis on evidence he conceptualizes in *Orientalism* that the colors of representation of the orient was definitely immersed in the ideology of

Western conception of the Orient, Western prejudices determining the devices of narration.

Such representation as "representations" was not as "natural" depiction of the Orient. This evidence is found just as prominent in the so-called truthful text, (Histories, Philological analysis, political treatises) as in the avowedly artist (i.e. openly imaginative text). The things to look at are style, figures of speech, setting, narrative devices, historical and social circumstances, not the correctness of the representation nor its fidelity to some great original (21).

The assumed scientificity and systematic study furthered its hold on hegemony. Thus representation is a system, which assumes a regime of "truth" that has a structure similar to that of fictions of Realism. Bart Moore Gilbert et al argue in their introduction to *Postcolonial Criticism* that:

In Said's view, Orientalism (in the new sense in which he uses the term) operates in the service of the West's hegemony over the East principally by producing the East discursively as the West's inferior 'Other', a maneuver which strengthens – indeed, even partially constructs – the West's self image as a superior civilization. It does this primarily by distinguishing and then essentializing the identities of East and West through a

dichotomizing system of representations most evident in the regime of stereotype, with the aim of making a rigid, the sense of difference between the European and Asiatic parts of the world (23).

Edward Said argues how these notions of Orient came into existence, out of fear or contempt for the East the Orientalist from the beginning itself created a notion of the East as a closed system of barbarian land. And no empirical material could "either dislodge or alter", the "facts", as in magic or mythology. He advocates, in *Orientalism*, that we need not look into the,

Correspondence between the language used to depict the Orient and the Orient itself, not so much because the language is inaccurate but it is not even trying to be accurate. What it is trying to do, as Dante tried to do in the "Inferno", is at one and the same time to characterize the Orient as alien and to incorporate it schematically on a theoretical stage whose audience, manager and action are for Europe and only for Europe (71).

Leela Gandhi criticizes Said for falling prey to Westernization, she argues in *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*.

If *Orientalism* is a limited text, then it is so primarily because it fails to accommodate the possibility of difference within

oriental discourse. Sometimes, in his obdurate determination that Orientalism silenced opposition, Said ironically silences opposition. So also he defeats the logic of his own intellectual egalitarianism by producing and conforming a reversed stereotype: the racist Westerner (79).

There are numerous pitfalls in generalizations that are made in the Western mould, as Leela Gandhi shows in her reading of Said's concept of Orientalism. There were truths in the Occidental depiction of the Orient is a fact that no one can deny, but how these facts are revealed and how much of imagination is added to facts determines concealed desire in colonial narratives. If the imagination that creates the narrative is stretched too far, then it is an easily contestable problem, you can dispose it as false. If the fact and the fiction are deliberately mixed or even if it is an attempt at "true" depiction, inevitably ideology of the class he belongs to, the unconscious desire or attitude he has, will also be embedded in the narrative. Othering had many dimensions to it, especially in the case of Indian colonial context, because diverse pictures of India were produced by different colonialists. Orientalists like, Sir William Jones and William Dow used a different language, from Orientalists like Macaulay and James Mill, to depict the Orient. Though a close reading of the latter's texts will also reveal their mentality of belonging to a superior race projected in their narratives. Moreover, they write their texts with an attitude of looking at India with a universal

knowledge base, that is the Western; overall their attitude was condescending. Behind their sympathy and "understanding" it is true that the Orient was a place of threat to ^{the} European and later with enlightenment project taking root, an effort to degrade all native aspects became common.

Thomas R. Metcalf in his work *Ideologies of the Raj* though taking or following the same condescending attitude, and trying to justify British colonization of India, he could see how certain projects are used to create the Orient for the West which will later be imposed on the Indians (4). To put it straight, Orientalism, the description of the East, arises out of an imaginary construct that depends for ~~its~~ existence ^{on} an apparatus of cultural fiction in which imaginative literatures play a decisive role. How could this narration gain strength in the colonial regime? I have already discussed how the fear of the unknown played a major part in depicting the Orient in negative terms and how imagination played a dominant role. It has become very clear that Othering was a trope of narrative that helped colonial hegemony to gain space and then to strengthen its grip.

Other and Othering

Other can be defined as the one who is different from the self. The existence of others is crucial in defining what is "normal" and in locating one's own place in the world, essentially, it is difference that gives definition to a thing. The European needed to be recognized by the Other, as David

Theo Goldberg argues in his critiquing of Fanon. Fanon argues, according to Goldberg, that visibility limits or expands the conception of the Other and that the Other always wanted to avoid the gaze of the dominant. Analyzing the influences of Hegel's epistemological theorization and Sartre's existential conceptualization, Goldberg argues that

Underlying Fanon's analysis of visibility and its delimitation lies the Hegelian conception that human beings assume, self-consciousness in and through recognizing themselves in those whom they recognize to be their other. "Man" writes Fanon explicating Hegel, "is human only the extent to which he wants to impose himself on another in order to be recognized by him". Recognition both presupposes and reinforces the light of human worth, respect and esteem. Self-consciousness requires recognition by the Other" (181).

Sartre and Hegel understand the recognition by the Other from two extreme points of views as Goldberg enunciates in his deliberations on Fanon. For Hegel, for one to be "fully human, to attain full consciousness of self, is possible only through the reciprocal struggle for recognition by the Other" (quoted in Sonia Kurks, *Fanon: A Critical Reader*, 124). On the other hand, for Sartre, the Other is always a threat to self's own experiences, having the power to objectify the self and to cause the self to flee into self-

objectification. Both arguments hold good for postcolonial readings. In the case of Hegel's assumption, othering helped to project oneself as superior, and in the case of Sartre, as assumptions the fear of objectification compelled the narration of the self as normal and therefore superior. The self is normal and since, the Other, the threat, the fear creating aspect, will naturally become abnormal in the narration.

Recognition and non-recognition by the Other is very significant to imperialism; the creation of hegemony is depended on recognition by the subject class of the ruling ideology as being beneficial to all communities concerned. Colonial narration *per se* always attempts to gain the recognition of the colonised, the Other, in order to be able to control him. Recognition, essentially guaranteeing colonial self's superiority over the colonized other. Thus recognition plays a crucial role in colonial dominance and as Sonia Kurks says "If recognition by the negating Other was not needed for the integrity of the self, non-recognition *per se* would not present itself as a problem". (126)

The construction of the Other was, as already explained, a part of the construction of the self, which necessarily demanded recognition from the Other. The shaping of the signifying process, as it applies to colonial people was done within a certain semiotic field, a field that provided the limits within which the colonial images functioned. The field is filled with desire and

power and as Foucault refers in *Power/knowledge*, this semiotic field constitutes a significant aspect of subjugated knowledges. Foucault argues in *Power/knowledge* that subjugated knowledges mean two things:

On the one hand, I am referring to the historical contents that have been buried and disguised in a functionalist coherence or formal systematization (...) And this is simply because only the historical contents allow us to rediscover the ruptural effects of conflict and struggle that the order imposed by functionalist or systematizing thought is designed to mask. Subjugated knowledges are blocks of historical knowledges which were present but disguised within the body of functionalist and systematizing theory (. . .). On the other hand I believe that by subjugated knowledges one should understand something else, something which in a sense is altogether different, namely a whole set of knowledges that have been disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naïve knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity (81).

Colonialism flourished by creating knowledge but in the process they subjugated certain knowledge that they considered threatening. Therefore, the act of subjugation was essential for colonialism to flourish and it allowed

the “rational” grounds to hold on to the assumption of validity of colonial enterprise. The task of a postcolonial critic is to look into the creation and manipulation of knowledge structures and to unmask the exploitative aspirations behind colonialism and to reap from the semiotic field of colonial narration the subjugated knowledges of history. As Homi Bhabha argues in, "The Other Question":

It (postcolonial discourse) is an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a “subject peoples” through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised (...) The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest - and to establish system of administration and instruction. Despite the play of power within colonial discourse and the shifting positionalities of its subjects, I am referring to a form of governmentality that is masking out a “subject nation” appropriates, directs and dominates its various spheres of activity. Therefore, despite the (play), in the colonial system which is crucial to its exercise of power, colonial discourses produces the colonised as a fixed

reality which is at once an “other” and yet amiably knowable and visible. (Mongia 41)

Jacques Lacan holds a similar view as Hegel in the recognition of the Other. Though, he uses a different terminology, namely desire, to explain the process of othering. For him, the meaning of desire“(. . .) is to be found in the desire of the Other,” in the longing to be recognized by another person; as he postulates in *Écrits*:

What I seek is speech in the response of the Other. What constitutes I, as a subject is my question? In order to be recognized by the Other, I utter what was only in view of what will be. In order to find him, I call him by a name that he must assume or refuse in order to reply to me (85).

The colonizer started naming the colonized in his language to appropriate the Other into his system, as he desired ^{the colonized} him to be controlled. The colonized were very late in recognizing their subjugated position of the colonized-self in these narratives. Numerous historical factors determined their condition, and they can be accused as being passive or silent, this silence on the part of the colonized helped the colonizer to introduce new names and concepts without encountering resistance from the colonized. By the time the colonized recognized that the colonizer was representing him to control and subjugate him, he had come under colonial rule. But resistance developed as soon as it

was recognized but the task was double fold for he had to counter from within a strong discursive field created by the coloniser.

Narrative of othering was achieved by dichotomizing the self from the Other as JanMohammed's theory of Manichean allegory elaborates. The term "Manicheanism" is adopted from the "Manichean allegory of the third century A.D, according to which Satan was represented as co-eternal with God, an equivalent opposition to God. This implication, which relates that the two realms of spirit and matter are always and eternally separate and could never be linked, implies an extreme form of structure". (18) Abdul R. JanMohammed points out that the myriad and perceivable alterity the European theoretically allows the colonized the option of responding to "Other" in terms of identity of difference. Therefore, in postcolonial studies it has come to mean for the binary system of imperial ideology.

JanMohammed discerns that the Other's world is perceived by the European as "uncontrollable, chaotic, unattainable and ultimately evil", while the civilized culture of Europe is an embodiment of good. He corroborates this by saying, in the above-mentioned article, "While the surface of each colonial text purports to represent specific encounters with specific varieties of racial other, the subtext valorizes the superiority of European Civilization" (19). The superiority was gained in various forms; through various stages of colonial growth, it was contextually determined. The construction of the

Other shifted in response to changes in the colonial context. The colonial conquering was a total and crushing endeavor by Europe over other lands. In imperialistic discourses, the colonised subject is characterized as the Other through discourses such as *Primitivism* and Cannibalism, as a means of establishing binary separation of the colonizer and the colonised, and asserting the naturalness and primacy of the colonizing culture and world view. Othering is a term used to suggest the process by which the imperial discourse creates its others. Othering is done in the Western imperial discourse by redefining the self as superior in a new land where Western concepts of civilization had not reached. It was a systematic planned action, destroying the native cultures. As Robert Young conceptualizes in *White Mythologies*:

The construction of knowledges which all operate through forms of expropriation and incorporation of the Other mimics at a conceptual level the geographical and economic absorption of the non-European world by the West (...) Such knowledges is always centered in a self even though it is outward looking, searching for power and control of what is Other to it (...) The appropriation of the Other as a form of knowledge within totalizing system can thus be set alongside the history (if not the project) of European imperialism, and the constitution of the Other as 'Other' alongside racism and sexism (3).

Thomas R. Metcalf also holds a similar view and he argues in *Ideologies of the Raj* that "The taxonomies of natural history by constructing secularized notion of the 'modern' and the 'civilized', inevitably emphasized at once the difference, and the inferiority, of non-European societies" (5). He further states that when one describes oneself as being modern and enlightened, it meant that someone else is not modern and enlightened or rather is uncivilized. In his own words, "To describe oneself as 'modern', or as 'progressive', means that those who were not included in that definition had to be described as 'Primitive' or 'backward'" (6).

A method of attributing scientificity to all knowledge created by the colonial was followed to gain mastery of the situation. A constant "scientific" study of the Other was attempted as Elleke Boehmer states in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures*, the interest in "poring over others was inexhaustible". Efforts were constantly made to bring the colonized under the colonizers' gaze who scrutinized the former and passed judgment from a self-assumed superior position. Elleke Boehmer states that it had become:

Habitual for Europe to approach other cultures as *objects of study*, bodies of knowledge to assemble and to bring into shape (...). The colonial look as authority made manifest, therefore, was also represented in motifs of *research* scientific study, documentation and survey. From the mid-eighteenth century,

the European at large in colonial territory had been himself in the character of a disinterested scientist, the rational and neutral gatherer of knowledge (72-3).

Europeans justified their position as being the best to judge upon a colony, as Elleke Boehmer has shown in her study of James Mill's case. In Elleke Boehmer's words, "The utilitarian James Mill, author of influential *History of British India* (1857), justified his ability to pronounce India by claiming that the subcontinent could be better understood by an informed outsider, "one who had never visited India, such as himself" (73). As the ironical last sentence suggests, colonial discourse time and again took a superior position, whether one has visited India or never visited India doesn't matter but he is always projected as being better equipped, if he is a British, to describe the other culture, India. The defining is done in a manner not guided by facts but as he wishes, deriving data from earlier discourses, in order to validate the violence of colonial invasion. Elleke Boehmer states as to how Orientalism gained its raw materials from early Orientalist narrations, history being continuously misrepresented in the name of learning: "Over determined by stereotype, the characterization of indigenous peoples tended to screen out their agency, diversity, resistance, thinking voices" (73).

Hegel and Sartre, signify the Other as a being that is unfamiliar and extraneous to a dominant subjectivity. The opposite or negative of the self

against which an authority is defined and through this method the West conceived the lack of power, of division in the colonized people, enabling the coloniser to assume the position of a ruler. Therefore, the self and Other are coextensive and counter productive to colonial creation of knowledge.

Subordinate terms were used against the other within a "sympathetic" narrative mode. With a style that is at the same time arrogant and condescending: using negative figures of speech when the other is defined and positive figures or flamboyant narrative when ^{the} self is portrayed. Boehmer argues in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures* that "The colonized made up the subordinate term in relation to which European individuality was defined. Always with reference to the superiority of an expanding Europe, colonized peoples were represented as lesser, less human, less civilized, as child or savage, wild man, animal or headless man " (79).

The efforts of imperialistic discourses were to create the Other as ignorant, superstitious and at the same time to describe themselves as superior angels who have arrived from the modern land of Europe to save the uncivilized barbarian land. Their literature is steeped in such creations as Abdul R. JanMohammed postulates in "Manichean Allegory": "Colonialist literature is an exploration and a representation of a world at the boundaries of 'civilization' a world that has not (yet) been domesticated by European signification or codified by its ideology" (18). To Bhabha all these binary

arguments do not remain simple for they create an ambiguous situation with the appropriation of colonial ideology by the colonized. He makes it compressive by looking at the situation, that develops with the appropriation and assimilation of Western values and with the expansion of awareness among the colonized, of them being exploited. Bhabha further argues that "the visibility of the racial/colonial/other is at once a point of identity and at the same time a *problem* for the attempted closure within discourse". (50)

The symbolism of the Other was not simply the result of confident authority. The colonized described as barbarian, as a threatening strength, as libidinous temptation and as danger, was also an image of an extreme colonial ambiguity. The technology of Othering is very complicated and it can be seen as operating in two ways. One is by describing the self and the Other is by describing the Other. It is neither personal nor cultural: It postulates a maze of situations where it is very difficult to comprehend and constructs situations out of contexts. Homi K. Bhabha best pronounces it in his article "Signs Taken for Wonders,"

The discriminating effects of the discourse of cultural colonialism, for instance, do not simply or singly refer to a "person", or to a dialectical power struggle between self and Other, or to a discrimination between mother culture and alien cultures. Produced through the strategy of disavowal, the

reference of discrimination is always to a process of splitting as the condition of subjection: a discrimination between the mother culture and its bastards, the self and its double, where the base of what is disavowed is not repressed but repeated as something different- a mutation, a hybrid (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 34.).

The hybrid is a threatening image, Bhabha argues, because it shows little difference between the self and the other therefore, shows tendencies of attaining or achieving the status of being equal. This in turn disrupts the colonial narrative strategy of Othering.

Hegemony

The trope of discovery and Othering were the essential components of the project of the European conquest of the non-European world. And, later to prolong the grip by maintaining of this knowledge, propagation and development of other strategies to maintain hegemony in the colonized land gained priority. Hegemony had a significant role to play in the maintaining of colonial power. Enlightenment project, Universalism, differentiation were significant aspects that formed part of the European projects to hegemonize the non-European.

Hegemony can mean "domination by consent". It can be defined as the power of the ruling class to convince other classes that their interests are interests of the populace at large. The intention behind the discourse of this

creation of knowledge is to have control over the economy and over the state apparatuses such as education and media, by which the ruling class's interests are presented as the common interest, which later on will be taken for granted through practice and the conditioning that the subject undergoes.

The term hegemony got popularized with the publication of Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks of 1935*. Hegemony is a constant struggle and every state is ethical to raise the greatness of the population, as Gramsci postulates in the *Prison Notebooks*:

To a particular cultural and moral level, a level (or type) which corresponds to the needs of the productive forces for development, and hence to the interests of ruling classes. The school as a positive educative function, and the court as a repressive and negative educative function, are the most important State activities in this sense: but, in reality; a multitude of other so called primitive initiatives and activities tend to the same end – initiatives and activities which form the apparatuses of the political and cultural hegemony of the ruling class (258).

The significant value of education in the gaining of colonial hegemony is crucial. Ashcroft writes that education in all its forms, "State or missionary, primary or secondary was massive cannon in the artillery of empire. The

military metaphor can however seem inappropriate since unlike outright territorial aggression the effect of education in Gramsci's terms is that which makes the domination by consent easier" (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 425). In Ngugi Wa Thiongo's words, "The physical violence of the battlefield was followed by the psychological violence of the class room" (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 287). The famous Macaulay's Minutes of 1835 is a perfect example of how the imperialist recognized and used the enlightenment project of post-enlightenment period of Europe to control the colonies. He makes it explicit, that the imperialist project to educate the Indian was primarily in order to make them clerks, to make the British colonial machinery in India function.

Guari Viswanathan in *Masks of Conquest* opines that the imperial designing of Western education project was done by those who knew the value "Of humanistic function traditionally associated with the study of literature, for example, the shaping of character or the development of the aesthetic sense or the disciplines of ethical thinking - are also essential to the process of socio-political control"(21). Macaulay, who wanted to create Indians brown in colour but English in taste and values, intended to create a society which will in turn create a situation that will enable the colonizer to gain the consent of the colonized, By showing how rich the European literature is when compared to Indian literature and to use them as tools of colonial machinery, explicitly⁶ show the devices behind the aura of Western

Humanism and enlightenment projects. In his *Minute on Indian Education* he postulates:

The question now before us is simply whether, when it is our power to teach this language (English), we shall teach languages in which, by *Universal* confession, there are no books on subjects which deserve to be compared to our own, whether, when we can teach European science, we shall teach system which by *universal* confession when ever they differ from those of Europe, differ for worse; and whether, when we can patronize *sound* Philosophy and *true* history (...)" (emphasis mine, Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 135).

This is a most conspicuous statement available that reveals the imperialist project, which is a most undemocratic method of imposition of self's superiority on to the Other. Here, Macaulay is very true to his self, and is not afraid to make it very clear, he is a colonizer who accepts his position as a coloniser as Albert Memmi argues in *The colonizer and the Colonized*. The strategy involved in the representation of the self's culture as the perfect and most civilized whereby the Other is degraded and discarded into darkness. This is an effort to efface the sordid history of colonialist exploitation and class/race oppression under the veneer of European superiority. The colonialist in the colony is there to teach the colonized Other

the world's *best* philosophy, science and history. Guari Viswanathan observes this as an attempt of the Englishman to make known "the Englishman (...) to the natives through the products of his mental labour", which in turn, "served a valuable purpose in that it removed him from the plane of ongoing colonialist activity of commercial operations and military expansion" (22). The brutality of colonial rule was covered under the veneer of implicit and explicit claim of superiority of colonizer's civilization embodied through the structure of English book.

In the colonial situation, hegemony is achieved by the appropriation of ~~the~~ colonized subject into the imperial discourse, so that Euro-centric values, ~~assumption;~~ beliefs and attitudes can be projected to him by degrading the colonized and eulogizing the self's belief system and manners. In the earlier stages of colonial expansion, because of the colonizer's military might and imposed colonial narratives, the colonized were compelled to recognize the self as peripheral to that of Euro-centric values. While at the same time accepting the centrality of European values helped furthering of colonial hegemony and control.

Gramsci in his analysis of society in *The Prison Notebooks* finds two major superstructure "levels" in the society:

The one that can be called "civil society", that is the ensemble of organism commonly called "private", and that of "political

society" or "the State". These two correspond on the one hand to the function of "hegemony" which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of "direct domination" or command exercised through the State and "juridical government (...). The intellectuals are the dominant group's "deputies" exercising the subaltern functions of social hegemony and political government (12).

His analysis runs parallel to Althusser's concepts of Ideological State Apparatuses and Repressive State Apparatuses. Althusser states in "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" (*Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*) that, "The state is a 'machine' for repression, which enables the ruling classes to ensure their domination over the working class, thus enabling the former to subject the latter to the process of surplus-value extortion" (137).

According to Althusser, "The Government, the administration, the Army, the Police, the Courts, the Prisons, etc are repressive state apparatuses. Repressive suggests that the State Apparatuses in question "function by violence – at least ultimately" (142-143).

Ideological State Apparatuses "are a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions" (143). The institutions include the religions, the educational, the family, the legal, the political, the trade-union, the

communications, and the cultural. He distinguishes the ideological from the repressive by saying that the former is private and function by making disciplined individuals, and the latter has governmentality associated with it, but both are coextensive in the creation of ideological states assumed.

In *New Literary Histories*, Claire Colebrooke compares and contrasts Gramscian concept of hegemony and Althusserian concept of state apparatuses. He proclaims that both concepts function under the question of recognition and consent of all concerned. He states Gramsci's theorization of hegemony as the form of power within civil society^{which} can in some ways be likened to Althusser's function of ideology in ideological state Apparatuses (166). Comparing the two critically Colebrooke argue that, "In both cases, cultural production is not a mere distortion or reflection of economic conditions; rather, intellectual production plays an active role in producing and sustaining political relations and the distribution of power" (166-67). Although both analysis of cultural production is valuable, Colebrooke finds Gramsci's hegemony more sophisticated in social analysis

A similar opinion is held by D. Miller in his introduction to *Domination and Resistance*, he states that "His (Gramsci's) concern with hegemony was not, as with Althusser and other writers, a means of understanding dominance, but precisely the opposite". (11). It could also encompass the overthrowing of the dominant group by the complex forms of resistance, which could be

theorized. Miller further suggests that, "What was necessary was the gradual build up of a complex of associations by which other groups who saw a common interest in their resistance to the ruling formation were bound together as an emergent force" (11).

Gramsci's contestation is that:

The supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as 'domination' and as 'intellectual' and moral 'leadership' before winning Governmental power (this indeed is one of the principal conditions of winning of such power); it subsequently becomes dominant when it exercises power, but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to lead as well (57).

In other words there can and must be a "political hegemony" before attainment of power by any group. The Indian struggle for Independence, as Bipan Chandra maintains in *India's Struggle for Independence* is a perfect example of this gaining of hegemony and power. The core of my thesis forms an analysis of this gaining of hegemony by Indians under the moral and political leadership of Gandhi and socialist leaders as manifested in specific selected novels of that period, both Indian and British.

The extracting of hegemony from the colonizer was never easy, even though it was evident that the colonizer had no rights over ^{a land} thousands of miles away from their land. The colonized can be a barbarian, uncivilized, poor,

ignorant, devilish but all these qualities of the colonized does not allow him to be conquered by another and to be kept under oppression and to be exploited. It is based on these arguments that postcolonial critics have used hegemony to examine the colonial situation. Edward Said is one of the early critics to have used this method of analysis. As Bill Ashcroft and Pal Allhulwalia state in *Edward Said* "The notion of hegemony and elevation, the power of culture to legitimate, characterizes Said's view of culture; "its tendency has always been to move downward from the height of power and privilege in order to diffuse, disseminate, and expand itself in the widest possible range." (44)

Ania Loomba points out that Gramsci's notion of ideologies create the terrain on which men move, which helps us to locate racism not just as an effect of capitalism but as more complexly intertwined with it. And this complexity is an interest to modern historians to find out the intricate nature of colonial cultural dominance and resistance. Ania Loomba reveals in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* that:

Today, historians are increasingly interested in probing how colonial regimes achieved domination through creating partial consent, or involving the colonised peoples in creating the states and regimes which oppressed them. Gramsci's notion of hegemony is of obvious interest to these scholars, even though they often invoke it in order to emphasize how dissimilar

colonial situations is from the European situations that were analyzed by Gramsci. Colonial domination involved much repression and coercion, and thus ~~is~~ sometimes analyzed as a process which did not involve the consent of colonized. However, recent scholarship has suggested that in colonial societies, harsh coercion worked "in tandem with a "consent" that was part voluntary, part contrived. (31)

Ania Loomba strongly advocates analyses from this perspective because according to her:

Colonial regimes tried to gain the consent of certain groups, while excluding other from civil society. But even the most repressive race involved some give-and-take Gramscian notion of hegemony stress the incorporation and transformation of ideas and practices belonging to those who are dominated, rather than simple imposition from above. Such transformations are being increasingly seen as central to colonial rule. The dimension of Gramsci's work that has most inspired revisionary analysis of colonial societies is his understanding that subjectivity and ideology are absolutely central to process of domination. (31)

The intellectual here in becomes an important aspect because he recognizes the importance of the creation of knowledge through the reading of knowledges that are already there, created by the colonialist. As mentioned by I.G. Merquior in *Foucault* "The role of intellectual is no longer to provide theory, for the masses and the role of theory, in turn, changes: it is no longer a striving to attaining consciousness but simply a struggle 'for undermining and capturing authority'" (85). The intellectual assumes a greater importance in the postcolonial world, where neo-colonial tendencies acquire new masks of ideology. As with all Marxist critics, for Gramsci also, ideology played a dominant role, Gramsci argues that various ideologies come to play in a single situation, which determine the political condition of the state. Ania Loomba puts it in this manner: "Gramsci drew a distinction between various kinds of ideologies, suggesting that whole ideology in general works to maintain social cohesion and expresses dominant interests, there are also particular ideologies that express the protest of those who are exploited." (28). The knowledge of being exploited gives an impetus to resistance for the exploited people. ~~With~~ the recognition of being exploited and the knowledge of privileged of rights that power allow the colonized ^{begins} to create space through which the exploiters' ideology is accessed. Thus, through countering the dominant ideology through various devices of subversion and opposition the colonized wrested power from the colonizer. The colonised is divided into two groups in this endeavor, the colonized proletariat who enjoys certain good

wills of the colonizer and the colonized who recognizes, suffers, and opposes the exploitation of the colonizer. The proletarian of the colonized community is divided for he is not ready to forgo his privileges even though he wants freedom from foreign oppression. He is caught up in two minds as Ania Loomba puts in *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*: "That which is beholden to the rulers, and complicit with their will, and that which is capable of developing into resistance." (33) But in the case of colonized who has recognized his subject position the consciousness is clear, he knows that in all possible ways it is not for his benefit, but for his exploitation that colonialism flourishes. He with his strong sense of purpose disrupts colonial power by all ways and means.

The hegemony over the colony by the colonizer was achieved through varying practices, is a fact that has already been discussed: Orientalism, trope of discovery and Othering were a few of them. All these were further lifted into more sophisticated levels of analysis as situations demanded. Universalism is another aspect that allowed supremacy to the colonizer.

Universalism

Postcolonial critics have found Universalism as a strategic concept used by the hegemonic forces of colonialism. All European concepts were narrated as being Universal, which effectively subdued the Other to believe that his values are wrong. Christianity ruled Europe from the Middle Ages.

European men conceived Christianity as the best religion and he being the owner of Universe, everything was for him and was ruled by him. Racism and representation helped in the growth of the notion of the Other as being inferior and devilish. Knowledge conjured and invented by the Europeans in the colonial situation conceptualized the self as being universal and superior. These narrations made Europe the centre of activity and the European was superior to the non-European; civilized, propounder of human qualities and his views were so good that it had to be universal. The narration of self as being universal helped them to impose their ideas on to the other. Universalism and its politics is very interesting, it can be simply defined as, "The assumption that there are irreducible features of human life and experience that exist beyond the constitute effect of local cultural conditions (. . .) The assigning of Universalism to all West's concepts was a hegemonic view of existence by which the experiences, values and expectations of a dominant culture are held to be true for all humanity". (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 235)

The political world is always a site of contest, ideologies contest here and Althusser narrates how the ideology of being universal helps in gaining dominance. According to the ideology of the ruling class, the ruling ideology and the ruling class also shift from its paradigms. He cites an example of the eighteenth century in *For Marx*. The bourgeoisie which was the "rising class" in the nineteenth century "developed a humanist ideology of equality,

freedom and reason, it gave its own demands the form of universality, since it hoped thereby to enroll at its side, by their education to this, the very men it would liberate only for their exploitation."(234).

The coloniser with his concept of humanism and enlightenment created his narrations; he assumed universal nature of all that is European, tricking the colonized to believe that the education and the benefits of the colonial project is to liberate the colonized from the inner depths of darkness and ignorance. My next chapter is a reading of two novels, *A Passage to India* By E. M. Forster and *The Day of the Scorpion* by Paul Scott in order to analyze how these methods are used by these writers in order to sustain, originate and propagate colonial narratives.

Colonial Narrative: Condescending and Bemoaning

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 4
**Colonial Narrative:
Condescending and Bemoaning**

I

There seems to be no Indian word for thank you

E. M. Forster, *The Hill of the Devi*.

There is a conspiracy of silence around the colonial truth, whatever that might may be.

Homi Bhabha, *Location of Culture*.

Forster published his work, *The Hill of the Devi*, in 1953, by the time he had more than 50 years of association with India. But in India, where there are numerous languages, various forms of civilization, and a past stretching back to time immemorial, Forster is not able to find a word to express his gratitude in any Indian language. The problem is not with Indian languages but with Forster's colonial mentality and his prejudiced vision of India, which can be considered an extension of views and ideas of India created through the narration on India by indologists and Orientalists. Colonial narration created an imagined India, an ideological British India, which needed colonial management. Creation of India as weak, barbaric and chaotic prepared the background to justify colonial rule. Colonial rule, which was assumed as a requisite to liberate India from its darkness, was narrated as

improving, civilizing, liberalizing, modernizing, and enlightening. Metcalf argues in *The Ideologies of the Raj* "Building upon what has previously been little more than a vague expectation that somehow British rule ought to bring 'improvement to India, free traders, utilitarian, and evangelicals created a distinctive ideology of imperial governance shaped by the ideals of liberalism" (124).

Metcalf points out that in order to reassure that the British occupied a secure position, they showed deliberate urgency in demeaning and criticizing all that was Indian. They compared India with Europe on a hierarchical scale of civilization, and wished to fix India as an exotic land, less developed than even Canada and Australia. John Stuart Mill did not find Indians even capable of having a democratic rule in their country.¹

The demeaning and fixing was not easy as it was thought. Indian myths, epics, spiritual experiences, enormous knowledge system, social system etc. torpedoed many of British narrative intentions. The transcendental achievements of India in art and philosophy made the British fear India. Metcalf writes, "Africans, in the British view, were deemed to have no history at all, because they lacked written records and ancient monuments. Hence, they were regarded as mere 'Savages' whose bodies alone could define their enduring nature. India's extensive past could obviously not be treated with the disdain directed towards the African people"

(83). In India the notion of its "barbarism" required a defiantly complicated rhetorical exercise. There were many reasons for the British not trying to wipe out Indian customs and belief system. Indianness in itself was a multiple narration that could not be easily combated. From one geographical terrain to another, drastic differences in customs and values were evident; but at the same time, they were bound by some common principles. Multiple narrations to carry and comprehend all these were impossibility for any regime in a short time of analysis, and, therefore, what they did was to generalize and narrate India in terms of certain general trends, which inescapably were chosen in the negative.

The lethargic and inefficient Indian rulers gave the colonizers ample scope to picture India as a country ruled by inefficient rulers, giving them opportunity to narrate India to create hegemonically a notion of superiority of British system of government. The confused Indian social system, which the British could not grasp, in fact, they did not want to grasp, helped the narration of India by British as a miserable land. British narration followed certain basic concepts to deny superiority or any value to Indian systems.

Feminization of India

Description of the colonized as weak and feminine was a recurring element in colonial narration. The colonizer assumes a superior stand point of view and marginalizes the colonized as an embodiment of so-called feminine

quality. The definition of the female sex as fragile and weak being, who must be controlled by the dominant male, is an aspect of patriarchic social system. The system also denies freedom to the female because she is the embodiment of frailty and helplessness. In colonial narration the feminization of the colonized country was an effort to easily subjugate the colony with these image structures. Teresa Hubel finds in *Whose India* that Kipling's fiction celebrates the viewpoint and in his works "India is either depicted as a woman or is represented by a woman who needs to be controlled by the British because she is dangerous and immoral when left to her own devices" (48).

The British, when they depicted their experiences of their conquering India through fiction, were trying to reinforce this idea of gender stereotyping. They had the feeling that, in Metcalf's opinion, women or "womanly men," who feared battle and therefore deserved to be subjugated, ruled India'. It is a logic that is hard to digest, since Indians had resisted the British for long and powerfully, but superior British weaponry defeated Indians. Moreover, the Indian kings let down each other. The British also used the strategy of using one king against another. Indian Warriors like Shivaji, Tantia Tope, Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi, Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev, Surya Sen, Chandra Shekhar Azad, Balwant Singh were denied space in their fiction, and if at all they were narrated, it were as if they were extremists or terrorists lacking in moral and social commitments; bent on destruction and disturbing peace. What they were narrating for was to attain a psychological superiority or ideological set

up. We find in British fiction, Bengali as the ruler of India pictured as feminine, weak and indolent.²

If one reads more closely the structure of Psychic subordination implicit in the history of colonial domination, one finds a kind of self-assumed superiority and a negation of degradation of all the commendable qualities of the colonized. The colonizer always takes the male dominant position. A marriage of European man and Indian woman is from that perspective natural, but other way round, was considered impossible. Teresa Hubel writes in *Whose India?*: "The possibility of sexual attraction and emotional compatibility between White men and Indian women is conceived of as 'natural' in Anglo-Indian Literature. That the same might not be true in reverse is not even entertained" (69).

The metaphor of marriage is a dominant element in the feminization of India in order to construct a justification of British rule. Teresa Hubel in *Whose India?* finds out Kipling's celebrating of the superiority of the white male attempts a hegemonic creation of knowledge to suppress brown men's desire: "The marriage metaphor and his congruent construction of India as a seductive woman, evident in numerous short stories, serve to justify the hierarchy that he repeatedly establishes between Britain and India. As the ruling country, England obviously retains the dominant masculine position in

Kipling's work, while India is cast into the feminine role, with its implicit suggestions of inferiority and subjugation" (47).

The feminization of India attains disproportionate elements of degradation, by the creation of the figure of India as a prostitute, as Teresa Hubel shows in the same text: "For the British, the prostitute, alluring and dangerous, at once symbolized India's degradation and generated a set of practical problems of regulation and control." (102).

Teresa Hubel, reading the story "On the city Wall" by Kipling, finds imperialist energies trying to mystify India in order to feminize it. Hubel finds Lalun,³ the secretive prostitute as being an extension of India. "They are identical in their secretiveness and in their possession of immense knowledge. Indeed Lalun's knowledge has no boundaries" (37). She finds the English narrator, though ironic and with his own pretence of knowledge, is compelled to speak in impossible extremes when describing what Lalun knows, "She is what she knows, and she both is and knows things that are unfathomable, unobtainable to the English narrator and dangerous" (37-8).

Marginalization of Middle Class

British narration involves conscious selection and rejection of ideas. Those ideas that could damage the image of India were magnified and projected. National protests were represented as dangerous actions and protestors were cast as terrorists in British fiction. These narrations involve

creation of an image of the Indian as a Barbarian and of India as a land of inefficient rulers. India was thus narrated as in need for liberal transformation. By liberal transformation it meant flowering of British institutions in Indian soil.⁴ It was narrated as if liberalism acted as a source to destroy evils of barbarism and the narration enabled the British to differentiate India as an exotic land. It helped in creating an image of India as a land where "fascinating horrors were at practice that evolved death or mutilation of the body" (41).

Education was one ideological territory that the British tried to and did hegemonize to create consenting Indian citizens. Indian literature was dismissed as not worth British learning. But ^{for} the "native" to become civilized, he had to be taught English literature and its universal values of humanism and civilization. Alastair Pennycook, in her work *English and Discourses of Colonialism*, states that:

Policies about providing or withdrawing an education in English were not simple questions to do with the "the medium of instruction" but rather were concerned with different views of how best to run a colony. To some, provision of limited English was a pragmatic policy to facilitate colonial rule; to others provision of English was an essential part of messianistic spread of English language and culture (20).

The enlightenment effort, to emancipate the "uncivilized" Indians, according to Gauri Viswanathan was not entirely uniform: two groups were treading it, the missionaries and the administrators. Both shared the basic principle of "Arnoldian curriculum" of heavy stress on classical language and literatures combined with the poetry of romantics, showing deep relations between nature and the human soul. An effort to inculcate Christian values by which the British supposed that man of culture is to live.

Jyotsna G. Singh states, in *Colonial Narratives: Cultural Dialogues of Discoveries of India in the Language of Imperialism*, that the projection of Christian values through English literature helped the administrators to represent literary texts as transcend^{ental} and timeless: "Thus, they found an ally in literature in promoting the superiority of the British/Christian culture under the guise of liberal education" (128). She finds that the colonial manipulation of literary reception acted as an ideological apparatus in the Althusserian context in perpetuating dominant power relations.⁵ These texts functioned as the symbol of civilizing mission, which produced inevitable contradictions, as evident in colonial relationships, between the Indian reader and the English texts. The endeavor was to encourage the Indian to become a surrogate Englishman. At the same time a narration followed which projected the inability of Indians to fully comprehend the "truth" "enshrined in the Western texts" (31).

Bengal renaissance was a response to the project of colonial modernity. The pioneers of the Indian renaissance were consenting to liberal education project. These pioneers did not question the empire or its bad effects, but were happy to accept European models for improvement. The colonial ideology of dichotomizing ~~between~~ civilization and backwardness was supposed to make the colonized people consenting subjects. Jotsyna Singh writes that she sees ideology in Althusserian sense to define a set of representations by which we imagine our relationship to the real conditions of our existence. She writes that the working of the colonial ideology was to beckon the Indians to the ideologically shaped in British standards:

Thus, British political and military power presented itself, not entirely through brute force, but rather, through cultural representations and practices that cast this power into benevolent light. And even the self-critique of liberal, like Taylor or later Kipling, did not question the validity of civilizing mission; but only the limitations of some of its agents, for whom, they believed, the Mutiny had been a timely lesson (93).

Elleke Boehmer is of the opinion that these newly educated, young westernized intellectuals used education as a way of gaining supremacy in power rivalries with traditional leaders. They used colonial rule to further

their own interests and later they became a potential threat to British rule. The British narration of the second half of nineteenth century marginalized the upcoming middle class. Teresa Hubel writes in *Whose India?*: "The rising middle class in India, mostly composed of Indians educated in English was dismissed as unimportant minority which would be over looked because it was not real India" (49). The licentious, autocratic, lethargic and pompous princes and aristocrats were pictured with sarcasm, which could become an easy symbol of a despot, corrupted to the core. The poor, miserable masses were pictured as the "real India", which needed British rule to uplift them. Both had evident narration of the necessity and ^{the} blessing of British rule.

Middle class became a real disturbing factor to imperial projects. They were in the early stages depicted as caricatures of Englishmen, later they turned to be figures of contempt and hatred in British fiction. Metcalf, studying the story, "The strange Ride of Marrowbie Jules," by Kipling, discusses that during the last decades of the nineteenth century British had a fear of being placed at the mercy of Indians. The focus was on the educated Bengali who by then became, "At once a political threat to the stability of the Raj and a parody of the Englishman himself, the babu, no longer simply a stock figure of caricature, was in the hands of men like Kipling, the object of a hatred informed by mockery and derision" (165-166).

The narratives changed during the twentieth century in the novels of Edward Thompson and E.M. Forster, although those had acquired the status of being self-critical, the colonial imperatives prevailed unabated in new disguises of sympathy and “understanding”. But we don’t find a growing recognition of India as a nation and an understanding of discontent among natives against the British rule.

Suppression of Nationalism

The rise of nationalism was a potential threat to imperial rule. British narration was so structured that the British dismissed every possibility of giving nationhood to India. Teresa Hubel says that Anglo-Indian fiction mythologized the British mission in India with the ICS official as the central figure and his benevolent rule as a burden on him but something meant for the progress of the colony. Narrow-mindedly they dismissed all possibilities of nationalist spirit among Indians and termed all rebellion as terrorist activity. As Elleke Boehmer points out, in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures: Migrant Metaphors*, ^{her} crowd imagery came in handy to “suggest a lack of character and individual will” (95). Hubel is of the opinion that Kipling and other Anglo-Indian writers saw India as only a collection of groups of people. Even its becoming a potential nation is dismissed and the British narrated India as a part of Britain, with Britain as the benevolent mother ruling the savage, vulgar colonial child.⁶

Imperialism was pictured as highly protective to the native. The infighting among Indians in the name of caste, religion (Hindus and Muslims) and the violent attitude of the natives to life had to be controlled by a civilized ruler. Teresa Hubel says, in *Whose India?*, that for writers like Kipling, "The only legitimate expression of Indian is violent," which is at every cost destructive and unprogressive (41).

Imperialism was narrated as civilizing the violent Other and the events of 1857, and uprisings like the Indigo Revolt of 1859 in Bengal, Deccan riots of 1875 by peasants of Maharashtra, Munda movement of 1900 etc. were looked upon as terrorist activities and not as resistance or as movements arising out of development of a national consciousness. Teresa Hubel opines in the above mentioned work that writers like Kipling had a tendency to see "Indians in terms of some minor collectivity," a strategy of divide and rule, "but never as a nation – or even a potential nation – is one of the key elements in the imperialist construction of Indian nationalism." (32).

Colonial narration tries to create a framework that is ultimately helpful for the colonial rule to continue. The framework is produced out of an attitude they have towards the colonial state and the things it wished to achieve from the colonial enterprise. Their aims were several including political, economic and social. These attitudes were reflected in all forms of representation, verbal and non-verbal, art and actions. Novels, poems,

architecture, art evidently reflect these attitudes. These representations were never true and can never be taken as the truth. These were contrived and biased, having vested interests in the creation of such knowledge. These narratives were networks of creation of ideas whose ultimate aim was to control and dominate the power structures.

These narratives were not true and were countered by counter narratives by the colonized and counter-narration, which reveals a totally different picture of the situation, can be seen developing simultaneously in colonial discourses.

II

He regretted taking sides. To slink through India unlabelled was his aim. Henceforward he would be called 'anti-British' 'Seditious'- term that bored him, and diminished his utility. He foresaw that besides being tragedy, there would be a muddle; already he saw several tiresome little knots, and each time his eye returned to them, they were larger. Born in freedom, he was not afraid of muddle, but he, recognized its existence.

E. M. Forster, *A Passage to India*.

Forster is a very shrewd artist but not bold, as the epigraph describes Mr. Fielding in his novel *A Passage to India*, because he too wanted to escape being interrogated in his attitude to^{the} political situation in India. He has revealed through his narrative in the novel and the criticism of the novel this attitude (this point will be elaborated later in this chapter). Sara Suleri in her

article "The Geography of A Passage to India" has pointed out that in the novel, *A Passage to India*:

The mode is characterized by the desire to contain the intangibilities of the East within a Western lucidity, but this gesture of appropriation only partially conceals the obsessive fear that India's fictionality inevitably generates in the writing mind of the West. The symbolic violence of this fear underlies the impulse to clear out of history and to represent India as an amorphous state of mind that is remembered in order for it to be forgotten (107).

Suleri also makes out from the narrative that it was a beginning of a new conceptualization, a basis of a new 'un'-reality. She writes:

A Passage to India (. . .) represents India as a metaphor of something other than itself, as a certain metaphysical posture that translates into an image of profound unreality. It thus becomes that archetypal novel of modernity that co-opts the space reserved for India in the Western literary imagination, so that all subsequent novels on the Indian theme appear secretly obsessed with the desire to describe exactly what transpired in the Marabar caves (108).

The political situation in India during his period was one of deep tension arising out of ideas of colonialism and their opposites. But the intensity of the volatile situation slipped from the colonial narratives. When one recognizes that one's opposition is competent to see through one's plans, the mind tends to become condescending, assuming all-knowing attitude where he is authoritarian. Then the mind desires to be analyzed in terms created by the mind. The colonial condition, where coloniser is a master, permitted such narrative plans: the coloniser fears the breeding of a different knowledge of his desires. It is not a one to one verbal battle that one earns in such situations but subtle overtones and sabotages of the surface realities to benefit the underlying aims of gaining or retaining power. By the time of Gandhi's arrival on the Indian political scene, educated Indians, "two cheers for western education", and nationalist leaders had built a strong image of India, as being civilized and having depth in philosophy before the Westerners and they had convinced the Indian's subjective awareness of this fact. The colonial narration of these periods began to display reduced vehemence, in comparison with the earlier periods of colonial enterprises. In Shamsul Islam's opinion, (in *Chronicles of the Raj*,) post 1914, period was a difficult period for a writer working in the colonial context to categorically share Kipling's "confidence and faith in the Raj and the imperial idea without serious doubts and fears about the future and validity of the Raj" (103). The era of confidence is replaced by the era of doubt and melancholy, because they could foresee the

"perishable" limits of empire. He postulates that, this does not however mean that it was all anti-Raj position they took but "The large majority of the British public, display mixed feelings; they seem to be aware of the justice of the nationalist case and they recognize the moral confusion involved in the colonial process, yet they cannot help admiring the Raj" (103).

Novels of the Raj

C.W.G. in a review identifies three types of novels emerging out of the Anglo-Indian mind with respect to the theme dealt in them. The first is the historical romance, which mostly belonged to the time of Moguls. The most widely read, both at home and in India, were those written around the life of the European stations in India and they form the second type. And the third type introduces the contact between the British and the Indian peoples. The third type of novels is very interesting and complicated, in C.W.G.'s opinion. In the essay in *E. M Foster: A Critical Heritage*, he reiterates:

To fiction of this kind special responsibilities attach. It is almost impossible for a novel of this type to avoid some shade of political implication. And provided that the story is well planned and vigorously written, it will carry a far more powerful message to the British public than a vast amount of more deliberately information writing (. . .) (270).

The critic accuses the writers of these types of novels for exaggerating everything in the novels and for being prejudiced and assuming the position of being a superior race, all of which haunt these narratives:

The novel that sets out to deal with the social psychology of station life in relation to its Indian environment exercises, therefore, a half-conscious influence, which will be the more pronounced in proportion, not to the accuracy of the picture, but to the interest and vivacity of the narrative. And this responsibility implies a corresponding claim that the picture should be drawn from intimate and expert knowledge, without prejudice in delicate and careful delineation of a most difficult subject (271).

C.W.G.'s arguments are a pointer to the analysis of colonial text, which dealt with Indo-British relationships. The question of barbarian existence or civilization did not exist during the Gandhian era in colonial narratives; Indians are assigned the status of being crypto-barbarian: figures in these narratives as Ashis Nandy says in his work, *The Intimate Enemy*. The question whether the Indians were capable of ruling themselves dominated the arguments; the question of British leaving India etc. also formed part of it. Another major attempt in those narratives was to increase the gulf between the Hindus and Muslims, by making it conspicuous in order to bring into

consciousness. We can clearly discern attempts to picture these communities as being distinct from each other and how difficult it is for them to come together etc. are narrated.

Forster's *A Passage to India* is a good example of this condescending attitude, published in the year 1924, it marked prophecies of British withdrawal and their attitude. Paul Scott's novels are all about the jewel in the crown, India. My opinion is that Paul Scott is nothing more but mourning Forster, both of them seem to look at the Indian situation "sympathetically". They show sympathy to Indians and to the Anglo-Indians as well. A postcolonial reading of their novels, that shall be discussed, will reveal the colonial narrative strategies during the final decades of the Raj. Like all other writers since 1920, E. M. Forster also attempted to acquire^{the} consent of as many sections of Indian society as was possible and to bring in an understanding of British delicacies. Paul Scott mourns at the failure of the British officers - their pride and prejudices, which made them give away the jewel in the crown. These writers handled the colonial situation with great care and to legitimize the British rule they projected ideas of good intentions. They did not fail to show the need of the Raj of British officials. The desire of civil authority and avoiding drastic military intervention; and not appearing 'arbitrary' was an important part of their ideological policies. The strategies evolved were complex and require penetrating eyes to see the attitude of the author. Colonial narrative, in their novels selected, can be said to be

bemoaning narratives: complaining at the failure of the Anglo-Indian in maintaining the colonial rule in India.

E. M. Forster had visited India, before the novel was written, once in 1910 and then in 1921 and these visits became an inspiration for the work, *A Passage to India*. It is one of the most discussed texts and many have attempted postcolonial readings of the text. Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* identifies the most interesting thing about *A passage to India* to be:

Forster's using India to represent material that according to the canons of novel form cannot in fact be represented -vastness, incomprehensible creeds, secret motions, histories and social forms. Mrs. Moore especially and Fielding too are clearly meant to be understood as Europeans who go beyond the anthropomorphic norm in remaining in that (to them) terrifying new element – in Fielding's case, experiencing India's complexity but then returning to familiar humanism (241-2).

Said, further, making a generalizing statement of all colonial narratives finds out that Forster's India like Conrad's Africa:

Is a locale frequently described as unapprehensible and too large. Once when Ronny and Adela are together early in the novel, they watch a bird disappear into a tree, yet they cannot

identify it since, as Forster adds for their benefit and ours, "nothing in India is identifiable, the mere asking of a question causes it to disappear or to merge in something else." The crux of the novel is therefore the sustained encounter between the English colonies – "well-developed bodies, fairly developed minds, and underdeveloped hearts" - and India (243).

This is a typical example of postcolonial reading to E. M. Forster, but Western critics are unable to see this fact, for them Forster's humor and humanism are most applauded instincts. In his work *E. M. Forster* Lionel Trilling observes that:

Forster's plots are always sharp and definite, for it expresses difference by means of struggle, and struggle by means of open conflict so intense as to flare into melodrama and even into physical violence. Across each of his novels run a barricade; the opposed forces on each side are Good and Evil in forms of life and Death, Light and Darkness, fertility and sterility, courage and Respectability, Intelligence and stupidity all the great absolutes that are so dull when discussed in themselves (13).

Again Trilling observes that, "It quickly establishes the pattern for our emotions and keeps to it. We are at once taught to without our sympathies

from the English officials, to give them to Mrs. Moore and to "renegade" Fielding, to regard Adela Quested with remote interest and Aziz and his Indian friends with affectionate understanding" (124).

These are two methods of looking at the text, Said's Poststructuralist method and Trilling's, both revealing vested interests. Until postcolonial mind developed the notion of power relations and used that in reading narratives that aspect of Forster's narrative remained hidden. My attempt is to fix the novel in the Indian colonial context to discover its characteristics as colonial narrative, its effects on the ideologies generated in the society and the effects of ideas generated in the society on the text, by "resisting" the novel with postcolonial tools of understanding. Resisting in the sense of critical reading to find the inner layers of meaning.

Political or Philosophical

E. M. Forster is always on the defensive when the question of political ideologies in the novel ~~are~~ discussed. In an interview with Avtar Singh he is trying to make it philosophic and poetic, escapism as the epigraph has already revealed:

For the book is not really about politics; though it is the political aspect of it that caught the general public and made it sell. It's about something wider than politics, about the search of the human race for a more lasting home, about the universe as

embodied in the Indian earth and the horror lurking in the Marabar caves and the release symbolized by the Birth of Krishna. It is – or rather desires to be – philosophic and poetic (Qtd in Avtar Singh, 192).

The novel is set in a historical situation, and the novelist has written it from the viewpoint of an agnostic visitor who was unhappy with the working of imperialism. One has to be conscious of the fact that Forster was not against imperialism but felt uneasy about the working of it. He had the intention of improving the general situation, which has remained unnoticed until recently. It is evident in the dialogues in the novel itself. Avatar Singh almost got into the idea of this aspect but he again is sympathetic to the author he studies; who he believes showed sympathy to Indians. In his work *The Novels of E. M. Forster*, Avtar Singh finds out that for Forster:

The British Raj is an Order of force and will, not of love and understanding. What is needed, says one of the characters in the book, is "good will and more good will and more good will" and, in so far as *A Passage to India* is a political novel – which it is only partly –, and secondarily, these words constitute Forster's answer to the problem of British rule (. . .) His critique of imperialism is based on an ethical rather than political consciousness (191-2).

Good will and more good will to subdue and emaciate a culture, which needs to be nourished with "European modernism", Western Humanism and "proper government". In my analysis I could not find many aspects which showed that it is good will that the author was aiming for. The novelist criticizes everything, but by his taking a very obvious ideological stance he was advocating colonial rule: showing superiority of the British race, culture, and religion. John Colmer making a genetic structuralist reading of social and political structures in the novel in his article "Promise and Withdrawal in *A Passage to India*", recognizes the fact that Forster is bemoaning the failure of imperialism that began on a Western humanistic approach. He recalls an unpublished essay by E. M. Forster to argue that E. M. Forster believed that it had an idealistic and darker side:

Its ideal was to bring freedom and the benefits of Western civilization to all the parts of the world. In this tradition the quasidivine role is attributed to a nation not to a function of the human mind as in the liberal tradition. The expectations aroused by early imperialism were great; the promise seemed infinite, but from the Boer war onwards, historical events marked a series of disappointments and withdrawals. Moreover, the whole movement contained within itself an internal contradiction. It purported to bring freedom, but actually enforced economic and political dependence. It

promised justice but produced the comic pantomime of the trial at Chandrapore. As with the liberal intellectual tradition, a noble idealism, disguised a selfish materialism. In the unpublished essay attended to above, Forster remarked. "Many of us soon saw that this crude imperialism had an economic side and we were put of" (120).

As Colmer detects the element of humanism in Forster, we can identify an imperialist in Forster. He too was a propounder of Western humanistic project of enlightenment; or rather during his period the colonizers themselves were recognizing the mask of humanism used by the earlier imperialists. Writers like Edmund Candler and Edward Thompson, who came after him, also had this view. They all represented a class, which looked from outside, who had faith in orientalist enlightenment project. The greatness of E. M. Forster lies in the fact that he could reflect the totality of the colonial situation through drawing on the unconscious; the collective unconscious as well as the personal unconsciousness. The underlying mental structure of the characters, from various sects – Indians: Hindus and Muslims, Anglo-Indians - males and females - and visitors reveal the narrative strategies of the English mind. The writers' creation of "characters" reveal much more than he intended when viewed with the objective of discovering the fantasy and dreams, and the fears and hopes, of a dominant omniscient narrator like E. M. Forster. Barbara Rosecrance has pointed out in her essay "*A Passage to India: The Dominant*

Voice", that: "In *Passage* Forster has created a narrative voice that is controlling, from the opening phrase of the first chapters, 'Except for the Marabar caves', to the concluding statement, 'No not there' "(235).

John Colmer observes that, Forster being a visitor to India could look at India from a distant point of view exterior to the world that he has created:

In *A Passage to India* Forster has created a coherent fictional universe that faithfully embodies the internal contradictions of social class and of number of traditional more especially the tradition of romantic liberalisms and the tradition of British liberalism. At this stage in his career Forster was ideally placed to present these contradictions, since his attitude towards them was critical without being utterly unsympathetic. An inheritor of the romantic liberal tradition and a bourgeois beneficiary of British imperialism, clearly he could not be totally unsympathetic to either (119).

John Colmer is right in his arguments, but is there any ideal position in any historical context. is the pertinent question that reverberates in this context. Forster was looking at India as an Englishman does and he assumes a position superior to both Indians and Anglo-Indians and we need to recognize this fact for any analysis. However, this is one of the best novels to ^{be} read if one wants

to discover the subtlety of colonial narrative, for it offers a situation with wider scope, not plot wise but ideologically.

The Novelistic Space: India and the Indian Landscape in the novel

The creation of an imaginary space in a novel is a potential space of ideology to maneuver and create "truths" which can later become universal. Lennard, J. Davis in his work, *Resisting Novels*, observes that creation of space in a novel is ideological, "space is objectified by description to become a representation, that is, a controllable but unreal space - hence ideological location" (70).

Davis's attempt is to show how colonial novels become a part of the colonial enterprise. Howsoever neutral the novelist appears to be, the novel will evidently show underlying ideological imperatives lurking behind "unintentional statements". Imagining a space in the novel itself is an attempt at controlling a pregnant site of dialectics, which can develop into a discourse, as Davis puts in *Resisting Novels*:

The seemingly neutral idea of describing a place and setting action in it carries with it the freight of a middle class interest in controlled property of which the colonial experience is a compelling metaphor. Novels claim space and turn it into a system of meaning - just as countries claim other countries and turn them into system of meaning (. . .) The way that these

location embody meaning is ideological – they are indirect, naturalizing their signs, initiating the terrain. becoming the secret sharer of the original and finally replacing the original (. . .). The ideological function of this act of appropriating space may serve to convince us that place can be summarized, controlled and intended for specific purposes (85,86).

Forster, in *A Passage to India*, fills the narrative by imagining the space of Chandrapore, Marabar caves and Mau, authoritatively tries to control the colonial space. He fills in it with a new set of meaningful situations^{sk} his own, imbued with ideas of his own making, moreover, Forster is a prey to whims of a colonizer that he is. A study of the Indian space created by Forster in the novel is bound to show the colonial tendencies, imaginings and wishes that the author contained, which he reveals by devising structures that worked in those times and places. We should be aware of the fact that Forster was never aware or if even conscious of the ideological roles behind his narratives, many have read ideological imperatives in the novel and my reading is an attempt to see the colonial mind that worked behind the narrative.

Twentieth century writers of empire were heirs to the long established traditions of symbolist interpretation. They had to face a stiff resistance in the prevalent condition of general consciousness of the natives, vibrant in the colonial cultural context in various forms. What is conspicuous is that they

could not come out of old tradition, as Elleke Boehmer in *Colonial and Post-Colonial Literature* says, "They too sought to interpret the obscure by using symbols, exotic in signification and yet manageable domesticable – something like looking at the unerring monotony of the bush through the fixed frame of Oscar's glass Church." (18). And as any other writer does, Forster was also creating a land, ^{And} making a "land of its textual artifact was to exercise mastery"(19).

The subtle portrayal of India in the novel is a very interesting area for deliberation and interrogation. The first description of Chandrapore itself is a pointer to the attitude of the author:

Except for the Marabar Caves - and they are twenty miles - off the city of Chandrapore presents nothing extraordinary (. . .) The streets are mean, the temper ineffective, and though a few fine houses exist they are hidden away in gardens or down alleys whose filth deters all but the invited guest. (. . .) The very wood seems made of mud, the inhabitants of mud moving. So abased, so monotonous in everything that meets the eye (. . .) (1).

For Benita Parry, the narration of the Indian climate is a signpost to the attitude of the author. She in her essay "Passage to More Than India", finds out that it is in as a bizarre, desert-look atmosphere that the whole novel is set:

“Significantly, the scenic beauty of India is seldom mentioned in the novel, though we know that Forster was very much aware of it; the hopeless and melancholy plains and a treacherous sun without splendor dominate”(161). This is in accordance with the Western attitude of looking at India as a difficult terrain. Vinay Lal in, the article "Representing India" writes, "The enduring image of India abroad, particularly in the West, is of a hot, dirty, and conflict-ridden country with a vast and largely illiterate population leading lives of grinding poverty (...) (86).

Was Forster finding the Indian scenario a hot seat to handle? The Indian scenic beauty is never mentioned, it shows the typical Western outlook which the author shares: the Marabar caves and the Mau festival and the river Ganges are all muddled mystery. A view that the Orientalist had about India is reinforced here, as Edward Said had opined in *Orientalism*: "The political and cultural circumstances in which Western Orientalism has flourished draw attention to the debased position of the Orient or Oriental as object of study" (9). Is the author not a prey to the orientalist concept? Benita Parry finds out that the Indian landscape is an essential force in the novel: "It seems to use distinction; an elephant looks like a hill, a train like an insect, a path of field jumps as if it were being fried, a snake is a stick or perhaps a stick is a snake; if the boulders in the heat seem alive, why should a stone not feel?" (161).

The conclusion that she arrives, that it shows the possibility of diminishing value attached to all things Indian, is acceptable, but another question that arises is whether the narrator was not just the latest Orientalist? He has not been able to overcome the Western prejudice and one is not to expect ~~that~~ from a colonizer, he inevitably carries the ideology of the ruler in him.

Forster in a subtle manner was reiterating the traditional orientalist viewpoints. Critics claim that Forster's narration is comic. A comic narrator is someone who can climb up and look down upon things. Another view is that he is sympathetic, but in my view his narrative also leads to the dichotomization of people as the colonial ruler and the colonised as the ruled, the essential characteristics of colonial narrative. Benita Parry contradicts herself when she observes that, in the aforesaid article:

India is the nullity of the caves, and the obscure marvels fashioned by men; the hopeless plains, the cities of Kashmir and Delhi. Its infinite variety is echoed in the diversity of Hinduism: the incarnation of God as a monkey, God conceived as Krishna sporting with the milk-maids, ascetics who suppress the senses, siddhus who satiate them, the creed of harmlessness to all living things, violent sacrificial rites – all have their place. Hinduism's all inclusiveness contains a profound apprehension

of a world in which good and evil, the ridiculous and the august, cruelty and pacifisms coexist (165).

Like her, many critics arrive at the conclusion that Forster embraced Hinduism at the end. But there again my argument is that Forster was looking "down at them" and not embracing or eulogizing Hindus or their values. The narration in the final section is detached and things are described as if they are observed from a superior point of view. Comments by Aziz and Fielding all reveal the satirical nature.

Leonard Woolf in "Arch Beyond Arch" finds out that if the mystery and muddle that India is described here. "Behind that is an arch of politics, the politics of Anglo-India and the nationalist India, and beyond that is another arch half mystery, half muddle, which permeates India and personal relation and life itself (. . .)" (206). The orientalist conception of the East as mystery and muddle is made out here by Woolf, repeating or reproducing the concept to give validity to the colonial discourse.

A statement does not consist in analyzing relation between the author and what he says but in determining the position any individual can and must occupy in order to be the subject of that statement. These statements are maps of their mentality. One of the significant statements that Forster made in the novel, many critics have looked into though they did not read the colonial consciousness in it, is the statement that showed a snake that turned out to be

a tree stump.⁷ June Perry Levine observes it as describing the Maya; she finds an analogy in Vedanta:

The piece of rope lying in the road which is perceived as a snake is one of the classic Vedantic examples of maya. But Forster actually had, at Devi, the experience of seeing a snake that turned out upon closer examination to be a tree stump. Of this incident, he wrote, "Everything that happens is said to be one thing and proves to be another, and it is further said in an unknown tongue I live in a haze " (170).

Definitely, if one wants he can see things from various angles and prove his/her arguments. Forster could be trying to explain the maya⁸ but there is much more to that than Maya in that statement, from a postcolonial perspective.

Written in the 1920s towards the beginnings of the end of British imperialism, the statement carries much significance. It shows that the colonialist or the Orientalist, in Saidian terms, has not escaped the author's mind. India was incomprehensible to the Orientalist and they have always through ages tried to picture it in various terms. Here, Forster's seeing an imaginary snake, the fear that he had or the Orientalist tradition had and it is a realization that the colonizers had of India as a nation. It shows growth in their knowledge, that is compulsorily defined by the period of narration, of

the upcoming threat of muddling of affairs. ^{The} Narrator assumes that everything is clear in the Western world. My argument is that it is not so, but it is the fear that is remaining in their traditional consciousness, the hallucination of danger threatens their existence and that compels the invention of illogicality of the Indian mind.⁹ Edward Said's arguments in *Orientalism* are worthwhile to be remembered here:

It is true that no production of knowledge in the human sciences can ever ignore or disclaim its author's involvement as a human subject in his own circumstances, then it must also be true that for a European or American studying the Orient there can be not disclaiming the main circumstances, of his actuality, that the comes up against the Orient as a European or American first, as an individual second (11).

The fact that the question remains unanswered, adds to the mystery of India, the mystery that India was supposed to be, and the muddle that it becomes in the narrative are the main achievements of the novel. The novelist does not make any conscious effort to clarify his doubts and the muddling attitude shows that Forster himself did not have clear idea of all that he wanted to say. This is what Sara Suleri makes clear by stating that, in "A Geography of *A Passage of India*" : "This fiction most clearly delineates the desire to

convert unreadability into unreality, and difference into an image the writing mind's perception in its own ineffability " (108).

We can find another parallel in the novel of the same kind in Adela's hallucination. Adela has the hallucination of being molested by Aziz which, she later cannot corroborate with evidence or stress the fact with strength and integrity. She miserably falls in the court scene and gets the abuse of the Anglo-Indian community. Hallucinations are fear-psychosis that develops in a strange situation and realizing of these factors is essential for the colonialist to overcome the schizophrenic existence that the colonist^{ali} community had. Colonial people came with a preconceived notion of the orient and all their fears were attributed to factors that resembled their fears. The realization came very late in the colonial period that it is not so, but by then the colonialists had been conditioned to believe it and^{the} 1920s marks a period of colonial conscience being pricked by the realities of the pathetic colonial condition. Colonizers' private and selfish needs are exposed, their neurotic projection of fears is recognized and they cannot escape the blame of "misrule" in an alien country.

III

The Novel and its Critics

The effect that the novel had on its reader is more important than whether certain representations are true or false. The novel is a representation

of Indian society. The earlier Orientalist representation of India as a land of half naked fakirs, snake charmers, and colorful festivals, and India being a spiritual land – Forster extends the mystery to muddle – has not escaped Forster's imagination. And, therefore, it makes the questioning of who is representing whom and by what right and with what results become more significant.

To see the effects the novel had on various communities is very interesting. A comparison of the Indian and the English responses to the novel will reveal the mammoth influence the novel had made on the cultural milieu of British colonialism in India. More than anything the attention that this particular novel received during the colonial era and after independence itself is an important aspect that requires close examination at any cost. The criticism of the novel in itself became a fairly formidable discourse. This discourse outside the novel showed the radical changes in the approach to the Indian situation by the coloniser. The opinions of the visitors or critics who have never visited India or only have had an idea of India from second hand sources, from British or colonizers, who were not Anglo-Indians, are very interesting. They all seem to appreciate Forster's keeping his balance in the narrative. Edwin Muir in a review in "Nation" (*Critical Heritage*) opines that, "He holds the balance evenly between the Anglo-Indian and the natives, without a hint of prejudice, idealistic and imperialist, and with no fear of the

opinion of the English public. He is above the quarrel and without much hope for its issue. It required courage of rare kind to write the book" (286).

The balance he observes in the novel shows his attitude rather than any unique aspect of the novel, his attitude deserves close attention. He is observing what he wanted to see in the novel and he shares a common approach to the narrator, for the author assumes a 'neutral' position for he too is a visitor. J. B. Priestly in a review in "London Mercury" observes that:

Everything is present, ideas, character, action, and atmosphere – a genuine civilized narrative. While I enjoyed every moment of this book (. . .). Anglo-India is in that astonishing just and sensitive mind of his. Anglo-India is caught here, I imagine, as it has never been caught before, and its sharp division, its crushing institutionalism and officialism, its racial and herd thought and emotion, provide an excellent background for Mr. Forster's somewhat elusive philosophy of personal relationship." (228).

Here, the critic attempts to universalize the attempt of Forster; he is also a part of the grand narrative of imperialism. The cultural context in which the opinions are put forward deserves special attention. The question of the functioning of the Indian colonial missionary occupies the content of these evaluations. That India could project different picture of the situation and get

the attention of the coloniser become conspicuous here. Andrew Rutherford in *Twentieth Century Interpretations* runs a parallel ground, his endeavor is to rescue Forster from political criticism and place him on the level of ethics, which was again a universalizing attempt, a device to avoid the question of ideological interpretations:

The defects, which he observed in the British in India, were attributable, however, not merely to their national character and upbringing but to their political role there. Believing (like Adela Quested) in "the sanctity of personal relationships" Forster was appalled by the corruption of personal relationships produced by imperial rule, with its harsh division of humanity into governors and governed, white and colored, and its hierarchical structuring of both racial and social relationships.

(7)

Here again, we can identify a venture towards unconscious effort to impose their knowledge on the novel. That Forster was employing the same racial dichotomization in subtle narrative is evident here. We can see furthering of their arch of criticism towards the long established traditions of interpreting the Indian scene. Walter A. S. Keir, in an article in *Twentieth Century Interpretations* finds that beyond the personal relationships the novel embraces, "people who wore nothing but a loin cloth, people who wore not

even that, and spent their lives knocking two sticks together before a scarlet doll, humanity drifting and grading until no earthly invitation can embrace it." A typical India of colonial imagination is grasped here and moreover the spiritual aspect is given prominence, "There is always in this book the suggestion of something beyond and beyond again." (36)

Arnold Kettle trying to get out of the imperial mode falls prey its own consciousness; he too considers the novel as a genuine site of truth where the question of British rule in India can be judged. Is it not an overemphasis given to a piece of literary work that has to be dealt with caution? And to expect it to give ultimate truths is nothing but exaggeration, making the author a superman.

Kettle in his article, "E. M. Forster. *A Passage to India*", in *Twentieth Century Interpretations*, expects Forster to be optimistic and all encompassing narrator.

It is in the final sentence that Forster lets us down and exposes the weaknesses of his positive values. It is simply not true that one touch of genuine regret would have made the British empire a different institution. (. . .) The ugly realities underlying the presence of the British in India are not even glanced at and the issues raised are handled as they could be solved on the surface level of personal intercourse and individual behavior (47).

Kettle himself finds a reply to this, though not "entirely convincing reply", that Forster is writing a novel about personal intercourse. The reply is convincing for Kettle because Forster moves constantly from "the individual to the general, so clearly recognizes that the two are subtly intertwined" (47). Kettle's arguments are convincing, Forster is not a prophet and one cannot expect him to profess truth. However, both Kettle and Forster are but holding in their language hidden wishes and fears and they are prisoners of ideology: how they are caught in the ideological meshes of their own times is explicit in the novel and the criticism of it respectively.

Rose McCauley in "Woman in the East" writes, "He is probably the most truthful, both superficially and fundamentally" (196). She is amazed of the fact that "He can even make these brown men live," a typical astonishment at the fact that brown men are also living beings. Leonard Woolf sees the novel primarily as dealing with human relation, friendship and beyond that we find politics of nationalist India, Anglo-India and beyond that you find half mystery, half muddle, "which permeates India and personal relation and life itself"(. . .)"(206). Thus the British response (excluding Anglo-Indian) to the novel furthered the imperial discourse that the novel generated in a specific manner. The almost similar attitude the novelist and the critics share show an ideological imperative latent in their sub-conscious mind.

Anglo-Indian Response

Anglo-Indians did not receive the novel, quite understandably, with much appreciation. They felt that the author did not recognize their hard work; their "burden of ruling" India. E. A. Horne in a letter to *"New Statesman"*, giving an "Anglo-Indian view" concludes that it was Aziz who had the hallucination which is then "communicated itself" to Adela, "Just as old Mrs. Moore's obsession by 'evil spirits' communicated itself to the girls impressionable mind" (245). Horne seems to have fallen in love with Adela that he wanted to invent every possible reason to save her from all possible acquisitions. Aziz in his eyes is the culprit. Anglo-Indians had a strong aversion for Indians for they lived amongst them under constant pressure of mutual mistrust and fears. Naturally, being the ruling class they were not ready to accept the fact that white people are also susceptible to hallucination and mistakes, that acceptance they knew will work against their wishes. His arguments lead us to think that Adela's head is empty to receive all nonsense. The Anglo-Indians in the novel are strangers to Horne, he asks in a very imperative mood:

But the Anglo-Indians? Where have they come from? What planet do they inhabit? One rubs one's eyes. They are not even good caricatures, for an artist must see his original clearly before he can successfully caricature it. They are puppets,

simulacra. The only two of them that come alive at all are Ronny, the young and rapidly becoming starched civilian, and the light-hearted Miss Derek (249).

The picturing of Anglo-Indians as lacking in sensitivity and prey to false whims and fancy of ruling class did annoy ^{the} Anglo-Indian, for they felt injustice is being done to them. They were also expecting the sympathy of the author. The author's unconscious intentions in doing so are beyond their view of things. The author wanted them to be better rulers, carry the "burden" in a more sophisticated, civilized manner. He was actually angry with them for not performing their duties.

About the Bridge Party, Horne says: "All the fuss about the 'bridge' party will strike the Anglo-Indian reader as hopelessly out of date, it being nowadays very much the fashion – not in Delhi and Simla only, but in the humble mofussil station also – to entertain and cultivate Indians of good social standing" (249). The civilizing mission or the aura of civilizing mission will never end in colonial narratives. The Anglo-Indian cannot appreciate the criticism that Forster makes on the surface level of the text. Even the questioning of their attitude and behavior make the recursive Anglo-Indian irritated. The sub-text remains beyond him. The irritation is also a suggestion of the disturbed consciousness of the imperial mind, where the question of his presence and attitude in the colonial situation is interrogated.

Indian Responses

Indian responses to the novel deserve special attention for they reveal many ideas that got consolidated in the past. Such responses share the notions that the novel effected a change of attitude. In "An Hommage a Mr. Forster" by someone signed as 'An Indian' in a review that came out in 1928, finds Forster is a "Sympathizer who has retained his detachment" (290). The critic observes that, readers will fall prey to the new orientation that Forster has brought forth: "In a word, his is the sympathy of the artist. And if we in our turn sympathize with him, we do so in the sense of adequately responding to him and not in the sense of behaving kindly towards him. We do not see his point of view, we submit ourselves to a new orientation" (290).

What is this new orientation? Is it something great? Or whether it is a new change that has come out as a result of the historical compulsions? Definitely it is something to be applauded but surely to be cautious enough; it is important not to be carried away by the new wardrobe of subtle narrative, that has many dark alleys and traps embedded to its core. The Indian seem to transcend his time when he writes.

When I read *A passage to India* I was filled with a sense of great relief and of an almost personal gratitude to Mr. Forster. This was not because as an Indian I felt myself indicated or flattered by the book. Indeed to know oneself is not to feel

flattered, as many as Anglo-Indian reader of the book has discovered for me. It was because for the first time I saw myself reflected in the mind of an English author, without losing resemblance of a human face (. . .) Mr. Forster in *A Passage to India* has created the Easterner in English literature, for he is the first to raise grotesque legendary creatures and terracotta figures to the dignity of human beings. (290).

The traditional Orientalist narrative finds a change over during the Gandhian Era. Here the colonizers have been forced to reckon with an ideological force, which they find very difficult to ward off. The earlier narratives would not receive space in the new circumstances and Forster was well aware of that fact. Tactfully he takes a neutral position and tries to look at the "universal" human values, the Western values, and adds the ingredients of political positioning. He had to suppose men who were living on both sides and to get attention from both sides, and he did not want to be politically questioned.

Nirad C. Chaudhari expects, as Meenakshi Mukherjee ironically comments,¹⁰ Forster to give a clear picture of the Indian situation so that one may decipher from it the realities of colonial situation. Chaudhari's arguments at times cross the limits and give too much importance to this piece of literary work. All patriots of ^{the} Indian nation can see his comments as an insult to the struggle for freedom. Chaudhari's argument is that the novel

touched the English conscience and that they had to leave India because of the novel's bringing in of this consciousness:

Mr. Forster's book not only strengthened the indifference, it also created a positive aversion to the empire by its unattractive picture of India and Anglo-Indian life and its depiction of Indo-British relations and being of a kind that were bound to outrage the English sense of decency and fair play. Thus, the novel helped the growth of that mood which enabled the British people to leave India with an almost Pilate – like gesture of washing their hands of a disagreeable affair (68).

Chaudhari is giving too much of significance to a piece of literary work which is a natural outcome of a discourse. It may have its effect on the reader but to expect that it would affect a decision of historical significance is foolishness. Chaudhari is carried away by the fact that Forster has written a novel showing "sympathy" to Indians.

Chaudhari is a typical scholar who plays into the novelist's ploy. His analysis of Aziz as a Muslim character is an unhappy projection of his religious prejudices. Aziz is a subjective sign constituted in an Englishman's novel, but Chaudhari is a renowned literary personality and his words carry much historical significance than Aziz's words or in that sense, words by any character in a fictional world.

Mr. Forster is too charitable with the Indians. Aziz would not have been allowed to cross my threshold, not to speak of being taken as an equal. Men of his type are pests, even in free India. Some have acquired a crude idea of gracious living or have merely been caught by the show of snobbism, and are always trying to gain importance by sneaking into the company of those to whom this way of living is natural ^{chandan} (69).

He can see that the character of Aziz pictured here is snobbish and yet cannot see the attitude of the author. An English man cannot help seeing a Western educated Indian to be snobbish or mimicking his manners, the trade-mark of a Englishman is to mock at the Indian babu since the mimicking is threatening to their existence, in Bhabhaian terms, for it brings forth ambiguity in understanding the situation. The Other is too close to the self to find difference. And hence the differentiation is possible only in a narrative that creates differentiation by mocking at colonial discourse itself. The situation creates a hybrid-colonised individual who feels the situation threatened from various sides, including from the motherland.

My analyses of these three ideological responses to the novel reveal that the novel had much impact on the historical context, and people saw it as a mouthpiece or prophesy which is all the more appalling. In my opinion the novel is a typical colonial narrative text, which could deceptively conceal its

colonial tendencies and yet is strongly wedded to the colonial recognition of emerging Indian nationalism.

IV

Characters

Poststructuralism permits us to see that there are no characters in a novel but only subjective positions of author's mentality that protrude in the imaginary figures of characters. Lennard J. Davis observes that our idea of novel that has developed through ages has given in the false notion of seeing characters in a novel. Davis states in *Resisting Novels* that "Novels are compelling," because they have the capacity to "make us believe that in reading we are actually getting to know that characters in novels are not really people, yet it is difficult if not impossible", to read a novel bearing in mind that all characters are totally fabricated constraints (102). In Forster's opinion characters live in a novel and these characters are limited by the author's presence. In *Aspects of Novel* he argues " people in a novel can be understood completely by the reader, if the novelist wishes" (31). What we get of the "character", if at all one exists, is the opinion the author has about that particular imagined character. And it is from this premise that one explores, "their inner as well as outer life" and exposes more the author's attitude than the characters! A novelist is great because he can create a discourse wherein he can place diverse subjective positions to expose ideological structured

notions, and encoded emotions working in a society or to suggest changes in that working. The responsibility of a scholar is to attempt at a remaking of the situation to understand the ideological premises of discourse to understand the complex workings of the narrative.

Forster's creation of characters, belonging to a wide range of differing communities, India - Hindus and Muslims, - British - Anglo-Indians and visitors - all can be studied to reveal the attitude of the author in shaping his signs around subjective positions. Traditional critics falter in their attempt to see that all characters are available with personality in novels and believe that one or two deserved more close study and more "sympathy". *A Passage to India* as a historical novel has received much attention as it deserved and much more, for it dealt with a nation that was beginning to realize its potential to rule itself. The novelist here is taking a dominant viewpoint, which tries to encompass the universal, which would be transcendently valid and non-political. A subtle attempt to fix the Indian and the British into an ideological terrain, the author appears to be sympathetic and superior to his fictional world, outside it and assumes to have a complete view; and the narrative deceptively brings in division and confusion into the discourse.

What is peculiar about this type of narrative is that it tries to be more understanding and civilized, here the colonial Other is subtly pictured in the negative rather than picturing him to be a barbarian or an uncivilized. The

snake has become a stump; the fear is taking a new perspective that arises out of losing the grounds of colonial arguments.

My argument here is that *A Passage to India* is a natural outgrowth of imperial narratives; and it could not be anything other than that. The manipulation of language by Forster to fix and enclose the Indian history of the Gandhian Era, though in its beginning, addresses the experience of the colonizer he is, the oppositional discourses that he develops in his novel is a pointer to this fact of prejudging and precaution..

Forster, in *Aspects of the Novel*, draws lines between characters in real life personalities and to the subjective positions in a novel and argues that personalities are difficult to understand for they have secrecies and "characters" in a novel cannot have them as he postulates in *Aspects of the Novel*:

This is why they often seem more definite than characters in history, or even our own friends, we have been told all about them that can be told; even if they are imperfect or unreal they do not contain any secrets, whereas our friends do and must, mutual secrecy being one of the conditions of life upon this globe (32).

Forster is of the opinion that novels emerge out of ^ocommunity. A novel is based on evidence though there would be blending of the imagination of the

author, which is an unknown quantity, "and the unknown quantity always modifies the effect of the evidence, and sometimes transforms it entirely."

(31). (One simple question I have in my mind is this, how far we know people in real life and can we draw lines very easily between these enterprises, the semantics of personality reading is too much too complicated.) It is clear that Forster draws ideas of subjective position in novels from history and his imagination plays a crucial role in creating the text. When we read into the novel of Forster, *A Passage to India*, looking at how he modeled his "characters" blending it with his imagination, and any postcolonial reading into this imagination of the author is definite to reveal colonial elements in the narrative. Poststructuralism permits us to see all writings as discourses; language is to be studied in order to reveal the play of power in the creation of knowledge or the part played by the creation of knowledge in acquiring and retaining power. Traditional novel allowed us to see living characters in it whom we knew, "strongly enough (...) better than we know some of our own friends or acquaintances", (Davis, 105). In Davis's opinion, this feeling of living changing people in a novel created by novelist is a mass cultural assumption - "not a universal given - and requires a major perceptual defensive change of the kind that the novel as a discourse encourages and requires" (103). And obviously "the novel seems to have taken over the technology of description of the self in its development" (104). Novels are discourses and every novel is a part of a grand discourse that preceded it and

it expects a discourse to follow it. The concentration of utterance, in a manipulated space gives novel a significant space in a historical context. Pam Morris in *The Bakhtin Reader* defines how discourses have ideological implications, which is all too complex for literature; apart from directly refracting the "generating socio-economic reality", it also refracts, "the reflection and refraction of other ideological spheres (ethics, epistemology, political doctrines, religion etc). That is, in its "content" literature reflects the whole of the ideological horizon of which it is itself a part. Since this ideological horizon is constantly developing, the special literary form of refraction could account for the way verbal art so often seems to anticipate further changes" (10).

Forster's creation of discourse in *A Passage to India* has an ideology to perform, which need not be the real conscious effort of the author's intention but what the historical context permits or compels. As Pam Morris states, "The individual consciousness is a socio-ideological fact", because consciousness necessarily implies the possession of meaning and "since all meaning has an evaluative element it is inevitably social and ideological" (12). My attempt here is to read the creation of images of Dr. Aziz, Indian-Muslim, Ronny-Fielding Anglo-Indians, Godbole, Indian-Hindu, Adela, Mrs. Moore, visitors from Britain and the group of Anglo-Indians to reveal the unconscious working of a colonial conscience and the defensive attitude it had developed due to developments in the political front. I begin with the

presumption that "named personages are represented in story form, but those names can mark out entirely different concepts of what character is, depending on the variety of historical period. That is, "the very idea of character in the novel is itself ideological" (107). And in this process there is only one subject that is myself, placed in a particular context in space, time and ideology and has a tool of poststructuralist theory, postcolonialism, used as a looking glass, with its opportunities and limitations, looking at ideological compulsions behind the narrative of the novel *A Passage to India*. Aziz being the protagonist deserves the first position in my analysis. Nirad C. Chaudhari is disappointed of the fact ^{that} a Muslim is made the hero of the novel:

Mr. Forster's more serious mistake was in taking Muslim as the principal character in a novel dealing with Indo-British relations. They should never have been the second party to the relationship in the novel, because ever since the nationalist movement got into its stride the Muslims are playing a curiously equivocal role, realistic and effective politically, but unsatisfying in every other respect. The Muslims hated the British with hatred even more vitriolic than the Hindus because it was they who had been deprived of an empire by the British (72).

Here one may ask the question as to whether Chaudhari is writing against a proclamation by the then viceroy of India or a Governor of a State. And how can one expect an Englishman to be "too true" to the Indian attitude and write a novel that will "please" every party concerned. Chaudhari himself gives the answer to the question that he emotionally raised, "But I think, I know why Mr. Forster would not have a Hindu. He shares the liking the British in India had for the Muslim, and the corresponding dislike for the Hindu. This was a curious psychological paradox and in every way unnatural, if not perverse" (73).

It is neither unnatural nor perverse, it is the natural outcome of the wishes and fears of the author, who is a part of a greater discourse, that of colonialism. The creation of Dr. Aziz and Mr. Godbole, Muslim and Hindu respectively is ideological to its core. Forster seems to show sympathy in the creation of Dr. Aziz but Aziz is created so that he appears snobbish, childish and lacking in clarity of thought. I acknowledge my indebtedness to Homi Bhabha, to a large extent, in my analysis of Aziz as a stereotype. Bhabha in *Location of Culture* states, "To judge the stereotyped image on the basis of a prior political normativity is to dismiss it, not to displace it, which is only possible by engaging its affectivity; with the repertoire of position of power and resistance, domination and dependence that constructs colonial identification subject" (67).

The author looks at Aziz from different angles assuming imaginary subjective positions. So for Mrs. Moore Aziz is somebody different to what Ronny believes or Fielding knows, all are suppositions of the author. The wholeness of picture of Aziz on a subjective position is what I aim to find now. Every writer creates "characters" from his mental frame and works upon them and maneuvers intellect wise with ideas and ideologies that are the author's own, which he transposes on to the image of the "character". The intention behind this endeavor is to create a discursive space that projects the character with his outer realities or ideas perceived of him by other subjective positions the author takes or through narration by the author himself and the supposed mental struggle the "character" undergoes. All characters share the viewpoint of the author and poststructuralist tools of analysis can be used to reveal, if one is ready to take specific standpoints, the attitude of the writer. The attitude need not be conscious but the collective unconscious or individual unconscious, playing upon the discursive strategy of those messages. It can also be argued that my attempt is to reveal what the author was unaware while he conceived the discourse.

The creation of Aziz is complicated, and he represents not a typical Indian Muslim, if there is any, or a Muslim who retains the mentality of a Muslim. He is a hybrid Westernized Indian, rootless and fragmented into different worlds and Forster finds it difficult to manage the character at various stages of ^{the} discourse. The author retains sympathy and attempts to

infuse in the reader an attitude of understanding and there is an overall attempt to show that Aziz is a nice human being, all these are superficial, and the sub-text has a different story to tell.

The author deliberately uses, an Indian, a Muslim who is a friend of Aziz, to introduce Aziz into the Novel. It is a negative remark that strikes the note. Aziz enters the room and apologizes for being late and the friend, Hamidullah replies, "Do not apologize," said his host, "you are always late" (7).

Aziz later arrives at Mr. Callendar's late, he is late, and it can only be discerned by making a guess of the hurdles, that the author lets us know, he had to overcome before reaching there. And he blames the Collector for not waiting for him and he even bribes the servant in Mr. Callander's house to extract the truth. Images of India being lazy, incompetent, escapist and corrupt are projected through these structured pieces of information around Aziz.

Now from the corrupt side, author projects the philosophy of Aziz, satirically belittling the enthusiasm of the young doctor. The epitaph on the tomb of a Deccan King:

Alas, without me for thousands of years the Rose will blossom
and the spring will bloom. But those who have already

understood my heart; they will approach and visit the grave where I lie (21).

The narrator laughs at the bemused Aziz who regarded, "it as profound philosophy - he always held pathos to be profound" (21). Aziz is a prey to the good nature of Mrs. Moore and readily becomes an admirer of her. He was excited - as any Indians would be - as the narrator perceives Indians are suppose to. when they get an acknowledgement from White people. And how does he respond to the situation? Not dignified neither composed but "he was excited partly by his wrongs, but much more by the knowledge that someone sympathized with them. It was this that led him to repeat, exaggerate, and contradict. She had proved her sympathy by criticizing her fellow-country women to him, but even earlier he had known" (24).

Here, again Aziz is weak, he is earning, as the author conceives, to get sympathy. This is a normal aspect of the novels of colonial narration; they are not ready to give dignified pictures of the colonized class. All Indian characters are pigmies. Mrs. Moore is shown as sensible and all encompassing and ready to learn and is contrasted to Aziz's fickle nature.

Later, in the discussion with Mrs. Moore, Ronny criticizes Aziz as being very cunning. He argues with Mrs. Moore that Aziz abused the Major in order to impress Mrs. Moore and it is the educated native's latest pretension. "They used to cringe, but the younger generation believe in a

show of manly independence” (33). The author again escapes the context of political and racial prejudice; he is stating facts through the character. Whatever or whoever a native be Ronny warns Mrs. Moore, "There's always something behind every remark he makes (...)if nothing else, he's trying to increase his izzat (...)" (33). This is what Bhabha calls the menace of mimicry, the presence of Western educated natives are^a threat to colonialism, contextually it attempts at removing him from the space as Bhabha says in *Location of Culture*, "The effect of mimicry on authority of colonial discourse is profound and disturbing. For in 'normalizing' the colonial state or subject, the dreams of post-Enlightenment civility alienates its own language of liberty and produces another knowledge of its norm (. . .)(86).

According to Ronny, the Anglo-Indian bureaucrat, all educated Indians will be no good. The author handles the space delicately; the opinion Ronny holds is none to different from the narrator's opinion towards the end of the novel. In chapter 36, the author to denigrate Aziz further, uses the incident of Aziz entering the Guesthouse in Mau. Aziz reads two personal letters of Fielding, the narrative that describes the situation is pungent with racial prejudice and hatred for the "uncivilized". "Aziz went from one room to another, inquisitive and malicious. Two letters lying on the piano rewarded him, and he pounced and read them promptly. He was not ashamed of this. The sanctity of private correspondence has never been ratified by the East" (302). The commentary that follows the description of this incident is worthy

of a colonialist, showing or comparing the civilization of the West to the crude attitude of the East, which ultimately produces, in the narrator's opinion, envy in the oriental:

He envied the easy intercourse that is only possible in a nation *whose women are free*. These five people were making up their little difficulties, and closing their broken ranks against the alien. Even Heaslop was coming in. Hence the strength of England, and in a spurt of temper he hit the piano, and since the notes had swollen and struck together in groups of threes, he produced a remarkable noise (emphasis mine 303).

The East is compared to the West in a subtle level of differentiation; Othering is done in a delicate manner, ^{as} possible to dismiss the East as vulgar – a crypto-barbarian. The East, now they lack certain manners, oh no, they are not barbarian but lacks propriety, they need to learn more from the British, is the attitude that the narrator possesses. This is none too different from the attitude shown through Ronny. He advises his mother "The educated Indian will be no good to us if there's a row; it's simply not worthwhile conciliating them, that's why they don't matter. Most of the people you see are seditious at heart, and the rest would run squealing" (39).

The utilitarian attitude along with the desire for Othering, whereby the Indian is defaced through the attribution of the generalized fears of the West

dominates the narrative. The period during which the novel was written was very disturbing. The British had begun to develop a fear psychosis whereby they started to doubt their beliefs and believe their doubts. The neurotic condition of struggle for dominance was disturbing every nerve and the rulers found it very difficult to handle the colonial situation. Homi Bhabha in *Location of Culture* describes the colonial situation as being ambivalent. The colonialist is caught up in a context from which he wriggles out new approaches:

The colonial presence is always ambivalent, split between its appearance as original and authoritative and its articulation as repetition and difference. It is a disjunction produced within the act of enunciation as a specifically colonial articulation of those two disproportionate sites of colonial discourse and power: the colonial scene as the invention of historicity, mastery, miseries or as the 'other scene' of *Ent-Stellung*, displacement, fantasy, psychic defense and an 'open' textuality. Such a display of differences produces a mode of authority that is agnostic (rather than antagonistic). Its discriminating effects are visible in those split subjects of the racist stereotype (. . .) which ambivalently fix 'identity as the fantasy of difference' (107).

Another typical incident is met in the novel when Ronny meets Adela talking to Aziz and Godbole. A careful reading is required to see the strategy of the novelist. The narrator assumes the position of a superior in the context but simultaneously assumes the view of Ronny, the Anglo-Indians.

Ronny was tempted to retort; he knew the type; he knew all the types, and this was the spoilt Westernized. But he was a servant of the Government, it was his job to avoid 'incidents', so he said nothing, and ignored the provocation that Aziz continued to offer. Aziz was provocative. Everything he said has an impertinent flavor or jarred (75-6).

The narrator never misses a chance to hit at Aziz, whether it is his inferiority complex, his Indian Babu attitude or his lack of composure or his slavish attitude. I fail to recognize how one in such a situation ^{ow} could argue that the novelist was sympathetic to Aziz; he was satirical, never missing a chance to belittle the "character" of Aziz.

This does not reveal as to how an Indian Muslim - Western educated - behave ^{such} in a context, but how a Westerner looks at the behavior of an Indian in a similar situation, is evident. There is a marked difference between the two, and the gulf to cross shows the ideology that has ^{be} to discern ^{ed}. The subjective position of Aziz is created in ^o very precarious mould to invite sympathy and contempt simultaneously, which in turn justifies the humanistic project and

racial superiority. The dialogic manner in which Aziz is created in the text, forming a part of the text, and the milieu and the Orientalist discourse, reveal the dichotomy of colonial narration. Aziz can only be understood by considering the discourse in text to the orientalist discourses that preceded the novel and that which will proceed from the discourse in the novel. Pam Morris in the *Bakhtin Reader* argues that, "Intentionally or not, all discourses are in dialogue with prior discourses on the same subject, as well as with discourses yet to come, whose reaction it foresees and anticipates. A single voice can make itself heard only by blending into the complex choir of other voices already in place" (ix).

Aziz is a creation of the individual consciousness of Forster and we see Forster possessing a knowledge, which he blends into the historical context, and "since all meaning has an evaluative element it is inevitably social and ideological" (12). Forster is a clever artist who covers his intentions, but my reading has proved that by the creation of subjective position of Aziz in the novel, Forster has not been able to escape the Orientalist tradition of Othering the non-White, in order to dichotomize the two races as superior and inferior. The superior race is, of course, the white people and inferior is the non-White, Indians. The creation of Aziz is not a development of a false image, but as Bhabha says in *Location of Culture*, "It is much more ambivalent text of projection and interjection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies displacement, over determination, guilt, aggressivity; the masking and splitting

of official and phantasmatic knowledges to construct the possibilities and oppositionalities of racist discourse" (81).

Divide and Rule

The imperial narration presents India as being divided into two religious sects: Hindus and Muslims, and projects themselves as the secular ruler who can bring about an understanding between the two religious sects. That the colonizer belongs to another religion, different from the above-mentioned two religions, is often obscured or concealed tactfully by narrative devices; projecting a secular vision of the rule. Religion, the European colonizers were well aware of, is an emotional bomb that has to be handled in a very delicate manner in order to gain desired results in a discourse. Gauri Viswanthan, in her work *Outside the Fold* gives credence to my argument:

The challenges posed by managing far-flung colonies from a metropolitan center plainly showed the advantages of secular governance over the more risk-laden goal of christianizing colonial subjects. The official promotion of missionary activity was especially perilous in British colonies like India, which had entrenched religious traditions and laws that derived in turn from these traditions (3).

Recognizing the risk involved in bringing in the discussion of religion, the question^{of} religion was handled in a very sophisticated manner by the author.

Christianity is not projected as the dominant but assumes the dominant backdrop, which remains concealed under the author's persona. The concealing of the Christian backdrop enables an assumption of neutrality on the part of the author. The colonized are shown as divided among themselves and it is achieved in two ways. Firstly, the colonizer consciously assumes the neutral superior position, the colonized will take time to recognize this particular fact, and this narrative creates the world for the colonized. Secondly, the narrative figures out division within the colonized community. That has been the imperial British policy for long in India. Gauri Viswanthan points out in *Outside the Fold*: "England's policy of religious neutrality had always officially resisted endorsing missionary proselytization and substituted 'Englishness' for 'Christianity' as the defining principle of subject hood, even while retaining the moral foundation of Christianity" (14). Even while religious neutrality was masked, their policies revealed their projects and the imperial government followed a strategic method. Religious policies got transformed contextually as Ashis Nandy, in *The Intimate Enemy*, has shown: "While in the first phase of the Raj the rulers supported political participation of the Hindus (because such participation by the then pro-British Hindus was advantageous to the regime) in the second phase, the rulers discouraged it because of growing nationalism" (26).

In a statue of Warren Hastings, now in the Victoria Memorial, made by Richard Westmacott in 1830, there are two more figures on his sides. An

Indian Brahmin and an Indian Muslim. Metcalf in *Ideologies of the Raj*, citing this statue argues that, "Both figures, garbed as scholars, were treated respectfully, and so reflected Hastings's sympathetic view of India's culture and its religious traditions. Yet they also announced what was to be Britain's enduring insistence that India was divided into two religious communities—those of Hinduism and of Islam (132). Metcalf later states that only with the coming of British rule that "the notion that there existed distinct 'Hindu' and 'Muslim' communities in India take on a fixed shape" (133).

Metcalf is colonialist after territorial colonialism has ended, with his almost pleading type of neutral attitude justifies the British rule in the work *Ideologies of the Raj*. It remains out of Metcalf's analysis that the colonialist is a Christian: which shows how far he too is following the projection of English attitudes. He opines that it was the German Indologists, who were not interested on advancing the British rule in India, who found out that Hindus could not manage themselves. German scholars like Hegel, Friedrich Schlegel and Max Muller created the ideology that though the Indian mind, "imaginative and passionate", acted as a foil for Christian and Western 'rationality', nevertheless it necessarily, "carried with it the assumption that Hindus:

Unable to supply this elements themselves, required an *externally imposed* 'rationality' to order their day-to day lives.

Hence, Germanic ideology of the Raj, by creating a coherent vision of the 'Hindu mind' that at once incorporated it into a larger ordering of the world and yet subordinated it to the West played a critical role in sustaining the intellectual assumption that bulwarked Britain's Indian Empire (my emphasis 135).

The author is being too subtle to argue or establish the fact that “externally imposed” authority or in other words colonialism is required for the Hindus to realize the merit of their own philosophy. A very nice justification for the empire! Forster is none too different in his strategically subjective positioning of characters in the novel. He uses Indians belonging to one class to criticize people belonging to another and overall the Anglo-Indians and visitors criticize the Indians. And the narrator always shows differentiation between Indians and White people. One of the most crucial strategies evolved is dividing the Indian community as Hindus and Muslims. The mingling of religious element from across the two religious groups suited the British vision of their rule as colonial rulers. By drawing together forms distinctly labeled as "Hindu" and "Muslims", Forster proclaims the need of a master, the civilized, efficient White man, who can shape harmony among the Indians, which they could not themselves achieve being divided by religion.

There is too much use of the words “Muslims” and “Hindus” in the text. The author is very much conscious to declare often the religion to which

one character belonged. And attitude is shaped according to the religion, narrating the subjects as being groped in the ideology of their religion and being fanatic, unable to transcend their silly prejudices.

Muslim attitude is projected more than the Hindu attitude, but the narrative ultimately degrades the two sects as inferior, uncivilized and superstitious. There are two incidents in the novel in which the Muslims abuse or narrate in the negative the Hindus and later they themselves fall prey to the same state, which ultimately attempts to show the supremacy of the White race. The author creates a vicious circle around which the limited Indians go round and round, they have no escape route for they are all the same, no matter to which community they belonged.

The first incident is that of Aziz criticizing Mr. And Mrs. Bhattacharya for not sending a carriage to fetch Mrs. Moore and Miss. Adela, as the former had promised. Aziz, provocative as we are made to believe, doesn't miss a chance to hit at Hindus, while Fielding is trying to shift the topic; "Slack Hindus - they have no idea of society. I know them very well because of a doctor at the hospital. Such a stack, unpunctual fellow! It is as well you did not go to their house, for it would give you a wrong idea of India. Nothing sanitary. I think for my part they grew ashamed of their house and that it is why they did not send (68).

The author schemes the narration in a manner to appear neutral and the subjective position of Aziz in the novel, an Indian Muslim, to hit at Indian Hindu customs, beliefs and superstitions. Two purposes are served here. One, it shows the divide between the two religions. And, secondly, that Indians are ashamed of their living, when compared to the White. The narrative becomes very interesting, later, when the narration of Aziz's apartment is made out. It is made out as though Aziz imagines it, "Aziz thought of his bungalow with horror. It was a detestable shanty near a low bazaar. There was practically only one room in it, and that infested with small black flies" (69).

This is a double edge maneuver, the Indian himself looks at his own house and that of his fellowmen, though belonging to the opposite sect, the author's Machiavellian skill covers his real intention beneath the subjective positioning of Aziz as the speaker and ^{the} thinker. It reveals the pathetic state of the hygienic habits of the "natives" along with their dubious and lazy nature. There is a statement made by the narrator later in the same scene. When Aziz invited Mrs. Moore to his house, the narrator ironically states, "*she still* thought the young doctor *excessively nice*" (emphasis mine 68).

A similar exercise is done to prove that both Hindus and Muslims are superstitious and that the Muslims never miss a chance to criticize the Hindus.

In chapter eight when Nawab Bahadur has a chance to talk of the Maharani of Mudkul he uses it to denounce her:

A Native state, Hindu state, the wife of a ruler of a Hindu state, may beyond doubt be a most excellent lady, and let it not for a moment supposed that I suggested against the character of her Highness, the Maharani of Mudkul. But I fear she will be uneducated, I fear she will be superstitious. Indeed, how could she be otherwise? What opportunity of education has such a lady had? Oh, superstition is terrible, terrible! Oh it is the great defect in our Indian character! (...) 'Oh, it is the duty of each and every citizen to make superstition off, and though I have little experience of Hindu states, and none of this particular one namely Mudkul -yet I cannot imagine that they have been as successful as British India, where we see reason and orderliness spreading in every direction, like a most health-giving flood! (90).

What more can a subjective position of Bahadur created by Forster^{can} say, he criticizes the whole of Hindu Maharanis of India accusing them of lacking in education, and obviously it is Western education that is meant here: meanwhile he praises the British rule for spreading reason and orderliness.

The mouthpiece of an Indian is used to cut down the native attitudes and build the image of the modern Western civilization.

The subterfuge of ideals doesn't end there. Immediately after making Bahadur speak against superstition and the Hindu Maharanis who are immersed in superstition, we are shown one of the kinds of superstition Nawab Bahadur himself is prey to.

The incident of an animal hitting the car of Nawab Bahadur is made complex, the "little spin" is made intricate in several manners possible. First they don't identify exactly what hit the car. As Edward Said comments, everything is exaggerated in the novel. Later when the incident is narrated to Mrs. Moore, she spells, "ghost", adding mystery to the whole episode. The serene English people Adela and Ronny thought it to be a Jackal, goat or hyena, and forgot it and Mrs. Moore who is enticed by mystery of India spells her fear as ghost. The muddled-mystery doesn't end there, it is elaborated to show the superstition that Nawab Bahadur himself was a prey to. Again it is as if Nawab Bahadur is thinking, that the thought is presented: "He was preoccupied, his diction was appropriate to a religious subject. Nine years previously, when first he had a car, he had driven over a drunken man and killed him, and the man had been waiting for him, the man continued to wait in an unspeakable form, close to scene of his death"(96).

Later Aziz comments on the situation that “we Moslems should get rid of these superstitions, or India will never advance”(96). All these are discussed to show that India is in need of an external modern civilization as a model imposed upon them to uplift their moral values, and take them out of dark pits of ignorance and superstition.

The intriguing ploy of making one religious sect condemn and denounce the other, by the author, is to make his stance appear unprejudiced and neutral. They are critiquing themselves, so the author can remain "neutral". One group blames the other and the narrator escapes being caught in the process of proclaiming the “truths”. Hamidulah passes comments in the sick man’s room like “Oh, yes, both Hindus (Dr. Panna Lal and Narayan Godbole); there we have it; they hang together like flies and keep everything dark”(101). Later the narrator intrudes on behalf of all Muslims present in the room, he details; “Everybody looked and felt shocked, but Professor Godbole had diminished his appeal by linking himself with a co-religionist. He moved them less than when he had appeared as a suffering individual. Before long they began to condemn him as a source of infection. 'All illness proceeds from Hindus', Mr. Haq said" (101-02).

The colonial narration that Forster follows is very evenly poised to appear deceptive and on the surface level it may appear as if he is picturing a "true" India but it is really in the subtext that we can identify the eulogizing of

Western civilization and subterfuge of the Indian civilization. Wherever possible the writer attempted to show the hollowness of the myth of Hindu-Muslim unity. Forster comments on the committee thus:

Hamidullah had called in on his way to a worrying committee of notables, nationalists in tendency, where Hindus, Muslims, two Sikhs, two Parsis, a Jain and a Native Christian *tried to like one another more than came natural to them*. As long as someone abused the English, all went well, but nothing constructive has been achieved, and if the English were to leave India, the Committee would vanish also (103) (My emphasis).

When Dr. Panna Lal drops into enquire about Aziz's health, he is looked upon with suspicion. and, he is considered a spy of Major Callandar. The author does not miss a chance to reveal that he too is not punctual. The tension between the Hindu and the Muslim is given more importance. While the Muslim looked upon him with suspicious eyes, he was nervous and wanted to escape, "the den of fanatics into which his curiosity had called him" (104).

Later part of the novel shows a union between the two religions. When Aziz's case was taken up the national feeling takes dominance and Hamidullah, the barrister wanted a Hindu to handle the case because, "to drag in everyone was precisely the barrister's aim. He then suggested that the

lawyer in charge would be a Hindu; the defense would then make a wider appeal" (171).

The narrator views this as a ploy only to counter the British and later it is revealed that one of ^{the} Hindus betray Aziz. Dr. Panna Lal offered to give evidence, in order to please the English, and when that fact is found out by other Indian characters the narrator cuts a sorry figure of Dr. Panna Lal: "Agitated, but alert, he saw them smile at his indifferent English, and suddenly he started playing the buffoon, flung down his umbrella, trod through it, and struck himself upon the nose" (230).

Later, the assessment of Dr. Panna Lal by the narrator is deplorable by any standards: "Of ignoble origin, Dr. Panna Lal possessed nothing that could be disgraced, and he wisely decided to make the other Indians feel like kings, because it would put them into better tempers" (230). Here, we see a substantiation of one colonial narrative, which deciphers the native as weak, lacking in character, dignity, opportunistic, and corrupt. This type of narrative is never used against any Anglo-Indian character throughout the novel.

The third section of the novel surprisingly shows an understanding between the two communities and a failure of imperial power and scheming to this effect. Colonial Maggs rallied against Aziz to the old Raja of Mau. In a playful manner he deplored the act of Raja to have allowed a Moslem doctor

to approach the sacred person of Raja. But the Raja pays little attention to the fact and the imperial government's agent cuts a sorry figure, devoid of all powers, it was a reality that was shaping up.

The question of religion is very prominent in the narrative. The imperial strategy of divide and rule is constantly followed in the condescending narrative. The question of to which religion an Indian belongs is consciously highlighted and one sect is used against the other to maximize the gulf of separation.

The Indians and the Anglo-Indians

The colonizer who accepts his role tries in vain to adjust his life to his ideology. The colonizer, who refuses, tries in vain to adjust his ideology to his life, thereby unifying and justifying his conduct. On the whole, to be a colonialist is the natural vocation of a colonizer (45).

Albert Memmi. Colonizer and the colonized.

The close reading of all colonial texts is bound to reveal the structure of psychic subordination implicit in the history of colonial domination; one finds a kind of a self-assumed superiority and a negation or degradation of all the commendable qualities of the colonized. Forster in this particular novel tries to appear as neutral, but he takes an elevated stand over the situation, with an all-encompassing attitude, looks down on the victims and victors of situations. He does not show any firmness of attitude in condemning the colonial enterprise. His narrative does reveal that there are "bourgeois

colonized, whose affluence equals or exceeds his", (Memmi, 10) but he does so without much conviction. Here, the attitude is as Albert Memmi rightly points out:

Not to be the only one guilty can be reassuring, but it cannot absolve. He would readily admit that the privileges of the privileged natives are less scandalous than his. He knows also that the most favored colonized will never be anything but colonized people, in other words, that certain rights will forever be refused to them, and that certain advantages are reserved strictly for him. In short, he knows, in his own eyes as well as those of his victim, that he is a usurper. (10)

The novel is an attempt in creating a better colonial situation and not in abolishing imperialism. Ashis Nandy rightly suggests in *The Intimate Enemy*: "The drive for mastery over men is not merely a by-product of a faulty political economy but also of a world view which believes in the absolute superiority of the human over the non-human and the subhuman, the masculine over the feminine, the adult over the child, the historical over the a historical, and the modern or progressive over the traditional or the savage" (x).

Forster is also a colonizer, one who denies the fact, but enjoys the privilege of being a colonizer, ultimately to the detriment of the colonized.

The author, to suggest the benefits of colonial rule and the lack of character on the colonized people's side, uses various narrative methods. The rising of nationalism was a potential threat to imperial rule and Forster's narration dismissed every possibility of giving nationhood to India. Teresa Hubel in *Whose India?* states that Anglo Indian fiction mythologized the British Mission in India with the ICS official as the central figure and his benevolent rule as a burden on him but something meant for the progress of the colony. The infighting between Indians as Muslim and Hindus required an external ruler to control and civilize them, for Forster the only legitimate expression he finds in India is confused and muddled.

The Anglo-Indians in the novel and their relation to Indians clearly show the dichotomizing tendencies of the author. First chapter establishes the fact that there is no love lost between the rulers and the ruled. The prejudice of the protagonist - which the author very well recognizes as a truth in the Indian colonial situation - Aziz is revealed as he comments, "They all become exactly the same, not worse, not better. I give any Englishmen two years, be he Turton or Burton, it is only the difference of a letter. And I give any English women six months. All are exactly alike" (13).

One of the striking factors in the novel is that of the portrayal of the English women, who are always placed below Englishmen, in terms of hierarchy and mental power and is often compared or equated to Indians.

This bent of mind shows that Forster was a prey to patriarchal European colonial tendencies. Later in the novel Fielding finds out to his dismay that "It is possible to keep in with Indians and Englishmen, but that he would also keep in with English women must drop the Indians. The two wouldn't combine. Useless to blame either party, useless to blame them for blaming one another" (62). Fielding is a "coloniser who refuses" as Albert Memmi defines in *The Coloniser and the Colonized*:

If every colonial immediately assumes the role of colonizer, every colonizer does not necessarily become a colonialist. However, the facts of colonial life are not simple ideas, but the general effect of actual conditions. To refuse means either withdrawing physically from those conditions or remaining to fight and change them (19).

Fielding is not one who is ready to go, he neither becomes what his fellow citizens have become, he decries the colonial attitudes but remains to eat its fruit. As Memmi argues, "He participates in and benefits from those privileges which he half-heartedly denounces" (20).

When Fielding goes to meet Aziz in his apartment, the question of decline of morality in England because of atheism sparks a full-fledged discussion of ^{the} political situation in India. The discussion that follows is very interesting, Hamidullah begins;

“Excuse the question, but if this is the case, how is England justified in holding India?”

There they are! Politics again. "It's a question I can't get my mind on to", he replied. "I'm out here personally because I needed a job. I cannot tell you why England is here or whether she ought to be here. It's beyond me".

"Well-qualified Indians also need jobs in the educational".

"I guess they do. I got in first," said Fielding, smiling.

"Then excuse me again - is it fair an Englishman should occupy one when Indians are available? Of course I mean nothing personally. Personally we are delighted greatly by this frank talk".

There is only one answer to a conversation of this type: "England holds India for her good". Yet Fielding was disinclined to give it (108).

The final statement is ambiguous and ironic. Ambiguity lies in the fact that one may conclude that it is for India's good as well as England's good that the author is referring to. The irony is that the reader is confused to identify the speaker, Fielding or writer. This is one of the overt statements in the novel

that needs a closer look. The author is making a statement that reveals that the character believes in the "goodness" of colonization of India by England. In a 1959 talk, Forster argues that:

For the book is not really about politics; though it is the political aspect of it that caught the general public and made it sell. It's about something wider than politics, about the search of human race for a more lasting home, about the universe as embodied in the Indian Earth and the horror lurking in the Marabar caves and the release symbolized by the Bittu of Krishna. It is-or-rather desires to be - philosophic and poetic (qtd. in Avtar Singh, 192).

This argument is not a rigid one. It is a play to escape the burning question of political leanings. He too is a colonizer who refuses. Albert Memmi analyses this attitude as:

Not always accompanied by desire for a policy of action. It is rather a position of principle. He may openly protest, or sign a petition, or join a group which is not automatically hostile toward the colonized. This already suffices for him to recognize that he had simply changed difficulties and discomfort. It is not easy to escape mentally from a concrete situation, to refuse its ideology while continuing to live with its actual relationships. From now on, he lives his life under the sign of a contradiction

which looms at every step, depriving him of all coherence and all tranquility (20).

This unsuccessful struggle to remain on a neutral ground by the author is evident throughout the novel. The author finds for all the misery of India an answer in the Indian climate. It is climate chosen for the specific purpose: "In Europe life retreats out of the cold, and exquisite fireside myths have resulted – Balder, Persephere – but here the retreat is from the source of life, the treacherous sun, and no poetry adorns it because disillusionment cannot be beautiful" (206). Whose disillusionment is referred to here, the colonizers' or the colonized's. Evidently, it is the colonizers', essentially because of the fact that the triumphant machine of civilization may suddenly hitch and be immobilized into a car of stone, and at such moments the destiny of the English seems to resemble that of their predecessors, who also entered India with the intention of refashioning it, "but were in the end worked into its pattern and covered with its dust" (emphasis mine 206). The value of the statement given by Fielding resides on the colonial presumptive truth, the presumptive colonial authority, and so is a very potential statement, as Foucault states in *Archeology of Knowledge*, "In its rarity, the presumptively authoritative statement is an 'asset finite, limited, desirable, useful – that has its own rules of appearance, but also its own condition of appropriation and operation; an asset that is by nature the object of struggle, a political struggle.'"(98)

Following the Foucaultian paradigm we can conclude that the discourse is a "will to truth" pushing away everything it cannot assimilate. A statement made in a novel need not be used in analyzing the relation of it to the author, but it can be used in determining the position any author can and need occupy so that he remains a subject of that statement.

Forster efficiently handles narrative strategies. He fills in subjective positioning of Indians with praises for the white men. Hamidullah remarks when Fielding briefs him of his meeting with the superintendent, "This comforted Hamidullah, who remarked with complete sincerity, "At a crisis the English are really unequalled" (171-2).

When Nawab Bahadur and Co. meet with an accident, the narrative becomes critical. It is worth watching how Nawab Bahadur and Ronny are contrastingly detailed:

Seeming to pull himself together, he apologized slowly and elaborately for the accident. Ronny murmured, 'Not at all', but apologies were his due, and should have started sooner: because English people are so calm at a crisis, it is not to be assumed that they are unimportant. The Nawab Bahadur had not come out very well (88).

The dichotomizing or Othering in order to make the coloniser superior in attitude and character and showing the facility and inappropriateness of the

native is followed throughout the novel. Narayan Godbole, the Hindu, who never kept his work and was superstitious, is looked at with suspicion. When he appeals before the two visitors, Mrs. Moore and Ms. Adela, he is described as reflecting composure, where the East and the West met mentally and physically, but the narrative that follows lets him down. "The ladies were interested in him, and hoped that he would supplement Dr. Aziz by saying something about religion. But he only ate – ate and ate, smiling, never letting his eyes catch sight of his hand" (71).

In contrast when Mr. McBryde, the district Superintendent of Police, is introduced, euphemisms like 'most reflective and best educated of the Chandrapore officials', who had evoked "a complete philosophy of life" etc. are used. He is described as a very understanding type of a person and his attitude is very interesting. After arresting Aziz he is not accusing him, he shows sympathy; "Mr. McBryde was shocked at his downfall, but no Indian ever surprised him, because he had a theory about climatic zones. The theory ran: "All unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, for the simple reason that they live south of latitude 30. They are not to blame, they have not a dog's chance. We should be like them if we settle here". Born in Karachi, he seemed to contradict his theory, "and would sometimes admit as much with a sad, quiet smile" (164).

The climatic attitude runs parallel to the narrator's own concept of climatic zones and poetry. All these characters Ronny, Major Callander, Mr. McBryde, and Colonel Muggs belong to category of what Memmi calls "Coloniser who accepts". "A coloniser is, after all, only a coloniser who agrees to be a coloniser. By making his position explicit, he seeks to legitimize colonization" (45). And to legitimize it he uses all possible ideologies. McBryde describes the supposed crime of Aziz to show the difference between the two.

How should you? When you think of crime you think of English crime. The psychology here is different. I dare say you'll tell me next that he was quite normal when he came down from the hill to greet you (166).

Using such narrative devices Forster has been able to accomplish two purposes. It, first of all, gives him the scope to show how the Anglo-Indians despise and shun Indians, while on their part the Indian mistrust and misjudge the British and ^{secondly} how the gulf between the two is widening and becoming unbridgeable. Forster authoritatively takes a superior position, as that of being a visitor, to judge both ^{the} Indian and the Anglo-Indians. English at home looked down upon the Anglo-Indians as another class, a class that is inferior to home dwellers. And being superior he can judge upon the Anglo-Indian also.

Most of the characters, in the novel, Indians or Anglo-Indians, are vividly pictured in the novel; no doubt can linger on that fact. When the question of characters is concerned we are prompted to enquire, of what kind are they? I have proved in my analysis that the Indians in the novel are beyond doubt miserable creatures, feeble, servile, dishonest, unhygienic, treacherous, and insipid or what all negatives one would gather. They are shown in relation to Anglo-Indians who are shown definitely as being superior. Many critics making a value judgment of Forster's intellectual characters and attitude expected and of course imposed on their own these values to the novel. They were interested only ⁱⁿ the surface level of the novel and misjudged the Anglo-Indians, the representation of ruling race is depicted with severity and they also saw that Forster is being sympathetic to Indians. How far it is true is now explained. He has not done so, he has valorized in the subtext the chivalry and "white man's burden" attitude within the context of discourse and demeaned all that can be Indian in the novel.

Forster makes an ironical statement in the novel. 'God si love' is this the final message of India" (28). Before concluding he tries with zeal to find out what India is, "They sang not even to the God who confronted them, but to a saint, they did not one thing which the non-Hindu would feel dramatically correct; this approaching triumph of India was a muddle (as we call it) a translation of reason and form" (280). The pertinent question is who are this we? And, it is everybody's guess that it is the colonialist.

However, whosoever looks into this novel to find what Forster found in India, it is a simple statement that Christianity had known for ages. The attitude is explicit here, there is nothing in India, the Orientalist is fed up in his quest for Eastern spiritualism, and it gives him nothing. And finally he understands at the end of his spiritual tether: "Perhaps life is a mystery, not a muddle; they would not tell perhaps the hundred Indians which fun and squabble so tiresomely are one, and the universe they mirror is one. They had not the apparatus for judging" (256).

All the Indian qualified to be a part of a colonizer's depiction become a mass of ignoble vermins, following the long drawn Kiplingquese tradition of looking at India as a mob. Forster, categorically, did not dismiss ^{the} Indian_^ into a mob character, but went the other way round to find out that they all lack character and is just nothing but a mob **without** identity. In the discourse of the novel Ronny passes his judgment: "I am afraid, so. Incredible aren't they, even the best of them? They are all – they all forget their back collar stands sooner or later. You've had to do with three sets of Indians to-day, the Bhattacharya, Aziz and this chap, and it really isn't a coincidence that they've all let you down." (93).

They all let you down, they are a mob devoid of character, and you are foolish to look for dignity and honor in them. They are self-deceived they are dishonest, they have no self-discipline they need to be judged and who can do

that, well all white people. The Indian thinks, as the author perceives in his discourse, that someone showing sympathy would be a good judge. As I have given in the epigraph of his chapter, the novelist like Fielding wanted to sleek through the political question. Aziz in the novel thinks on numerous occasions, "No Englishman understands us except Mr. Fielding" (98). We all by now know how Fielding judged Indians as a mob.

Cyril tries to tell Aziz how foolish he is and tries to convince him with "irrefragable logic," that he had not married Miss Adela Quested but Heaslop's sister. It all came to no use then. Cyril recognizes "he had built his life on a mistake, but he had built it" (298).

The final statements in the novel is imbued with imperial instincts, which has a taste of the counter narration that is evolving in grand narrative of national upheaval:

They cantered past a temple to God so loved the world that he look monkey's flesh upon him – and past a saivite temple, which incited to lust, but under the semblance of eternity, its obscenities bearing no relation to those of our flesh and blood (316).

These statements rarely need explanation for any Indian who can understand the profound philosophy of life imbued into these spiritual myths and the pregnant nature of the Shiva linga, the life producing energy where nature and

source of life unite. If these facts are recognized, then what is the legitimacy in imperial rule, this for Forster was an endeavor for the enlightenment of the natives.

The final political statements also reveal imperial narratives being used by the author:

"Who do you want instead of the English? The Japanese?" jeered Fielding, drawing rein.

"No, the Afghans, My own ancestors."

"Oh, your Hindu friends will take that, won't they?"

"It will be arranged – a conference of Oriental statesman."

"It will indeed be arranged" (317).

The dialogue continues where both parties are in an imperative mood to make their own stand: clear and vivid to the other. The all knowing, "understanding", Fielding feels that Indians are a race destined to be subdued and ruled, either by Afghans, British or Japanese, ultimately what he means or believes, so too - as we can make out the author too, is that Indian are incapable of ruling. They need somebody from outside to govern, reinforcing the old colonial dictum of good governance narratives.

V

In the history of a nation there is a possibility of division of the literature that it produces in various forms and the Anglo-Indian writing on India can also be classified into temporary periods. Bhupal Singh in the work, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*, classifies Anglo-Indian novels into three periods. The first period begins with the Governor-Generalship of Warren Hastings and ends with the Indian Mutiny. The second period is from the Mutiny to the death of Queen Victoria and the publication of *Kim* in 1901. And, the third period begins from 1905 and according to Singh it still is continuing. In my opinion Forster's novel, *A Passage to India*, written during the early periods of the Gandhian era of Indian struggle for freedom, can be seen as a landmark of change that followed Anglo-Indian Fiction. After Forster's *A Passage to India*, two ideas dominated, on a grand scale, in the Anglo-Indian fiction, as Sujit Mukherjee says in *Forster and Further*: "One would foresee that British rule in India would end, someday soon, other novels continued to rest on the permanence of empire or at least indefinite prolongation of British rule" (45). Not many novels that could encompass a discourse of colonial context emerged in the narratives, mostly the narratives concentrated around Indian princes and nawabs, and the relation they had with Anglo-Indians. Philip Mason, who tried to give a reflection on British methods of justice or on Indian analysis of truth: J. R. Ackereley, who attempted an "Indian India" picture, A. E. R. Craig, missionary Edward

Thompson, who termed himself a prisoner of India, of Dennis Kincaid for that matter not many could give much of a valuable piece of work during the period, but together they form a recognizable collection of works.

The "prophetic" fiction, that the British would rule India forever, lost its ground with India's freedom and division. Concentration shifted now from prophecy to retrospective analysis. H. E. Bates, Polan Banks, John Masters and Gerard N. Hanley created these types of novels. The "Mutiny" of 1857, or the First War of Independence, lurked in the narratives of the 1980s. These novels also attempted a picture of princely states and the Muslims. That Muslim depicted is seldom a nationalist Muslim is evident (Sujit Mukherjee, 1993). Among these writers, who look in retrospect, Paul Scott stands apart from all of them for his sincerity to what he is trying to say.

His novels are about the loss of paradise and he tries to show how the British conquered India, but not Indians.¹¹

As Ian Baucom says in "Mournful Histories: Narratives of Post-imperial Melancholy":

The Modern English literature of nostalgia is vast. Melancholy and loss are among the most privileged tropes of a romantic and post-romantic canon of English letters, as in the image of the backward glancing English man or woman, domestic avatar of Walter Benjamin's Angel of History, turning a resentful back on

the present and a teary eye toward the image of a vanishing England (271).

There is a lot of space lying, between the imaginary molestation of Adela Quested in the Marabar caves and the gang rape of Daphne Manners in the Bibighar garden, which is filled with deliberations that tries to account for the colonial rule. Paul Scott in *The Day of the Scorpion* reanalyzes the neurotic colonial situation depicted in *A Passage to India*.¹² Scott is unconscious of the Forster lying within his ideological permutations.

The novel, *The Day of the Scorpion*, published in the year 1968 looks at the colonial context of the 1942-47, often a flash back into the histories of 1910s and '20s are also made. The look back is a new ordering of the historical context exposing the limitations of colonial management, it is a tentative re-ordering of aspects from a cultural context wherein the author is relaxed and he recollects the neurotic situation from an objective point of view. Even then that the novel is imbued with colonial narrative strategies is a fact and it can be discerned by the thought structure involved in capitalizing the colonial discursive situation attempted in the novel. Jenny Sharpe in, *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*, writes that the novel is "a mourning for the loss of empire that masquerades as self-criticism, a resurrection of the civilizing mission from its ashes (. . .) both a

self-conscious reflection on and a 'muted-celebration of Britain's imperial past" (qtd. in Suvir Kaul, 1996: 87).

Bhagban Prakash in *Indian Themes in English Fiction: A socio-literary Study* states that

In the Anglo-Indian society the rigid attitude to sex and mixed marriage with the Indians had relaxed. (. . .) The myth had served its purpose for so long and no could be discarded as there was also no need for armouring one-self against a supposedly hostile environment (185).

His analysis closes many possibilities of readings to the text of Paul Scott. His reading of *Jewel in the Crown* is limited by his love for the author he studies. He observes only admiration on the part of Scott for his Indian characters and Bhagban Prakash reciprocates it by eulogizing all that Scott said in the novel. His reading is not a postcolonial reading hence I have not used to further my arguments in this thesis.

In my opinion, Paul Scott is following Forster or Forster as a writer was expecting Scott. Scott recollects and justifies what Forster had foreseen, therefore the myth continues even in Paul Scott. D.C.R.A. Goonetilleke in *Images of the Raj* suggests that: " Not only does Scott ring a significant change on Forster (*among other differences, his rape is real whereas Forster's is imagined*) he creates a worthy epic. The quality of his writing

does not work on the level of greatness of Forster's and he does not always suffer by comparison with him – for instance on the question of scale" (130) (emphasis mine).

I intent to make a 'comparison', in a very limited sense of the word, not on the question of scale, but on the study of question of rape. I would like to quote another critic Sujit Mukherjee, in *Forster and Further*; Mukherjee is astonished of the fact that a rape is the central theme of the *Raj Quartet*, that too of an Anglo-Indian woman. Apart from the willing sexual contact of Daphne Manners and Hari Kumar, an Indian, before the incident of rape or the connection of adultery of Bibighar garden itself there is something more to the rape of Miss Manners by six Hindu Youths. Mukherjee states:

I have often felt there is a very different reason for Scott's excessively careful handling of the incident – he was afraid of it simply because it could not be made credible. And it cannot be made credible because during the whole history of Indo–British relations up to 1947 one seldom hears of a case where an Englishwoman, despite much provocation and many opportunities, was ever sexually assaulted by one or more Indian men. Neither the uprising of 1857, for example, nor the disturbances of 1942 caused such a happening. Englishwomen

were better guarded in 1942; in 1857 they were killed indiscriminately but never dishonored (153).

Mukherjee continues to suggest that Paul Scott knew that he was taking a risk by following a happy fulfillment of physical union with an outrage of multiple rapes. He also states this episode was one of the many misadventures of British in India. If taken to the psychological level of criticism, it gives a different picture. Here, I would like to recall the statement that Sara Suleri made in "The Geography of *A Passage to India*": "To approach the Indian fictions of the modern West is indeed to confront a secret attack on difference, and to reread the text that is *A Passage to India*"(108). Sara Suleri continues to state that, "It thus becomes that archetypal novel of modernity that co-opts the space reserved for India in the Western literary imagination, so the all subsequent novels on the Indian theme appear secretly obsessed with the desire to describe exactly what transpired in the Marabar caves" (108). *A Passage to India* in this sense is *a historical a priori* in the Foucaultian sense. Foucault says in *Archeology of knowledge*,

Juxtaposed these two words produce a rather startling effect; what I mean by the term is an *a priori* that is not a condition for validity of judgments, but a condition of reality of statements. It is not a question of rediscovering what might legitimize an assertion, but of freeing the conditions of emergence of

statements, the law of their co-existence with others, the specific form of their mode of being the principles according to which they survive, become transformed, and disappear. *An a priori* not of truths that might never be said, or really given to experience; but the *a priori* of a history that is given, since it is that of things actually said (127).

The mystic, erotic, horrific land that India was in European narratives since the 16th century or even before are finding their ultimate version in Paul Scott. Suvir Kaul, in her article, "Colonial Figures and Postcolonial Reading" critiques Jenny Sharpe's work, *Allegories of Empire*, to suggest that the rape of Daphne Manners in the *Raj Quartet* has its seeds in the racial memory of "the Sepoy Rebellion" or "Indian Mutiny":

In 1857 colonial narratives of the revolt insisted on featuring the violation of English womanhood even though magistrates "commissioned to investigate the so-called eyewitnesses report could find no evidence to substantiate the rumors of rebels raping, torturing and mutilating English women" (83).

Suvir Kaul insists that Anglo-Indian fiction that followed the "Sepoy Mutiny", "Enshrined these reports and made rape a figure for the colonial fear of the colonized but (potentially or actually) insurrectionary masses" (83). Kaul

quotes Jenny Sharpe to say, "rape is not a consistent signifier but one that surfaces at strategic moment" (83).

The rape of Daphne Manners in *The Raj Quartet* is thus a re-invocation of the racist memory to serve a special purpose that is to create a situation to justify the colonial rule.

Goonetilleke in *Images of the Raj*, suggests that Scott is very bold in bringing in a case of rape, "Kipling, Leonard Wolf and Orwell portrayed Englishmen having sexual relations with native women but Paul Scott possesses the extraordinary boldness to depict a sexual relationship the other way round" (143). The question of sexual relationship between ^{the} British and Indian, as I have already discussed, was a very complicated one in the light of the statement by Merrick, a character in *The Day of the Scorpion*, I find that it is made explicit;

They are connected," [Sarah: "The social pressure that keeps the ruled at arm's length from the rulers, or the biological pressure that makes a white girl think she mightn't like being touched by an Indian? (217)".] He said. "If you visualize such an action, or if you consider its counterpart, the connection is quite clear. A white man, well, supposing I - or Teddie - I mean if one's tastes ran that way, to marry an Indian woman, or live with her. He would not be what is the right word? Diminished? He wouldn't

feel that people would not really feel it, of him either. He has the dominant role whatever the colour of his partner's skin" (217).

The argument is autocratic and obviously reveals an attitude. Bhupal Singh in *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction* has dealt with this theme in detail. He states that Anglo-Indian had definite view on the marriage of countrymen in India:

Anglo-India condemns mixed marriage. (. . .) An Englishman who marries an Indian girl is pitied, and Anglo-India does all it can to prevent such a mesalliance. A romantic English girl who commits the folly of marrying an Indian gentleman is ostracized and regarded as dead by Anglo-India (21).

Incidentally, in Paul Scott's novel, the "raped" Daphanne Manners is transported and dies in the process of giving birth to the hybrid, Parvathi Manners. Thus, reiterating the recurrence of the pattern. Forster was careful, sneaky and always wanted to avoid political interpretations; Scott has the leisure of being unnoticed or rather less noticed with passion and zeal since Indians are relaxed after independence. The geographical regaining of Indian Territory by Indians gave them a victor's mentality, which made them complacent, and novels that came from Anglo-Indian side after independence are not seriously studied. How Scott was re-examining the situation to release

the tension that the colonialist "writing mind" had inherited thus remained "unnoticed."

Suvir Kaul in "Colonial Figures and Postcolonial Reading", contends that, "Criminal designations are central to the fertile colonial production of ideologically and administratively normative discourses of race, theories and paradigms of racial differences"(84). This is a kind of reproduction of the conditioned attitude where the English woman is rapable – the British fear – and the English man takes up the role of adjudicator who punishes and retaliates. Kaul believes that, "These become narrative tokens whose circulation defines an important aspect of the cultural and 'civilizational' burdens of colonialism" (84).

The rapable English woman, who mingles with the native, is a trope of narrative that continues in various shades throughout the narratives. The fear lurks in an uncanny narrative that reproduces and finds release in the imagination through the action of an Englishman. Suvir Kaul further suggests that, "The events of 1857 structured colonial policy and narratives, and they continue to provide – in Scott's novels and elsewhere - the central figures of a nominally anti-imperialist, postcolonial position. Historical memory dies hard, and the critical excavation of its palimpsest, over determined forms depends a sustained awareness of the circumstances of their origination and reception" (87).

Goonetilleke continues to argue in *Images of the Raj*, that "He (Scott) gets beyond Forster too in this respect; Forster merely hints at the attraction Aziz holds for Adela and the rape in his novel is a hallucination" (143). I disagree with Goonetilleke and argue that Aziz as a figure was not attracted to Adela. Aziz remarks in *A Passage to India*, "However, she was not beautiful she had practically no breast, if you come to think of it" (17). E. M. Forster is caught up in two minds, which makes it difficult for him to state anything clearly. Forster through out the novel takes an ambiguous position that reveals little about the realities. Therefore, assuming that Aziz is attracted to Adela may mislead any critiquing of the novel. The hallucination is for the British and it is from that neurotic state that they need explanation and reasoning: hence, these types of narratives. It is a psychological compulsion out of a historical condition, a trauma created by the development of an unreal consciousness, the colonialist consciousness. When Goonetilleke says that, "Scott brings out the complexities and tensions in such a relationship," (143) he is suggesting that a question that emerged from the time of Kipling, or I may assume even before, through Forster is finding a release of tension in Scott. It comes only after the geographical withdrawal, never before. Goonetilleke writes:

They consummate their love in the Bibighar Gardens but, soon after, Daphnne is raped. Daphnne's rape has been interpreted as a symbol of the rape of India by the British. But Salman

Rushdie is right: "if a rape must be used as the metaphor of the Indo – British connection, then, surely, in the interests of accuracy, it should be the rape of an Indian woman by one or more Englishmen of whatever class(. . .) ." Rather, Daphne's rape is a symbol of the impossibility of interracial sex relations and the inappositeness of naïve liberalism, in a colonial context (143).

It is not a symbol of impossibility of interracial sex relation but an overarching hallucination in the form of an artistic creation, a consciousness that developed traversing the colonial period. The colonial consciousness has in its very inception certain contraries which affect the conscience of the colonialist, making him neurotic. The physical union that was happily consummated is a reality, an action, that western patriarchy could not digest, therefore, inevitably a rape, a gang rape, follows it. In a case of gang rape the faces do not carry identity, they are just rapists, the incident re-invokes the mob image of India that was there in colonial narratives. It is English fear getting projected in artistic terms. The idea is one that needed realization in order to escape the fear that the colonialist possessed. It can also be argued that by imaginatively producing a fear in artistic term, the attempt is to find an outlet to the pre-logically conceived phobic condition of the colonizer.

The trial of Hari Kumar and the brutal description of torture inflicted upon him (*The Day of the Scorpion*, 238-352) by Merrick are all an antidote to release the repressed fears and doubts that the British had in India. The unuttered fear in *A Passage to India*, the supposed, unclarified attempt of rape is fully visualized in the novel, *The Day of the Scorpion*. The supposed rapists are arrested and Hari Kumar is tortured sadistically. This novel too carries the clumsy narrative patterns where the facts are never clear. India remains a mystery, a muddle, the Western role is more muddled and confused. The writing mind of Britain has to find an outlet to the obsessive fear that India's fictionality generated. The imagined violence of a gang rape and the imagined torture that follows all have a relaxing effect on the colonizer who ~~was~~ and ~~is~~ much affected by the loss of the colony.

The situation exposes the fact that these are discursive ploys to release the fears that were there in the British consciousness. The information that Lady Manners never appears to give evidence, that Merrick is not interested in releasing Hari Kumar, but inflicting torture, and that there is yet another group, like Aunt Fenny, who sympathize and try to understand suggest the narrative subterfuge. The rape is mystified, there are no answers to the reality; even the act of rape is doubtful, the only evidence is that a Eurasian is born, Parvati Manners, but whether as a result of happy physical union or rape remain^s undisclosed.
[^]

We can extend the figure of Adela Quested of *A Passage to India*, who was enticed by the charm of Aziz, and compare her with Lady Manners. The relationship that shows signs of beginning but never realized is that of Sarah Layton and Ahmed Kasim. The question of relation between ^{an} English woman and an Indian man is deliberated in the context to expose the reality. The "sensible" English woman, Sarah, listens to the English arguments and withdraws herself from the relation and she is safe. The dialogue between Aunt Fenny and Sarah Layton reveals the fact that the question of how Indian man – English women relation haunts the British consciousness. The rape case of Dhapne Manners, which functions as a backdrop to this analysis, and that, makes it more conspicuous:

"He is perfectly pleasant man," Aunt Fenny said, "and I understand his brother is an officer. But these days one simply can't tell what these young Indians are up to, let alone what they're thinking".

"Perhaps they find the same difficulty in regard to us".

"Yes, perhaps they do. But on the whole, my dear, we ought not to be let that concern us. We have responsibilities that let us out of trying to see ourselves as they see us. In any case it would be a waste of time. To establish a relationship with

Indians you can only afford to be yourself and let them like it or lump it".

"Yes" Sarah, said. " I suppose you're right. But out here are we ever really ourselves? " (15).

The British fear here works on two levels. On the one level they feel their women are uncontrollable and they may go after Indian men, they should be dissuaded and the arguments regarding that are placed. On the other level both the Indian men and the English women are uncontrollable: and if they pursue with their relations that will bring disaster to both parties concerned.

The colonial trauma brought about by displacement, disjunction and disparity, fears of a neurotic, the restraint of the animosity of human nature etc, in the narratives of colonization contributed to bring back the self dissipating echoes in the Marabar caves to all narratives that followed it. The echo is an European fear, the essential condition of colonial neurosis; sexual anxiety is predominant here.

Indian Characters

Pandit Baba's rhetoric allows the writer to reveal many assumed aspects from the Indian point of view that the writer conceived Indians had faith in. The dialogue between Pandit Baba and Ahmed Kasim, son of Kasim shows the division between the two religious, "Hindu and Muslim". The

rhetoric of Pandit Baba, with its philosophic and theological reference is used by the author to show the confusion that it brings about and eventually showing the confusion that a Hindu is to British. In the novel Scott writes, "In India everybody spoke metaphorically except the English who spoke bluntly and could make their most transparent lies look honest on consequence; whereas any truth contained in these metaphorical rigmarole was so deviously presented that it looked devious itself" (102).

Pandit Baba is unlike Godbole in only two ways. Pandit Baba appears to be very systematic in his discourses but very unsystematic when it comes to program the realities. He remains within his rigmaroles; Hinduist fundamentalism is linked through his image. Godbole is not systematic in his discourse, he never spoke to any credit and his programs were only dreams, he was a hypocrite to the core. For both Forster and Scott their Hindu figures, Godbole and Pandit Baba respectively were an enigma. Forster is more pungent and critical but Scott appears to have polished the tools of criticism. D.C.R.A. Goonetilleke in *Images of the Raj* had commented:

The philosophical considerations in the novel are important, but to regard them as forming its central theme is to miss the main life of the fiction. The novel is rooted in the colonial context, though its significance is not limited to it. The racial and social connections of each character, whether British or Indians,

matter in his or her affairs within or outside his or her group; these connections matter in the conversation, actions, thoughts and feelings of everyone. The theme of racial relations bulk much larger than the philosophical consideration and the latter forms an integral part of it (80).

Hari Kumar is created as a figure who is a hybrid, never having a world of his own. That it is towards him that the torture is afflicted reveals the attitude of the British toward the educated class. We can see a development of attitude traversing the whole development of colonial education from Macaulay to the present. The enlightenment project intended to bring civilization to the colony produced a site of hybridity resulting in mimicry. As Homi Bhabha says in, *Location of culture*, "Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*" (86). This creates not recognizable other but a formidable opposition that threatens the colonialist's role in the colony. The fear that he has towards this hybrid figure creates violence on the part of the colonialist. Merrick does it on Hari Kumar. Bhabha has said, in the same work "The Menace of mimicry is its *double* vision which is disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (88). This is the predicament of the colonized's consciousness, as Goonetilleke had mentioned, "He is too English for the Indians, too Indian for the English" (144). Hari Kumar thus becomes a menace to be controlled and convicted. The

fruits of post-Enlightenment education project that these men were thus appear as a result of liberation spirit infused into them. The British fear this class because they can wrest power and the British women from the British.

Struggling against non-violence

The novel though published in 1968 bears certain dichotomous tendencies, which inevitably is an effort to secure superior position to English people. The narrative tone of the novel is that of a defeated person trying to explain what went wrong and how, it is a reminiscence of a neurotic experience. The non-violent struggle that India adopted became unmanageable for the British. Their violent nature betrayed them before the enemy with this new weaponry.

The whole novel is a struggle against non-violent struggle that Gandhi adopted. The soul force or 'shakti' that became the energy of non-violent struggle created fissures in colonial narratives. The justification of colonial rule in India, which resorted to brutal violent actions, under the veneer of superior civility was disrupted. The violent rule expected violent encounter and when they found that it is not available they invent it. In the novel Merrick, the District Superintendent of Police invents cases, creates logical arguments for violence to erupt. It is projection by a neurotic; an unreality is given the picture of reality in the imagination.

The game that Gandhi was playing was finding its echoes in narratives that the British were creating. The formidable challenge Gandhian non-violent struggle afforded was never acknowledged but discarded as being old and outworn. The narrator says in *The Day of the Scorpion*, "In India only one kind of rebellion was possible, and that kind had become a old man's game. They had played it a long time and it wasn't over yet. The game and the men had grown old together and India had grown old with them "(474).

The narrative strategy takes a new turn after independence to emphasize that India can never be modern in colonial narratives. Even if it acquires Western knowledge or ideas it is rather degraded by stating that Indians acquired the past of the West. Therefore, India always follows Britain, Britain being modern at every age. Clarke observes in the novel: "Nehru and that lot, all the liberal upper and bourgeois middle class of India they're one hundred percent old-fashioned west. And it's all as dead as yesterday isn't it?"(474)

Mahatma Gandhi and his teammates gave the imperialists different game plans and scored and won. The reality seems rather too indigestible to the novelist. There are two aspects I want to touch upon before I conclude. The first is the imaginary fear that the novelist wants to project through Count Boronswsky, the Russian. It is again a discursive strategy on the part of the novelist to bring a Russian to comment upon the British attitude. The second,

the justification of General Dyer's action in Jallianwallah Bagh in the novel through the assumed subject position of Sir Ahmed Akbar, an Indian.

The novelist writes this novel with the knowledge that India had gained freedom. And that fact makes it more important to analyze the words of Clarke, who appears in the novel to make very critical and crucial statements. He makes observations like "That's India', Clarke commented, "the internal combustion engine in confrontation with a creature evolved from the primeval slime' " (417). He makes another observation that again suggests a whole lot of realities:

You can expect a general election in England in the summer of 1946 at the latest, and the socialists will get in because the common soldier and the factory worker will put them in. Lopping off India in an article of faith with the socialists but when they see that keeping it doesn't pay they'll lop it double-quick. Who wants India's starving millions as one of what we'll all call our post-war problems? (419).

In a moment of realization the colonizer recognizes that if it doesn't pay he will leave the starving millions. It is not true. The Indian condition, the counter hegemonic struggles in a predominantly non-violent mode were destroying the roots of colonial assumptions. The novelist uses a Russian, Count Bronowsky, in the polyphonic diversity of the novel to suggest the

implications of non-violent struggle. He appears to look upon both Indian and British nature at the same time. He advises Ahmed Kasim, son of Mohammed Ali Kasim, in a very crucial juncture of events:

"You shouldn't be afraid of your emotions," Bronowsky continued. "In any case to be afraid of them is un-Indian. Now there's a danger for you if you like. Young men ought to watch out for it - losing your Indianness. It's a land of extremes, after all, it needs men with extremes of temperament. All this Western sophistication, plus the non-Western cult of non-violence, is utterly unnatural. One without the other might do but the combination of the two strikes disastrous. After all the sophistication of the Western is a veneer. Underneath it *we are a violent people*. But you Indians see no deeper than our surface" (emphasis mine 90).

The Russian, all of a sudden assumes the collective Western "we" position. The unnaturality of non-violent versus violent combination is a menace to the colonizer. The menace is created by colonial hybridity generated by various colonial policies. The Western mind could never understand the depth of the psychological game that Gandhi was playing (will be discussed later). The novelist introduces a subject from another nation, Russia – that too communist, to comment up on the aspect. The comments made by Merrick,¹

has to be re-read together with what Bronowsky says to find out how the West was earning for violence on the part of ^{the} Indians. They were expecting ^{violence, so that they} could suppress it and enjoy the gratification involved in the perpetuation of violence, Count Bronowsky continues his advice:

On the other hand if you announced your intention to fast unto death if they don't release your father they'll let you get on with it. They'd feed you forcibly. They'd be furious with you for attempting moral blackmail. I must say I'd sympathize with them. *Non-violence is ridiculous. I'm not in favour of it* (emphasis mine 91) .

The question of non-violence is impertinent in this novel; it creates narrative fissure which the novelist is not able to contain. The intention of the author becomes more explicit when I analyze the justification afforded to Jallianwallah Bagh incident along with the attitude to non-violence. The violence that the novelist tries to infuse into Indian mind through Bronowsky reveal the sudden fissure that non-violent struggle could create in the colonial mind, and the justification of General Dyer's action is again a justification of violence, or the British consciousness recognizes a necessity for violence.

It is hard to believe that the justification of General Dyer is in a novel where the question of a gang rape is deliberated is a coincidence because General Dyer's action in 1919 followed the attack on Miss Sherwood, an

English missionary. Suvir Kaul writes in "Colonial Figures and Postcolonial Readings":

Eight months of public protests were required to force the British Government to initiate an inquiry; colonial English men and women overwhelmingly supported Dyer, arguing that he had suppressed a second mutiny and prevented English women "from being subjected to 'unspeakable horrors' ". Sharpe recreates this history, and analyses the discourse surrounding the Jallianwallah massacre, as a prelude to a superb reading of E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. She notes that Forster (after his stay in India in 1912-13) had intended to write an interracial love story of an Indian man and an English woman, but on his return to India in 1921 found the country to have changed to admit of that narrative. Jallianwallah Bagh and other political events had overtaken Forster, Sharpe suggests had caused him to re-imagine the details of the relationship between colonized man and colonial women: thus the "story of an interracial rape, more explosive by far, plays out the tension between a dissenting native population and a defensive White minority" (87).

The question of rape and the question of Indians being violent to Europeans were in the European imagination. Out of the fear and anxiety of being pitied against an overwhelmingly native population, who looked at the British imagination, created fears that find their echoes in the narratives. It becomes obvious in the novel that though the British recognizes the Indian claims of civilization, the collective consciousness of the rulers denied any space for union between the two communities. The imagined fear of the Western mind created contexts and situations in which cruelty was inflicted on Indians. The colonial neurosis is reflected in these all narratives, the novel *The Day of the Scorpion* is none too different from the traditional colonial narrative.

The novel attempts a justification of the violent actions on the part of the British because the very relevance of violence on the part of the British became a crucial experience in the British mind. The action of General Dyer was the most cruel and most evident revelation of the imperial atrocity. In the struggle to maintain hegemony over India, this action proved detrimental. The effect altogether gets projected in all narratives that came after that incident; the British had a mind that was vulnerable. Goontilleke observes in *Images of the Raj*:

There are many references to General Dyer and the Amritsar massacre, rightly because it was perhaps as decisive a turning point in British–Indian relation as the mutiny. In fact, Brigadier

Reid excuses Dyer and the conservative British thought, "He'd saved the poor old Empire." But others among the British "blamed him for turning Gandhi against us, "while Mabel Layton contributed to the funds Indians raised for the widows and orphans of the people Dyer shot (141).

The question of Dyer's action vibrates in the novel. It can be seen as an answer to non-violence. Mabel Layton states, "The choice was made for me when we took the country over and got the idea we did so for its own sake instead of ours. Dyer can look after himself, but according to the rules the browns can't because looking after them is what we get paid for" (61). The words are strong and assertive and suggest violence in its very form. It is shown that violence is essentially a part of bringing in order. The British enforce the law and order because the browns cannot rule on their own. The argument continues to assert that if children and women are looked after then their fathers and husbands can be killed.

It is an Indian, Sir Ahmed Akbar, who literally justified the act in a novel written by a Britishman. He believes that Jallianwalla Bagh was not a new experience and that the Indian congress cannot ensure that it will not be a new experience and that the Indian congress cannot ensure that it will not be repeated. According to him it is sincerity that propelled the atrocious act on the part of General Dyer.

You think Jallianwalla Bagh proves that the British were lying, taking freedom but acting tyrannically and leading destruction? Again you are wrong. Jallianwallah could never have happened if the British who talk freedom were not sincere. It happened because they are sincere. They have frightened their opponents with their sincerity (. . .) (62).

The question of sincerity turns out to a full rhetoric of impassioned justification of Dyer, "Why do you call that man a monster? He believed God had charged him with a duty to save the empire" (62). For Scott's Akbar, ~~the~~ English are not hypocrites: "You can only charge them with sincerity and of being divided among themselves about what it is right to be sincere about. It is only an insincere people that can be accused of hypocrisy" (62).

The cheque given by an Englishwoman is highlighted to show the philanthropy of the ruling class. Akbar becomes a figure of passion to advocate for British attitudes and actions. In the fictional realm of Paul Scott it assumes great propensity of importance. The episode is a self-confession and an attempt to wash off a long drawn out mental agony of the English, the Jallianwallah incident. The guilty consciousness of the colonizer is finding recourse in certain justifications. The gruesome incident is recollected, analyzed and justified and dismissed. It gives more confidence to the mind to believe that someone or some sections of the opposition or sufferers too

recognize the "reality" – that the oppressor's cruelty was for the sake of the oppressed!

The novel, *The Day of Scorpion*, by Paul Scott reveals one crucial aspect. There is a writing mind or consciousness that colonialists possessed. The working of this consciousness, developed out of a human collectivity, can be discerned using tools of postcolonial analyses to show the working of the mind. Ideologically it retains the old dichotomy of the colonial ruler and the colonized. Colonialism in India essentially was a neurotic condition for the colonialist. The neurosis is developed by their creation of split attitudes. It had its beginnings in the beginning of the colonial narratives in the beginning of colonialism. Essentially, fear and anxiety dominated colonialist endeavors. The projected fears in these artistic creations have a therapeutic effect on the consciousness, doubly inflicted by loss on the geographical level and on the psychic level. Colonial narratives have a framework, a set of rules, certain assumptions, and unchangeable prejudices. The framework incorporates a consciousness that evolves contextually. Racial prejudices, superiority complex, anxiety and fear, sense of sacrifice are woven into its texture.

A Passage to India and *The Day of Scorpion* though separated by half a century show certain common characteristics as I have shown in my analysis. The projection of legitimacy of colonial rule, the assumed racial superiority of colonialists, certain complexes and fears that the colonialist had and

nourished are all found in both novels. The former novel finds a fulfillment in the latter novel and the latter novel attempts a justification of certain attitudes of the former. The colonial consciousness of Gandhian era was split, they wanted to hang on to the ideologies that it created but was opposed by the strong currents of ideologies that emerged by the colonized; which revealed the bogus nature of colonial values. The agon that developed psychologically affected the colonialist consciousness making it neurotic. The novelist was projecting certain elements of culture in order to produce an ideological terrain. The selection and distribution of these artifacts reveal the colonial bent of mind that the colonised possessed. He was describing the situation which reveals certain facts and the revealing exposes his attitude.

Notes

-
- ¹ John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty Representative Government* (London, 1957), (Quoted in Thomas. R. Metcalf's *Ideologies of the Raj* pp. 31-34). CUP. 1998.
- ² Thomas. R. Metcalf. *Ideologies of the Raj*. pp. 81-91.
- ³ Lalun, is the protagonist of the story "On the city wall" by Rudyard Kipling.
- ⁴ Thomas. R. Metcalf. pp.35. OUP: 1998 and Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary study and British rule in India*. New York: Columbia, University Press, 1989, p. 55-56. ² *Ideologies of the Raj*.
- ⁵ Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Other Essays*, Monthly Review Press pp. 142-181.
- ⁶ Teresa Hubel. *Whose India? The Indian independence struggle as described in British and Indian, fiction and history*. Leicester University Press, 1998, p.22-23, 27-34.
- ⁷ Edward Said too points out the same fact in *Culture and Imperialism*, and I have mentioned about that in this chapter, when he describes the unidentified bird that Ronny and Adela watch.
- ⁸ Vivekananda in his talks at Harvard University has explained that Westerners cannot understand maya because they take it as being a synonym of illusion. The all pervading nature of maya creating illusion and delusion can never be explained through Western terminologies alone
- ⁹ Miss. Quested thin, dark object reared on the end at the farther side of a water course, and said, " A Snake!" the villagers agreed, and Aziz explained: "yes, a black cobra, very venomous, who had reared himself up to watching the passing of the elephants. But when she looks through Ronny's field glasses, she found it wasn't a snake, but the withered and twisted stump of a toddy palm. So she said, ' It isn't a snake'" The villagers contradicted her. She had put the word in to their minds, and they refused to abandon it. Aziz admitted he look like a tree through the glasses, but insisted that it was a black cobra really and improvised some rubbish about protective mimicry. Nothing was explained, and yet there was no romance. Films of heat, radiated from the Kawa Dol precipices, increased the confusion (139).
- ¹⁰ "Nirad Chaudhuri cannot forgive Forster for (a) not having used a Hindu protagonist, (b) not having chosen his Indian types happily, (c) not offering a solution to the problem of Indo-British personal relations, (d) not writing about the nationalist movement against the British. In other words he condemns Forster for not writing a book that could be prescribed for a course in modern Indian history. Mr. Chaudhuri's dissatisfaction with the characters in this novel is not that they are unconvincing but that they are convincing. Aziz would not have been allowed to cross my threshold" (Meenakshi Mukherjee; " On Teaching: A Passage to India: " Ed. A Shahane 98)

¹¹ There is a Pavlovian behaviorist imperative in historical narratives when the question of language rediscovering the past is discussed. John B. Carroll, the linguist states in *The Study of Language*, "'Consciousness' and the contents of consciousness such as concepts, thoughts, and ideas were regarded as mere epiphenomena. 'Thinking' was conceived as merely the action of laryngeal mechanisms or sub-vocal muscular movements" (74). When traditional proportion are re-invoked in the new narratives though there will be marked differences in attitude brought about by the growth of time, the past will establish itself in the traditional imperative. When Patrick Swinden tries to bail out Paul Scott by saying in *Paul Scott: Images of the Raj*, that, "To claim that Paul Scott's novels are about the loss of paradise is to suggest an unusually high ambition and, perhaps a correspondingly dangerous naivety," he is destroying very many possibilities of analysis (1). Swinden contradicts himself throughout the text, "But it is not unusual for writers to embark on a quest for paradise and to see it fall further below the horizon the nearer horizon they sail. It is not unusual for them to watch paradise subtly transform itself into a more questionable shape the nearer it is approached, the more closely it is investigated; to witness a glorious illusion fading into a reality more impeachable, less exalting to the spirit, sometimes profoundly destructive of the aspiration, even the very character, of the man who sought to enter it"(2). The arguments that Swinden makes are like a Malayalam saying: "After reading Ramayana one finds that Rama was not a good brother to Sita". (My translation) The glory is destroyed and it is destructive to the aspirations of the writer, yet it is not about "Paradise Lost", the most possible defensive argument that is split open in its inception itself.

¹² The word scorpion in the title assumes much significance in my analysis. Mary Coleman writes in *Success Signs*, a star sign book, "When challenged the scorpion will leap boldly out of its hiding place and fight to finish, even stinging itself to death rather than admit defeat" (257). Here the British scorpion is challenged, the scorpion cannot detect the strength of the weapon with which he is challenged nor does he have access to any weapon to counter it. The scorpion is attacked and he wants to fight; violence he is his urge but non-violence as a weapon on hands of suffering antagonist cuts down his desires. Therefore, I conclude that the word scorpion signify two things. One is that the scorpion is putting up a psychological fight, since it cannot admit defeat. Two the writer believes the death of Raj was a suicide act on the part of the British; it doesn't want to acknowledge the strength of the Indian opposition. The symbol of the death of the scorpion in the novel (Page 79) can be extended to British attitude. They can see the fire, the fire of national liberation struggle. The British people are very sensitive; in the Indian movement of struggle of freedom in the non-violent mode made the British helpless, British recognize that they cannot do anything and they sting themselves. As the narrator states, "In Ranpur we become aware of the immensity of the surrounding plain and in Pankot of the very small impression we have made on hills which when we are away from them we think of as safe, enclosed and friendly but which are in reality, unfriendly, vast and dangerous" (69). The analysis of fear and doubt continues to haunt the colonial narrative.

Resistance Narrative

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 5

Resistance Narrative

Storytellers are a threat. They threaten all champions of control; they frighten all usurpers of the right-to-freedom of the human spirit-in states, in church or mosque, in party congress, in the university or wherever.

Chinua Achebe

Politics in a work of literature is like a pistol shot in the middle of a concert, something loud and vulgar and yet a thing to which it is not possible to refuse one's attention.

Stendhal

Countering the colonial ideology, that had a prolonged grip in the colonial discourse, is a formidable task, especially, when it involved opposing a colonial state, where the repressive state apparatuses function in a brutal and a systematic manner. Colonial situation is very complex and the ruler (the colonizer) and the subject (the colonized) undergo radical changes in their conceptualization of the very essence of life. It is a period of de-colonization, de-colonization from the dominant colonial ideological prison house and de-colonization from the prison house of the colonized's own assumed subjectivity to the colonial condition. Fanon states metaphorically in his work, *Black Skins White Masks*: "There is a fact: White men consider themselves superior to black men. There is another fact: Black men want to prove to white men, at all costs, the richness of their thought, the equal value of their intellect" (10). The leaders of the struggle reiterate and throw up into the discursive field certain indigenous values blending it ^{with} socialist and

nationalist ideologies, strategically to rouse the feeling of self-confidence and the feeling of self-assertion in the colonized subject. Fanon states in *The Wretched of the Earth*, "During the period of de-colonization the native's reason is appealed to. He is offered definite values, he is told frequently that de-colonization need not mean regression, and that he must first put in qualities which are well tried, solid and highly esteemed" (43). To make a study of the counter-hegemonic struggles is an awe-inspiring experience. One is caught up in its passion for values, which are highly cherishable, and precious for any "humanist". Ideas of assumed superiority and permanence of European values entered the colony along with colonialism. These ideas got assimilated into the discursive field to which the colonized also forms an integral part. The assimilated ideas, in the discursive field, are appropriated by the colonized that in turn open up a site of contest for the application of these ideas, along with the already available indigenous ideas. Robert Young in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* is of the view that:

Wherever it emerged, anti-colonialism experienced a common project. That common project involved the reversal of a structure of power. The means through which, that subversion and inversion could be achieved, or conceived, however, was entirely specific to the historical condition of the colony in question and could take many different forms (165-166).

The colonized begins to dream of a nation through these ideological permutations acquired from Western values. A nation is a dream, an assumption of an imagined space of integration which has a sense of a belonging for its citizen. Homi Bhabha in his work *Nation and Narration* defines, "Nations themselves *are* narrations". One of the most influential results of colonialism was the emergence of nationalism, in Europe as well as in all other parts of the world. The growth of nationalism has given a new dimension to all the narrative, since its emergence, as Bhabha postulates, in *Nation and Narration*:

The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them. Most important, the grand narratives of emancipation and enlightenment mobilized people in the colonial world to rise and throw off imperial subjection; in the process, many European and Americans were also stirred by these stories and their protagonists, and they too fought for new narratives of equality and human community (xiii).

The colonial condition produces an agonizing social condition, according to the opinion of L.S. Stavrianos:

The colonial relationship was a relationship between societies, each of which had its own distinctive social institutions and its own internal social differences, its own cultures and sub-cultural paradigms. Despite the political power of the conqueror, each colony was the product of a dialectic, a synthesis, not just a simple imposition in which the social institutions and cultural values of the conquered was one of the terms of the dialectic" (Qtd in Barbara Harlow 5).

The presence of the alien colonizer itself is a unifying force for a colonized community. The image of the coloniser produced in^{the} colonized mind is that of an enemy, an exploiter, a subjugator or an alien Other. The colonized recognizes that the colonizer is in their land to exploit its resources, and to subdue the rightful owners (the colonized) of the land. A feeling of belonging to a suppressed class creates a unity among the colonized and various strategies of resistance are contemplated and practiced. Resistance can be defined as the fight back that politically oppressed groups make against the power that oppresses^{es} them. Lennard J. Davis in *Ideology and Fiction: Resisting Novels* states that resistance, "can be armed or passive - both indicate the rejection of power of the political over-structure and a sense of group solidarity against that structure" (12). Colonial resistances - psychological, political, and physical - have polyphonous strategies inscribed in their very existence. The colonizer exerts his power on the colonized and as

soon as the power is exercised the native offers his resistance to the colonizing power, it can be conscious or unconscious on the part of the colonized: as soon as power is exercised, resistance to it also begins its play. Resistance on the part of colonized begins along with colonialism. "Colonialism" as Leela Gandhi contends, "does not end with the end of colonial occupation. However, the psychological resistance to colonialism begins with the onset of colonialism." (*Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, 77). Conscious effort can be the attempt to ward physically off the colonizer from the native territory through the application of physical force or mental efforts.

The preparation for the removal or destruction of the imperial domain is a long drawn out one and it has to prepare that society to relinquish and modify the idea of the domination. And as Edward Said advances in *Culture and Imperialism*, "These changes cannot occur without the willingness of men and women to resist the pressures of colonial rule, to take up arms, to project ideas of liberation, and to imagine a new national community, to take the final plunge" (241). All these facts are facilitated by certain overpowering activities on the part of the colonized that challenge the idea of the empire and the colonial rule. Along with these, "unless the representation of imperialism begin to lose their justification and legitimacy, and finally, unless the rebellious "natives" impress upon the metropolitan culture the independence

and integrity of their own culture, free from colonial encroachment" (241) the struggle will not yield required results.

In the second chapter I read as to how the Western colonizing tendencies, consciously or unconsciously, created the 'Other' of the European, also how those tendencies exerted their resistance to these forms of resistance narratives through multitudinous strategic maneuverings. The colonial rulers by creating rationalizing ideologies using "a set of complex discursive devices, project what are in fact partisan, controversial, historically specific values as true of all times and all places, and so as natural, inevitable and unchangeable" (*Terry Eagleton Reader* 235) and managed to acquire power and hegemony in the colony. History, written by colonizers, reconstructing these situations, inevitably contains and carries these overtones. The Other becomes a passive receiver of attributions and, thus the view of the other of the context, necessarily, is out of the colonial histories written by colonizers. L. S. Stavrianos states: "Histories of colonialism written by imperialist ignore one of these terms; history is the story of what the White man did. Nationalist historiography has developed a contrary myth: a legend of "national" resistance, which omits the uncomfortable fact of collaboration" (qtd in Barbara Harlow 5). This aspect is more effectively and stylistically forwarded by Said in *Culture and Imperialism*: "One of the first tasks of the culture of resistance was to reclaim, rename, and re-inhabit the land"(273).

Resistance in any semiotic form can be called as counter narration. Counter narration can assume enumerable methods, and I suggest from the facts that it is a process culminating in a nation building and self-realization by a colonized, at the cost of imperialism. Imperialism which began on the trope of differentiation is opposed in the same coin by the colonized: he differentiates himself from the colonizer, but however in a new dialectics of the parameters of the colonized. However, it may be noted that, as Leela Gandhi brilliantly points out while she discusses the paradox inherent in these developments:

The energies of the anti-colonial nationalism under review are, as we have seen, fuelled by an indomitable will to difference. In its intensely recuperative mode, national consciousness refuses the universalizing geography of empire, and names its insurgent cultural alterity through the nation – "Indian", "Kenyan", "Algerian", etc. Yet herein lies the paradox at the heart of anti-colonial nationalism. It is generally agreed that nation-ness and nationalism are European inventions, which came into existence toward the end of the eighteenth century (113).

It is more effectively put by Leela Gandhi when she says that "the fictional Caliban" while protesting against colonial Prospero uses his language which

is paradoxically a protest "out of," rather than "against", the cultural vocabulary of colonialism (*Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, 148). Leela Gandhi, taking ideas from scholars like Richard Ford and Partha Chatterjee, contends in *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* that, anti-colonial movements:

Regularly drew upon affirmative Orientalist stereotypes to define an authentic cultural identity in opposition to Western civilization. Gandhian cultural resistance, Fox argues, typically 'depend upon an Orientalist image of India as inherently spiritual, consensual, and corporate?' Correspondingly, enthusiastic Indian nationalists responded to pejorative stereotypes about India's caste dominated, other worldly, despotic, and patriarchal social structure with reformist's zeal and agency. Thus, Orientalist discourse was strategically available not only to the empire but also to its antagonists (78).

In the colonial context, the colonized, being in a hybrid situation, is faced with a challenge to develop an identity. And the framing of the question of identity itself poses considerable stumbling blocks before the colonised. Since he is a suppressed class in the colonial framework, he has to develop an image that will overpower stereotypes created by the already available colonial narratives as Edward Said affirms in *Culture and Imperialism*:

"While identity is crucial, just to assert a different identity is never enough. The main thing is to be able to see that Caliban has a history capable of development as part of the process of work, growth, and maturity to which only Europeans had seemed entitled." (257).

Inevitably the dependence to master narratives in the colonial situation is crucial and unavoidable. These discussions echo Fanon's prophetic statement, "However painful it may be for me to accept this conclusion, I am obliged to state it: For the black man there is only one destiny. And it is White" (10). The colonized people are trying their best to evolve an independent culture, but are always pulled towards the metaphoric European centre, in their analysis of their situation. How far counter discourse is dependent on dominant discursive requires close examination.

Counter Discourse: How far Dependent on Dominant Discourse?

Helen Tiffin in her essay "Post-colonial Literatures and Counter-Discourse," in *Kunapipi*; ix, 3, 1987, postulates that all postcolonial discourses are inevitably counter discourses:

It has been the project of post-colonial writing to interrogate European discourses and discursive practices from a privileged position within two worlds; to investigate the means by which Europe imposed and maintained its codes in the colonial domination of so much of rest of the world (. . .) *Post-colonial*

literatures/cultures are thus constituted in counter-discursive rather than homologous practices; they offer 'fields' of counter-discursive strategies to the dominant discourse (emphasis mine 9).

Counter narrative necessarily is dependent on colonial narrative because the very essence of counter narrative is resistance to the dominant colonial narrative. But, however, I find it very difficult to agree with Tiffin in her conceptualization that resistance or postcolonial literatures are merely counter discursive. It is true that colonial narrative compels the emergence of postcolonial literatures but it needn't be completely dependent on dominant discourse. There are also homologous practices of creation of identity in a colony by the colonized. Western theories and historiography, however, fail in their attempts to grasp this reality or may not even know of its presence. Edward Said states this in *Culture and Imperialism*: the colonized's conscious effort is to "enter the colonial discourse, to mix it, transform it, to make it realize the existence of other system which are marginalized or suppressed" (260). The dream of the colonized is to produce a picture of resistance as being an "alternative way of conceiving human history." (260) Said cites Partha Chatterjee to conclude that, "Much nationalist in India, he says, depends upon the realities of colonial power, either in totally opposing it or in affirming a patriotic consciousness"(262). All these arguments inevitably deny a space for alternative history to exist, though the wish to acquire it

remains. This is a vicious circle that postcolonial critics have developed in their own discourse. There is no escape route from these puzzled narratives and one is caught up into meshes of sticky Western terminologies. Most of the critics, even Gauri Viswanathan, are caught up in the Janus faced wishes of a postcolonial critic. She, in her work *Masks of Conquest*, reveals that the native response is complicated:

How the native *actually* responds is so removed from the colonizer's representational system, his understanding of the meaning of events, that it enters into the realm of another history of which the latter has no comprehension or awareness. That history can, and perhaps must, be told separately for it is immensely rich and complex quality to be fully revealed (12).

Viswanathan is declaring a fact that there are other aspects to these types of discourses, which are not available to the colonial discourse. She addresses the issue: how the native's response to the colonial situation is beyond the reach of the Western historiography and how it requires the assistance of native historiographies to complete itself. The fact that colonialism permeates into inner layers of the colonized societies makes it difficult to find out how the native homologous practices created homologous identities in the postcolonial world. I, though an Indian, often grope in the Western theoretical discursive field that I have acquired through my learning and I myself find an alien to

many of the native rituals and native understanding of the world. I have attempted the same in one of my research papers, "Social Oppression and the Uncanny Resistance". (*PUSH* Vol.1, No.3, January 2003)

The Effects of Western Education

The overpowering dimension of too much of generalized conceptualization in the postcolonial theoretical fields makes it rather bizarre. In the postcolonial theoretical formulation, the use for codification of native homogeneous developments is rather diffidently projected. Following the Western tradition is rather a fashion even when claim of nativity is vociferously raised, and the process appears hollow in such occasions. Traces of counter narratives or narratives of self-realization are to be found in various sects, groups, subgroups and sub-cultures within the colonized land. All these can be recuperated from unwritten symbolic, and symptomatic practices, in which subjectification of the colonized people are eluded, by remaining within a closed and rigid social system already available to them. Folk songs and myths of indigenous people are a source of accessing these systems. The situation is rather dismal in this century when all the people around the globe appropriate the ideas of the West and the wielders of power use them against their own people. T.N. Dhar in his article "Historiographic Contest and the Post-colonial Theory" proposes an alternative and viable method of understanding the situation:

In its heavy preoccupation with locating difference between the colonizers and the colonized in stark binary terms, the post-colonial theory generally ignores that writers from the colonies may conceive of historiographic contests, which may not be oppositional at all. Instead of representing the past, directly or indirectly post-colonial writers may hold them to scrutiny to demonstrate that coercion may not necessarily inhere in the methods of their adversaries, but in the ones, which are a part of their cultural tradition and style (28).

The cultural identities, by and large are derived from the dominant, but they have a different side to it other than the production of racial discrimination as Gauri Viswanathan observes in *Masks of Conquest*: "If that enlightenment extended to an awareness of British rule as unjust, then it was all the more to be taken as a measure of the success of English education, not its failure" (*Masks of Conquest* 17). The English education project, which intended to enlighten the Indian Middle class, thus can be seen as a boon for the nationalists when the question of national liberation was deliberated. Therefore, the enlightenment project, as well as education project in India, helped the nationalists to change their position by assimilation. English was not simply the language but the locus of a set of values rather diffusely termed Westernization, but it essentially developed within itself an eventually conflictual social dynamics. Gauri Viswanathan observes that the project of

English public schools was "to foster these leadership qualities required of a governing elite: independent thinking, a strong sense of personal identity, and in British education, this was achieved through social discrimination and a markedly stratified schooling system" (*Masks of Conquest* 56).

Rajeshwari Sunder Rajan in her article "Fixing English: Nation, Language, Subjects," agrees with Gauri Viswanathan that English education as such helped the nationalist natives' cause:

Thus, though the overt purpose of English education – which was to create an amenable elite population that would be impressed by, conform to, and propagate the values of the secular English books - was undoubtedly served. The English text was also, in complex and mediated ways, appropriated within native arguments for political representation, for articulating demands and for questioning the rulers (12).

The policy thus turned out to be beneficial for the colonized to understand the colonial ideology and the appropriation of the tools of creation of Western knowledge helped the colonized to arrive at the dynamics of power the coloniser was wielding. Then they could intervene into the ideological reaction to subvert and invert certain of its imperial artifacts in order to access power.

Moreover, there is an inherent paradox in the situation, which helped the course of nationalists. Once again, I refer to Gauri Viswanathan's argument, as she proposes in *Masks of Conquest*, that the whole process resulted in developing frustration and discontent.

Indians receiving Western education were reading texts that taught them to be independent thinkers and leaders, but they had neither the independence nor the opportunity to lead. It would seem, then, that the political consequences of the Arnoldian curriculum in the India context could only be frustration and possibly rebellion, raising questions about why Indians were given the same kind of literary education as the English elite (56).

The colonial situation demands rewriting of colonial history by the natives also, which is inevitably resistive in nature, moreover its nature is essentially palimpsestic. These centralized attitudes are to be challenged and new centers are to be created to de-center and show the flexibility of ideological assumptions in a discursive field like colonialism. This is a natural conclusion to the discourse, for in the colonial context the growth of enlightenment project was benefiting the colonized and has many values, which were in many ways beneficial to the colonized. Herein, what I mean is, Western civilization is good in many respects, but it was used as a cover up for

imperialist projects is most unfortunate. Culture can bring in osmosis with contact with other cultures but colonialism brought it with violence and exploitation.

The emerging counter hegemonic ideologies grow from strength to strength with procession, meetings, discussions, and literature, and all these provide the colonized with a fresh energy for resistance. The resistance narrative assumes contextual validity as the situation demanded. Violent or non-violent, resistance peaks up to never before level and threatens the colonizers' hegemony. Self-glorification on the part of the colonized brings back his self-confidence. Fanonist violence and Gandhian non-violence ultimately have their base in ideologies, produced and propagated in a very enthusiastic manner. The drive, the clarion cry for freedom vibrates in the very air of the colonial context. Gandhian strength "does not come from physical capacity. It comes from an indomitable will" (*Non-violence in Peace & War*, 3) and the person who conforms to this will is capable of accepting suffering injury to one's own person that will enable him to become ennobled in the path of the liberation struggle that he undertakes.

No less passionate is Fanon. He is violent in his arguments and advocates, in *The Wretched of the Earth*, that he wants violence on the part of the colonized to counter the colonizer's violence. The native is ready to destroy the European and his culture. Fanon argues:

It so happens that when a native hears a speech about Western culture he pulls out his knife at least he makes sure it is within because the Western is no saint in this regard. The violence with which the supremacy of white values is affirmed and the aggressiveness which permeated the victory of these values over the ways of life and thought: the native laughs in mockery when Western values are mentioned in front of him (43).

In the ideological realm, new values develop which are taken hold of by the native intellectual, who has access to the Western critical tools, and who in turn uses them against the Western cultural values to undermine and subvert them. He insults the very idea of the supremacy of these values. Fanon states that: "In the colonial context the settler only ends his work of breaking in the native when the latter admits loudly and intelligibly the supremacy of the white man's values. In the period of de-colonization, the colonized man mocks at these very values, insult and vomit them up" (43).

In Fanon's style of looking at counter hegemonic struggle, armed resistance is not just the husk but also the fruit of ^{the} strategy forcing penetration of ideologies into the very kernel of the land. Its inner space forms a desire for liberation that is logical, natural and necessary and has its roots in the needs for cultural forms of resistance - the desire and the need go hand in hand.

Fanon advocates violence from the part of the colonized to achieve freedom. He considers it a necessity because of the fact that the colonizer in the process of colonizing and maintaining the colonized status used violence. In my opinion violence alone cannot help regaining of the lost terrain and dignity. Edward Said praises W. B. Yeats, in *Culture and Imperialism*, for recognizing this fact very early, "Yeats's prophetic perception that at some point violence cannot be enough and that the strategies of politics and reason must come into play is to my knowledge, the first important announcement in the context of de-colonization of the need to balance violent force with an exigent political and organizational process" (284).

Counter hegemonic endeavor by the colonized is eventually a cultural one, where economics, politics, rebellion, literature, organization and ideology of nationalism and freedom play crucial roles. There develops a sense of unity, out of a feeling of belonging to a class that is suppressed, among the colonized. They were coerced into a negative generic subject position in the dialectics of colonial narration and they recognize the nature of these conceptualizations and respond by converting that position into a collective one, which in effect becomes the essential force of anti-colonial discourse.

Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* graphically discerns the growth of cultural resistance on the part of the colonized: "The slow and often

bitterly disputed recovery of geographical territory which is at the heart of de-colonization is preceded as empire had been – by the charting of cultural territory" (249). Resistance, in many postcolonial critics' opinion, during the initial period is violent and it is through violence that they recognize their suffering and subjectivity. But later, as Said states, "After the period of 'primary resistance', literal fighting against intrusion, there comes the period of secondary, that is, ideological resistance, when efforts are made to reconstitute a shattered community against to save or restore the sense and fact of community against all the enterprises of the colonial system". (249).

The counter narrative strategies adopt three-tier method. First the colonized try to look into their own past in order to recover a lost pre-colonial self, which is only partially possible. Secondly, they appropriate the colonial ideologies, to an extent, to understand it. The intentions of getting access to the domain of the dominant knowledge system are to subvert it. As Foucault states in *Power/Knowledge*: "Once knowledge can be analyzed in terms of region, domain, implantation, displacement, transposition, it is able to capture the process by which knowledge functions on a form of power and disseminates the effects of power" (69). By the gaining of access to imperial modules of ideology, the colonized recognizes the hollowness of the ideology and they begin to recognize the importance of counter cultural hegemonic narratives. Thirdly, they operate within the colonial context, and become an active part of the discourse recognizing the need for collective ideological

defensive and offensive strategies: the need to create knowledge in order to regain power.

Various aspects of a colonized people's culture trying to become independent of imperialism by imaging its own past is studied by Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism*. He recognizes them to be of three types when it comes to the question of the choices that colonized have. The first choice is that of Ariel: "As a willing servant of Prospero, Ariel does what he is told obliquely, and, when he gains his freedom he returns to his native elements, a sort of bourgeois native untroubled by his collaboration with Prospero" (258). He sabotages the native ideology by complying with colonizer's will and wishes. He is a threat to the nationalists' project and he is servile to the colonial system. The second one is the way that Caliban adopts, accepting his mongrel past but recognizing that he is not disabled for future developments. "A third choice is to be a Caliban who sheds his current servitude and physical disconfigurments in the process of discovering his essential, pre-colonial self" (258). The first choice of Caliban is the most resorted and viable choice and in my view the best. "Caliban" has a strong sense of purpose and it helps in recovering the lost geographical territory. His struggle is one in which he engages the traditional past as well as the present circumstances of Western hegemony. This is adopted in order to determine the future coordinates of social and political formation of his land and the strategic alliances that he can lean on to. The question of cultural past calls

the question of the present image that the colonized possess, and the question of the present image calls the cultural past, which in turn produces a search for past glories to evolve a nationalist spirit.

Resistance Literature

Resistance literature is the literature of the oppressed, who are dispossessed of their basic existence values, trying to repossesses their fragmented and mutilated values and confidence in the literary mould. Resistance literature demands recognition to itself in a political and politicized activity. It works against the dominant form of ideological and cultural production. It is a critic of the dominant and at the same time of the self and self-critical controversies form the very essence of counter hegemonic narration. Literature plays a crucial role in various forms in the struggle by the colonized for liberation, as literature had helped the colonizer in ^{the} colonizing mission. These two work on two different planes. The colonizer attempts to write on to a perceived neat text, the neat text created by his own devices of ideology. The colonized in his stead has to counter the dominant literature with its own devices developing out of the cultural context. Nationalism plays a crucial rule, though it is not the only one. In resistance literature, narratives or novels form a dominant part because of their all encompassive nature which as Barbara Harlow states in *Resistance Literature*:

Unlike poetry perhaps, provides a more developed historical analysis of the circumstances of economic, political, and cultural domination and repression and through that analysis raises a systematic and converted challenge to the imposed chronology of what Fredric Jameson has called "master narratives", ideological paradigms which contain within their plots a predetermined ending" (78).

In Barbara Harlow's opinion, the Third World resistance writers resorted to the novel to achieve certain ideological purposes. "The use by Third World resistance writers of the novel form as it has developed within the Western literary tradition both appropriates and challenges the historical and historicizing presuppositions the narrative conclusions, implicated within the Western tradition and its development" (78). What is special about novel as an ideological instrument is that it has a polyphonic diversity, which can include fundamentally differentiated social groups to interact as a social group, which produces rather easily recognizable counter discourse to colonial hegemony.

Counter narrative novels, in the colonies of Europe, are generally experimentative efforts. The author experiments with the newly appropriated cultural artifact, mixing it with native traditional narrative tools like myths

and folk songs and in its very structure counter narrative novels attempt a sabotage of the novel form. Barbara Harlow writes in *Resistance* that:

Resistance narratives (...) display the historical and social context which produced such symbols or images. Their analysis and documentation of the cultural and ideological conditions of their plot, characters, and setting also challenge certain literary conventions which have been sustained through the history of the classical novel. Although, like Western modern and postmodern novelists, the writers of resistance narrative experiment with structures of chronology and temporal continuity, such experimentation is more than formal virtuosity. It is part of their historical challenge, their demand for an access to history which necessitates a radical rewriting of the historiographical version of the past which gives prominence of place to a Western calendar of events" (85)

In Barbara Harlow's opinion resistance literatures are a serious challenge to imperial narratives. She postulates in *Resistance Literature*, that resistance literature, like the resistance, and national liberation movements which it reflects in as content and form can be said to participate, demands recognition of its independent status and existence as an literary production. Moreover, it provides "a serious challenge to the codes and canons of both the theory and

the practice of literature" and its criticism as these have been developed in the West (85-95).

This is a method of resisting European text with ^{the} European's own method and it has profound implications, not only for the construction of national spirit but also for countering the European textuality. The colonised is in an attempt to create resisting discourse with innovative ways of replying to European literature and its methods of analysis. As Leela Gandhi states in *Postcolonial Theory: An Introduction*, "Colonial relations may have been established initially by guns, guile and disguise, but they were maintained in their interpellative phase largely by textuality" (3). And since textuality played a major role in accessing and controlling the natives, the natives needed textuality to counter it. Just as metal cuts metal, textual ideology must be countered by textual ideology. Therefore, the postcolonial or resistance narrative is necessarily concerned with the power that resides in discourses and textuality, and eventually it is on the arena of textuality that it gains its prominence.

The colonizers' were aware of the power of textuality and writing and the struggle was two fold for the native since he had to fight the repressive state apparatuses to which he had no access. Barbara Harlow finds out the same through her analysis. She in *Resistance Literature* theorizes that

Authoritarian control over the "power of writing" is especially evident in the case of political prisoners in the ban on all writing and reading materials which is generally imposed on those detainees (. . .). These prisoners, many of who are detained as a result of their literary and cultural activity, present already a serious threat to the authority's control over the "power of writing" (125).

Every colonial situation can be used to corroborate Harlow's argument since many leaders were imprisoned for treason for their writing pamphlets and articles in favor of nationalism in the Indian context: Tilak, Gandhi and Nehru, were jailed by the imperial government for writing supposed to be "provocative" articles.

The writings of the colonized people against the monopoly of writing of the West in the form of laws, literature, philosophy, and science are eventually interpretative in nature. The rearranging of the acquired language, which empowers the colonised, becomes a part of the texts. He creates an imagined space of his own, enjoys the power of creating and possessing that space. The space created has the colonised as its center, and therefore, he gains confidence in the very inception of this narrative. The literary genre, novel in its very structure, possesses the quality of making any kind of personality significant and, therefore, all these subaltern people find themselves narrated

as "heroes" in counter narrative novels and this centralization of the marginalized community infuses energy in the implied reader of these novels, the natives. The world of values created in the novel by the author gives power to wrestle with other values in the domain and can make insignificant characters appear to be of great importance. If one examines the colonial context of India during the Gandhian Era, through characters like Moorthy in *Kanthapura*, Bakha in *Untouchable*, Munoo in *Coolie*, Sriram in *Waiting for Mahatma (1953)* etc, we can see that all these assumed subjective positioning achieve importance that make "them" appear as heroes. India was full of such Moorthys, Bakhas and Srirams during the Gandhian age and they just needed this ideology to be infused into them within a framework to boost their confidence. ^{the novels} and it did happen during the last two decades of India's struggle for independence. _{make this}

In anti-colonial narratives it is not just rewriting the dominant narrative that takes places, it evolves various strategies of its own. Benita Parry in her essay "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse," reveals the same;

What the native writers do is not a copy of the colonialist original, but a qualitatively different thinking-in-itself, where misreading and incongruities expose the uncertainties and ambivalence of the colonialist text and deny it an authorizing

presence. Thus a textual insurrection against the discourse of cultural authority is located in the native's interrogation of the English book within the term of their own cultural meanings (42).

Textuality played a crucial role in colonialism and textuality played an equally important role in resisting colonialism. Terms like assimilation, appropriation, synergy, syncreticism, hybridity, and ambivalence are quite relevant in the juncture of discussion of counter discourse. The native swept by the current of dominant colonial ideologies accepts the ideology of the colonizer and the colonial text. And the assimilation and reproduction of the colonial is a complex process and we can divide the literature of a colonized nation into three ^{periods} in the opinion of, Jose Carlos Mariategui

A literary, not sociological, theory divides the literature of a country into three periods, colonial, cosmopolitan and national. In the first period, the country, in a literary sense, is a colony dependent on the metropolis. In the second period, it simultaneously assimilates the elements of various foreign literatures. In the third period, it shapes and expresses its own personality and feeling ("Literature on Trial" in *Seven Interpretative Essays on Peruvian Reality 190-1*)(qtd in Barbara Harlow).

The novels by Raja Rao and Mulk Raj Anand, novelists I have selected, belong to the third period, where they showed maturity as creators and artists.

The Importance of Language

Language is an important aspect of resistance, necessarily due to the fact that the colonial process has its inception in language. As Bill Ashcroft *et.al.* say in *Post-colonial Studies Reader*, "The control over language by the imperial centre – whether achieved by displacing native languages, by installing itself as a 'standard' against other variants which are constituted as 'impurities' or by planting the language of empire in a new place remain the most potent instrument of cultural control"(283).

In "The Decolonized Mind", Chinua Achebe links the question of power into language in a specific manner "In my view language was the most important vehicle through which that power fascinated and held the soul prisoners. The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation. Language was the means of the spiritual subjugation." (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 287).

The native is always caught up in a hybrid world where he is the quintessential image of hybridity. Acquiring a new tool, the colonizer's language, the colonized finds it difficult to manage the language in the early stages. Gareth Griffiths in the article "Imitation, Abrogation and Appropriation: The Production of the Postcolonial Text" attempts to prove that irony is possible only when the colonized could gain a place outside the

production of colonial system. The early postcolonial writer did not gain that space "Yet paradoxically such a place is where he exists" his transportation to the colonial environment has not been extended to "the language and literary form in which he might record his new experience" (12) The case is relevant to early writers but later native writers gained command over the English language and could use it to their purpose, subverting and even manipulating it. Moreover, any transformation of language or experimentation is an attempt to resist the colonial form. It does not mean that the language used by the native is an inferior type of language, though Griffiths masks it by calling it a variant. Griffiths states that to make the "language over is task faced by all writers." In addition, when the question of expression arises, they gain space into the existing discourse in a marginalized form, which is outside the received norm and they can do so only in a specific manner. Griffiths argues:

Only by abrogating that discourse, that is by recognizing that their reality is oppressed by the discourse and that any true language for them must involve rejection of the hierarchy within which they are not privileged. They need to make English into english, an appropriated and indigenous language which, embraces its variety as a positive and not as a negative quality. (15).

The question is, how the whole process affects the colonizer and as I have already argued, the English of ... England changed a lot for the English people itself. However, it does not mean that with the infusion of indigenous words and usages make RP English english. All these aspects make the question of language complicated in postcolonial discussion and crucial for any argument. Particular languages embody distinctive ways of experiencing the world, of defining what we are. We become the persons we are because of the particular language community in which we nourish our intellectual make-up. Language, above all else, shapes our distinctive ways of being in the world. Language, then, is the carrier of a people's identity. As David Lloyd argues in "Writing in the Shit: Beckett, Nationalism and the Colonial Subject" that 'to take on another language is already to live as an exile, to lose one's identity with one's paternity, to be condemned to translate.' (75). Fanon too proposes a similar view in *Black Skins White Masks*: "A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language" (18). In the colonial context, most probably the native is a bilingual. He has a native language, which is the mother tongue and he acquires another, which is the colonizers' language. When the question of resisting the colonial arises, he is caught up ⁱⁿ two minds: whether to use his own language or the language of the colonizer. In order to reach the widest of populace of his community he has to resort only to the native language, but it is removed from the colonizer. He can use it strategically to confuse the

colonizer but he will come under suspicion^{which is}, necessarily justifiable because he is against the colonizer, so he shouldn't mind that very much. Edward Said states in *Culture and Imperialism* that in the process of regaining a decolonized identity, "There always goes an almost magically inspired, quasi-alchemical redevelopment of the native language"(273).

Albert Memmi elaborates the same argument in his work *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, and his contention is that "In the colonial context bilingualism is necessary. It is a condition for all culture, all communication and all progress. But while the colonial bi-linguist is saved from being walled in, he suffers a cultural catastrophe which is never completely overcome" (107). Though bilingualism is not necessarily peculiar to the colonized, his case is unique, Memmi continues, "Possession of two languages is not merely a matter of having two tools, but actually mean participation in two psychical and cultural levels." (107). In the colonizers case the realm are in conflict because "they are those of the colonizer and the colonized" (107).

The colonizers' language can be effectively used as history proves to counter colonial ideologies. The colonized appropriate the language and assimilate it to his culture and thus they create a hybrid of a language. Essentially, this may not be very favorable for the colonizers, for the process

disrupts their ideological bases. And therefore, as Barbara Harlow conceptualizes in *Resistance Literature*:

The very choice of language in which to compose is itself a political statement on the part of the writer and will need to be considered in each case, from author to author, country to country. The date of language is crucial to any discussion of resistance literature, involving as it does questions of writer and background as well as issues of readership and audience (xviii).

David Llyod and JanMohammed in "Towards a Theory of Minority Discourse," state, "Every time we speak or write in English, French German or another dominant European language, we pay homage to Western intellectual and political hegemony" (Ashcroft et al. eds. 1995. 236). Reading the two together, arguments of Barbara Harlow and Lyold and Jan Mohammed, shows the depth of the problem. It was and is an inevitable thing to assimilate the colonizer's language and it brought with it ideas that are useful and it is the ability of the colonized to use it to his purpose that counts. However, Antony Appiaha argues:

Railing against the cultural hegemony of the West, the nativists are of its party without knowing it. Indeed the very arguments, the rhetoric of defiance, that our nationalist muster are (. . .) canonical, time tested (. . .) in their ideological inscription,

cultural nationalist remain in a position of counter identification (. . .) which is to continue to participate in an institutional configuration – to be subjected to cultural nationalism has followed the route of alternate generalizing we end up always in the same place; the achievement is to have invented a different part of it (Appiaha 1988).

The colonial context is a site of ideological struggle where in fact what is necessarily consequential is whether the native is able to countermand the rationalization of the West. As Terry Eagleton rather succinctly explains in, *Ideology: An Introduction*:

A way of putting this point is to suggest that ideology is a matter of discourse rather than language. It concerns the actual uses of language between particular human subjects for the production of specific effect. You could not decide whether a statement was ideological or not by extracting it in isolation from its discursive context. (. . .) Ideology is less a matter of the inherent linguistic properties of a pronouncement than a question of who is saying what to who for what purposes (234).

The problem of language will remain just in the colonial context and discussions about it and it is^{for} natural situation. In order to get to the nodes of

power, the native can use foreign language. The regaining of power is more important than the love for native language.

Nationalism and Socialism

Nationalism and socialism are two terms that are invariably used in various contexts of national liberation movement of colonial lands. Nationalism was only one of the aspects of resistance, and not the most interesting or enduring one. Gobinda Prasad Sharma in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican fiction* reminds, "In India and in other Asian and African countries, nationalism was adopted as a weapon for gaining freedom from European imperialism and colonial regimes" (1). In his opinion a people "Living under an autocratic or oppressive rule, very often foreign, want to throw off that rule and establish a new political set up of their own choice the people of that country said to have been imbibed with the spirit of nationalism" (35). His very simple arguments open up a wide arena of deliberation. The first statement I made about nationalism and socialism being used as alternative terms, which in turn creates complex ambiguities will be revealed by itself when we examine Sharma further, in the same work he professes:

Nationalism, while seeking freedom from foreign oppression, wants at the same time to organize and consolidate the collective power of the people. And since this power can be consolidated only after the removal of social injustices, a nation

struggling for freedom also struggles to free itself from its social evils (96).

Robert Young contends in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* that Marxist ideologies played a crucial role in all anti-colonial struggles, in one way or the other. For, he argues, "Marxism constitutes a political philosophy, committed to a more just and equitable society. Nationalism has no such project. The emancipatory demand for national liberation is very different from nationalism as such." (197). This statement by Young has more depth than it appears to reveal at first sight. Till today, postcolonial theory was groping in various dark alleys to understand the process of decolonization. By bringing in the question of socialism and nationalism as being coextensive in anti-colonial movements, Young opens up ^a fresh area of _^ deliberation. Young finds out that, with certain exceptions:

Marxism historically provided the theoretical inspiration and most effective political practice for twentieth century anti-colonial resistance. Its great strength was that its political discourse constituted an instrument through which anti-colonial struggle could be translated from one colonial arena to another. Far more than nationalism, which by definition was self-centered and in dialogue only with its own constituency, Marxism supplied a translatable politics and political language

through which activists in very different situations could communicate with each other; it offered a universal medium through which specificities could be discussed in common form of anti-colonialism (169).

I would consider attempting a critique of Young's view by furthering an opinion that it is rather the word "socialism" that is more adaptable to anti-colonial movements. When colonies acquire Marxist ideologies, definitely developed in the Western working class situations, they get transformed to suit certain specific cultural presumptive of the colony. It is not Marxism-socialism that develops, but an indigenous one, which of course has parallels in Marxist activities. India is a perfect example to substantiate my arguments. Marxist theories may have domination in postcolonial theories, essentially because it is economic aspects that get more acknowledgements in postcolonial deliberations because of the fact that colonialism was necessarily economic exploitation but the cultural and social aspects also require and demand close attention.

Therefore, paying due respects to the scholarship of Young, I contend that nationalism and socialism were major twin forces that determined anti-colonial movement. I propose these arguments on the belief that nationalism is a feeling of being one by a community and socialism as a concept that determines the overall development of a community, by bringing in equality on

all terms, economic as well as social. The objective of both, socialism and nationalism becomes somewhat of similar purpose in the national liberation movements and therefore it is dealt in a similar manner in postcolonial narratives. Young finds this ambiguity in Benita Parry's and Neil Lazarus' analyses (171). However, due to the presence of an alien oppressor nationalism in the discourse gets amalgamated to socialism because, as Young proposes, "Just as nationalism could function as a convenient siphon for the representation of a variety of discontents, a means through which they were funneled into a metaphoric meaning beyond themselves." (173)

The pitfalls of the nationalism as such as dealt by Fanon in his work *Wretched of the Earth*, reveal the complexity of nationalistic revival in the colony. Fanon is a transgressive figure in that he manages to combine the opposition to cultural imperialism with a vigorous defense of culture as a strategy of resistance and a locus of national identity. He has fears of the nationalist bourgeois taking hold of the affairs after independence, which will consequently develop a more threatening context in the land. In Fanon's arguments Marxists ideologies play a dominant part and the questioning of nationalism in the postcolonial context becomes conspicuous.

Ajiz Ahmed tried to clarify the issue in, *In Theory*: "Nationalism is much more difficult to settle, because nationalism is not an unitary thing, and so many different kinds of ideologies and political practices have invoked the

nationalist claim that it is always very hard to think of nationalism at the level of the critical abstraction alone, without wearing into this abstraction the experience of particular nationalism and distinguishing between progressive and retrograde kind of practices" (7). Leela Gandhi observes in *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* that: "In seeking to negotiate the complex implications arising from the nationalism question, 'postcolonial studies is forced to make an intervention into vexed discourse' (103). However, in the theatre of postcolonial deliberations the concept of nation played a crucial role. It created the framework required to control the discourse. Bill Ashcroft *et. al.* write in *Post-colonial Studies Reader* that, "one of the stronger foci for resistance to imperial control in colonial societies has been the idea of 'nation'. It is the concept of shared community which has enabled post-colonial studies to invent a self image through which they could act to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression" (157).

From all these theoretical observations I conclude that nationalism as such is not enough to define the anti-colonial resistance movements. Nationalism has its own "negative dialectics" because the wielders of ideological struggle as such determine it. Ranajit Guha's statement that India achieved independence without a national liberation movement is reverberating in this context with all its potential to subvert and invert post-colonial theoretical presumptive (308). Aijaz Ahmed states that: "Whether or not a nationalism will produce a progressive cultural practice depends, to put

it in Gramscian terms, upon the political character of the power bloc which takes hold of it and utilizes it, as a material force, in the process of constituting its own hegemony" (102).

Nationalism, the spirit, develops out of a feeling a dissent against the colonial power. In David Lloyd's opinion, as he makes in "Writing in the Shit: Beckett, Nationalism, and the Colonial Subjects": "Nationalism remains suspended; paradoxically it cannot develop beyond a re-territorialization of the dislocated subjectivity of the colonised people because its ends are to forge the political union of a heterogeneous population in the service of political liberation" (84). After the liberation the question of unity remains out of a feeling of a united past. But nationalism in itself cannot explain the anti-colonial struggle for experience, various other aspects like socialism, religion etc, come to focus in the context. However, it is to be remembered that the pressures of nationalism have a magnifying effect on the writers of resistance. These pressures determine their attitude to the struggle and to some extent define the nature of the involvement of the artist, not merely as a man but as national citizen, in his artistic creation.

Anti-colonialism: Cultural/Geographical

Colonialism as we all know makes itself manifest as a territorial occupation. An assumed geographical limit determines the nature of occupation of land. Every land has a culture of its own; there are no methods

of analysis of its superiority or inferiority to another culture except through the assumed subjectivity. Certain factors like military force and economic strength, to an extent, set up a sense of hierarchy. Even today the distinction of the first, second and third worlds are based on these criteria. The power bloc of the first world determines much of the decisions that have a global dimension. Those assumed territories, which have wealth and force (known by different names), are geographical entities but what they produce in political and cultural artifacts is more important. Neocolonialism that has developed its Janus-faced strategies to take hold of weaker nations, weakened by internal strife and lack of socialistic and nationalistic spirits is a threat: the relevance of postcolonialism multiplies here. Anti-colonialism, therefore, first of all is a retaining or regaining of a geographical land in order to produce a cultural strong hold. Then comes the countering of cultural colonialism. Both are achieved simultaneously because ideas play a crucial role in both cultural and territorial supremacy. Colonialism begins as a civilizing mission and as Ashis Nandy observes, in *The Intimate Enemy*, "Colonialism minus a civilizational mission is no colonialism at all" (11). And therefore the cultural aspect gets more attention in the colonial context; anti-colonialism is therefore a different conceptualization of realities, not truths. Edward Said states it in *Culture and Imperialism thus*: "At its best, the culture of opposition and resistance suggests a theoretical alternative and a

practical method for re-conceiving human experience in non-imperialist terms" (333).

In the narratives of anti-colonialism a great many attitudes, presumption and assumption, histories-past and present and languages circulate. The time of anti-colonialism is a fulminating scene of mutual antagonism between the coloniser and the colonized, and therefore a period of instability. It is a period of volatile reactions, which foresees a liberal environment.

A strong sense of purpose seizes the native intellectual, who assumes the positions of a link between the native and the colonizer to counter the colonial insurgencies. He recognizes that certain policies are wrong and the perception of this knowledge helps him build strategies to counter them. The assumptions of a state become very crucial, as Edward Said has made clear in *Culture and Imperialism*:

The national identity struggling to free itself from imperialist domination found it lodged in symbol of state, and is apparently fulfilled by the state. Armies, flags, legislatures, schemes of national education, and dominant (if not single) political parties resulted and usually in ways that gave the nationalist – elites the place once occupied by the British or French (379).

The native intellectual resides not in a luxury of ideological formulation. He is in the thick of matters and out of necessity of the programme at hand he formulates his strategies. A self-inquisitive analysis is made as Said observes, in *Culture and Imperialism*. The native intellectual who takes up arms to defend his nation's legitimacy, who is willing to strip himself naked to study the history of his body, is obliged to dissect the heart of his own people. (287). The native intellect definitely recognizes his responsibility in the context and he acts with enthusiasm to arrive at his goals of liberation. In Robert Young's view, as he proposes in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*:

The central role of culture in such elaborations constitutes a particular feature of the history of anti-colonialism; cultural activism, often deployed alongside the development of modes of resistance with which to meet force, was designed to counter the ideological assumptions, justification and sense of inferiority that colonists propagated upon subject peoples. In ideological terms these forms of political resistance can be divided into those that drew upon indigenous culture and those that identified with forms-colonial or Western – of modernity (164).

The native thus has a choice in his struggle, which enables him to fight for a political reality, which is a necessity.

The condition of the colonizer in these situations of anti-colonial movements is always uncertain. He has his own arguments being used against him by the colonized. And as Edward Said has stated in *Culture and Imperialism*, "The irony is that a native does the job, mastering not only sources and methods but the overpowering abstractions whose trace is in the minds of imperialists themselves were scarcely discernible when they originated" (306).

Resistance in colonial context is thus a very complicated affair. The same weapons and strategies that colonialists used are turned against them; there is nothing unusual in it because they were forcibly holding on an alien people's land. Consequently, it had to abandon the false values it projected wherever counter narratives gained dominance. In the next chapter I am reading into the Gandhian resistance narratives, in the cultural and political context as revealed through the selected novels.

Indian Counter Narrative

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

24

Chapter 6

Indian Counter Narrative

Then Gandhi came. He was like a powerful current of fresh air, that made us stretch ourselves and take deep breath, like a beam of light that pierced the darkness and removed the scales from our eyes, like a whirlwind that upsets many things but most of all the working of people's mind.

Jawaharlal Nehru, *Discovery of India*.

We shouldn't look for utopian theories, but simply ask how power operates in our society our task is to conquer power, not bring about justice. Justice simply reconstitutes power.

Michel Foucault. *Power/Knowledge*.

The Indian "will to truth," by resisting and subverting the colonial ideologies has been a unique experience in the history of humanity. The colonized Indian intellectual through seeking and gaining access to knowledge and the structures of colonial paradigms began to dismantle those very structures. The appropriation, extraction and distribution of knowledge by the Indian intellectuals created potential vibrations in the discursive field of colonialism that marked, paradoxically, the end of colonialism in India. Nationalism emerged as a strong ideological force in the Indian context. The pressures of nationalism had a magnifying effect on all native intellectuals as well as the populace. These pressures determined the attitude to the national struggle and to some extent decided the nature of the involvement of all concerned.

Saroj Sharma in *Indian Elite and Nationalism* finds out that "Indian nationalism manifested itself in various stages. From being limited to the intelligentsia in the middle of the nineteenth century, it spread to the urban middle class in the second half and reached the masses by the beginning of the twentieth century. The extremists like Tilak, Aurobindo and others initiated the process of mass mobilization which was completed by Gandhi" (12).

Nationalism as a political expression gained footage in colonial India with certain assumed concepts. In India, social changes and nationalism were intertwined to produce a radical change and they got nourished on the strands of progress that the intellectuals envisaged. It is normal for any group that campaigns for social changes or any change in political system and they claim confidently that the new changes will lead to improvement and development of the civilization.

The national consciousness that India produced was attained gradually through various social changes that came along. As Gobinda Prasad Sharma contents in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction*, "This national movement was not launched overnight throughout India, neither was a decision to this end taken in one single meeting of the representatives from all parts of the country. It was a slowly working process from the stages of germination of

nationalism in the mind of Indian to the new development in the INC (. . .)" (7).

The quest for individual liberty and dignity on the part of the native intellectuals, undertaken mainly due to ideas acquired from indigenous and Western concepts, determined the nationalist and socialist movements in India. A culture emerges out of this scenario which we may call national culture, which is best defined by Fanon, in *Wretched of the Earth*, as a "whole body of efforts made by a people in the sphere of thought to describe, justify, and praise, the action through which that people has created itself and keeps itself in existence (. . .)" (37).

Indian Nationalism

Nationalism is not, as Gellener says, "the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist" [Ernest Gellener, *Thought and Change*. Quoted in Benedict Anderson 1983]. Emerging and crystallizing of national consciousness was one of the major developments in the colonial societies during their struggle for freedom. Nationalism can be defined as a concept of shared community which enabled societies to invent a self-image, which they needed most to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression.

Fanon views efforts to form national culture as an inevitable stage in the liberation of a nation, a process intertwined with popular struggle. And

this process is begun by the colonised intellectual, who, in order to gain ideological power addresses the oppressor. His intention is to "charm him or denounce him through ethnic or subjectivist means".¹ Later, he turns to address his own people to awaken their consciousness.

The formation of "The Indian National Congress" was a major leap in the process of building nationalists unity involving the diverse societies of India, though a myth prevails that it was formed under the official direction and advice of Lord Dufferin, the viceroy, to provide a "safety valve" for the rising discontent among the masses.² According to this view A.O. Hume the founder of the Indian National Congress, was acting to the service of colonial regime. The Indian National Congress provided a common platform for the Indians to be united and to fight for their cause. Anyway it was not a sudden event, or a historical accident but a gradually developed one gaining strength during various stages of evolution. "It was the culmination of a process of political awakening that had its beginning in the 1860s and early 1870s and made a major leap forward in the late 1870s and early 1880s" (Bipan Chandra 71).

The intellectuals of the Indian political arena widened their thinking and, as a result broader national interests were developed. Intellectuals became the makers of consciousness for undermining and capturing power in Foucauldian terms.³ Ironically, as Bipan Chandra postulates, the "All-India

nationalist body that they brought into being was to be the platform, the organizer, the head quarters, the symbol of the new national spirit and politics" (Bipan Chandra. 1988: 71). Efforts were being made to prove that the notions about India formed by the colonizer were based on false assumptions. The colonized had to construct, through a prolonged period, their counter narration. The war was more on the level of narrations than on other levels.

Democratic and liberalist policies like freedom of ^{the} press, more funds for social upliftment of the poor, ensuring equality through power structures, and many other measures effecting socio-political equality were demanded by the Indian National Congress. "These were demands", Bipan Chandra writes in *India's Struggle for Independence*, "Which a colonial regime could not easily concede, for that would undermine its hegemony over the colonial people" (72). This grouping of a suppressed people under a consciousness of nationalism was a menace to the colonial regime. The colonial administrators' and ideologues' assertion that India could not be united or freed because India was not a nation, or a people but a geographical expression, a mere congeries of hundreds of diverse races and creeds, got shattered with the unification of the ideas of freedom under Indian National Congress. The narrative called freedom struggle was enormously powerful to hold together what was thought to be improbable to be held together.

The objective creation of nationalism and assertion of nationalistic feeling were extended ideological processes. In the case of India it was a much harder job, since a diverse society fragmented in various ways had to be united. A pro-poor orientation that was adopted by the national leaders got strengthened with the arrival of Mahatma Gandhi and the rise of the leftists in the Indian political scene, which struggled to make the movement adopt a socialist outlook.

With nationalist feeling catching fire, the natives could effectively counter the British narration of India as barbarian, uncivilized, uncontrollable. "In the colonial situation the anti-imperialist struggle was primary and the social – class and caste – struggle were secondary, and, therefore, struggles within Indian society were to be initiated and then classes and castes making concession," writes Bipan Chandra in *India's Struggle for Independence* (25). In a country like India with much disparity among different strata of people, the struggle for ideological hegemony needed readjustment of class interests into a particular ideological framework.

It becomes conspicuous from these facts that India's struggle for independence was not merely a political one but as Venkata Reddy postulates in *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose* it was "An all pervasive experience that became a part of the life of almost all the sensitive and enlightened Indians. Parallel to this struggle for political freedom was a

social struggle – a fight against superstition, casteism, poverty, illiteracy and many other social evils that were eating into the vitals of Indian society" (1).

In the Indian scenario as well as elsewhere, decolonization is a very complex battle, an Edward Said proposes in *Culture and Imperialism*:

Over the course of different political destinies, different histories and geographies, and it is replete with works of imagination, scholarship and counter-scholarship. The struggle took the form of strikes, marches, violent attack, retribution and counter-retribution. Its fabric is also made up of novelists and colonial officials writing about the nature of Indian mentality, for example, of the land-rent-schemes of Bengal, of the structure of Indian society; and, in response, of Indian writing novels about a greater share in their rule, intellectuals and orators appealing to the masses for greater commitments to and mobilization for independence (264-5).

Mahatma Gandhi as a Symbol of Nationalism

As it is well known, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's arrival into the field of Indian politics gave a new force and momentum to the struggle to counter colonial ideological structures. He was a charismatic figure, who could bind all sections of people. Khadi, national education, religious amity, realization of cultural values, boycott of liquor and foreign cloth, and

emancipation of the poor, the *harijans* and the tribal people, social upliftment were views which he wove and interwove into a new narration. Gandhi's theory of non-violence has an effective structure of ideas, which made the British bewildered. From within the framework of the emerging narration, the British became the inflictors of pain and the colonised Indian had to be looked at as benevolent, powerful sufferer. The psyche of the rulers was shattered by the passive acceptance of suffering by the *satyagrahis* who held on to the principle of non-violence. Bipan Chandra describes in *India's Struggle for Independence* non-violence as an inevitable part of "A movement whose strategy involved the waging of a hegemonic struggle based on a mass movement which mobilized the people to the widest possible extent" (25). By inflicting suffering on oneself, and narrating the other as evidently an oppressor, who is cruel, Gandhi was turning the table on the British. The suffering accepted by *satyagrahis* won the first major victory in the hegemonic struggle. These feelings helped to build the feeling of commonness, which strengthened the struggle.

Charisma of Gandhi spread from the lowest strata of the society to the highest. Bipan Chandra in *India's Struggle for Independence* writes that the masses were aroused to participate in the freedom struggle and people countered the narrations of the colonial rule in various ways like

Jail-going *Satyagraha* and picketing to participation in public meetings and demonstrations, from going on *hartals* and strikes to cheering the *jathas* of congress volunteers from the sidelines, from voting for nationalist candidates in municipal, district, provincial and central elections to participating in constructive programmes, from becoming four *anna* (25 paise) members of the congress to wearing *Khadi* and a Gandhi cap(...)(29)

These developments in the national consciousness and the realization of the rights the colonized had on their own land, led to the making of major statements like "*Swaraj* is my birth right", "Quit India", and "Freedom is my birth right" etc., which became pivotal in the efforts of the popular struggle. These were just attempts in the beginning but later these statements became strong and sharp weapons of ideological struggle. People became conscious of their rights and necessities. These, then, became facts about the Indian situation and nothing could shake them. The values of statement resides rather in their "presumptive truth", their "presumptive authority", and so in their actual instrumental potential. An explicit exhibition of demand for power, not as a disguised expression of a weak and resentful will but one arising against a political system based on economic exploitation and political oppression.

Gandhi as a historical figure and a mythical figure has attained a stature that no individual could do in modern world history. His character rather than personality enabled him to attain this. I make this observation from the fact that the term personality developed from the Greek term "persona" meaning a mask. Gandhi was revealing or "experimenting" with truth, a development of not a masking but a revealing. On the other hand the development of character that Gandhi endeavored was personal but its dynamics achieved a national image through many historical elements. So, when Saroj Sharma proclaims in *Indian Elite and Nationalism* that "His (Gandhi's) electing personality cast a magic spell over the masses and his leadership initiated a new phase in Indian National movement" (75), he touches only the tip of the iceberg.

Gandhi was essentially a postcolonial subject under colonial India. He was encountering the colonial ideologies with adept knowledge he had gained of certain presumptions of colonial rule. In my analyses I attempt to see how Western patriarchy and modernity^{is} adroitly dealt by Gandhi. How he managed to oppose the policy of divide and rule, how feminization was countered, how the assumption of Western superiority is challenged by putting forward an indigenous socialism, and how he himself as an image, with a simple and elegant character moved the masses to action and shattered the foundations of the empire in India.

Divide and Rule

British empire flourished in the Indian soil on a policy of divide and rule. I have already discussed this aspect in other parts of the thesis. Gandhi was capable of putting forward an image of unity among people through various strategies to counter them. Ashis Nandy observes, in *The Intimate Enemy*, "Gandhi (. . .) organized the Hindus as Indians, not as Hindus, and granted Hinduism the right to maintain its character on an unorganized, anarchic, open-ended faith." (26). The greatest conspicuous divide was between the Hindu and the Muslim religions in India, and Gandhi attempted his best to hold them together. Gandhi argued for a spiritual regeneration of individuals and, as Robert Young argues in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*, "Gandhi argued that only individual regeneration through personal self-rule would enable the political achievement of autonomous rule for India as a whole" (319).

Gandhi appealed to the divided people to acquire a personal character whereby their surface differences on the basis of religions and castes got overcome. In a letter to Charlie Andrews he writes, "*Swaraj* depended on how good India was, not how bad the British were. My belief is that the instant India is purified India becomes free and not a moment earlier" (Qtd in Louis Fischer, 276).

Gandhi always held his own life as a stake for the unity of the Hindu and the Muslim; he recognized "that Hindu-Muslim unity means Swaraj. There is no question more important and more pressing than this" (Qtd in Louis Fischer 276). Gandhi fasted in September 1924 to bring about communal unity. His fasts were a method to enter the people's mind as Louis Fischer observes in his work *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi*,

They would change, if at all, because the Mahatma's great sacrifice established a spiritual bond between him and them, a kind of common wavelength, a means of communication over which he conveyed to them the importance, the necessity, the urgency, the sacredness of the cause for which he was fasting. It was his way of going out to them, of entering their hearts, of uniting himself with them (281).

Fischer's observation that follows the above quoted lines is enlightening, "The fast was an adventure in goodness, the stake was one man's life. The prize was a nation's freedom" (281) Mahatma was a man of character, imbued in love, respect, dignity and freedom from fear. It is very difficult to understand such a man and the question of fighting him morally is a hazardous task. He questioned the integrity of India as a nation far before he questioned the right of the British in India. The man of vision could foresee anarchy if the nation as a whole does not develop a positive character. He was thus a spiritual

force, creating a morally inquisitive community. He wrote in *Young India* of June 16th, 1927: "Hindu-Muslim dissension proved that Indians could not regulate their own affairs. Then what claim had they on the British for more power? It was not enough to reply that Britain made use of their division or even created it, why did Indians give England this advantage."

Colonial narratives got an advantage out of the India situation and the British as manipulators of dissension enjoyed the religious divide that was slowly developing in India. In that context, Indians had to fight against their own faults, because the colonial narratives had to be proved wrong or to be corrected, and none other than Gandhi knew it better. He believed in dignity, discipline and restraints and in his opinion these would give the Indian self-respect, and as a consequence of it, respect of others as well as freedom. In the religious realm, it is not just an advocacy of religions unity that Gandhi proposed. He changed himself into a hybrid, by infusing religious values from all religions he came into contact. He proved with his gestures that any '-ism of religion, (Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Buddhism), may show dissimilarity but a Hindu, or a Muslim, or a Christian are far less dissimilar. One can see either a shrewd tactician amalgamating these ideas or a prophet analyzing with love and respect for all. Ashis Nandy in, *The Intimate Enemy*, declares that:

Gandhi's partiality for some of the Christian hymns and Biblical texts was more than the symbolic gesture of a Hindu towards a minority religion in India. It was also an affirmation that, at one plane, some of the recessive elements of Christianity were perfectly confluent with elements of Hindu and Buddhist world views and that the battle he was fighting for the minds of men was actually a universal battle to rediscover the softer side of human nature (. . .) (49).

Herein we can detect the subversion of the colonial religious attitude. Gandhi assumes through his hybrid image a universal stature, or a myth evolves around him making him a universal citizen. The assumed or granted position allows Gandhi assume a superior position in the colonial discourse. As Robert Young finds out in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*, "Gandhi's views, like everything else in his life, were irredeemably syncretic and often despite his affirmation otherwise, dialectical in their operation. This constituted the secret energy of the powerful counter modernity that he advanced" (317).

Gandhi is a typical product of colonialism, because he shows elements of hybridity in his character, but he gained a superior position, unlike many other postcolonial leaders by being syncretic or hybrid, which in turn becomes truly universal. Gandhi was a discourse in himself, emerging out of colonial

discourse yet became a strong force that determined the functioning of the colonial discourse. India – Pakistan divide can be cited as an example of failure of Gandhi's project. But we must recognize that Gandhi was a character in himself trying to overcome many idiosyncrasies and expected the people to follow him, which they did of course, but not knowing what he meant by all that. The issue of religion being a more sentimental force than Gandhi overtook him in the historical situation.

Encountering the Patriarchal

Gandhian method of encountering modernity and European mode of dominance is based on a purely indigenous concept of power, of using *shakthi* or soul-force against injustice. Normally, during decolonization the Western masculine might is fought with native masculine might, something like Fanonism or militant or terrorist activity wherein physical force is used against the colonial might. Cultural productions like nationalism, Marxism or socialism come as aid in this endeavor. Early Indian responses to colonial intervention were on this plane of activities. Ashis Nandy declares in *The Intimate Enemy*, "To beat the colonizers at their own game and to regain self-esteem as Indians and as Hindus, many sensitive minds in India did what the adolescent Gandhi at the ontogeneic level has tried to do symbolically with the help of a Muslim friend: they sought a hyper-masculinity or hyper

kshatriyahood that would make sense to their fellow-countrymen and to the colonizers" (52).

Encountering the colonial force in the plane of physical activities is a tough job, the colonizer with his access to state apparatuses, with his justification of discipline and peace, would brutally destroy the very act of violence on the part of the colonized.

Gandhi more than any Western theoretician, for that matter anybody else, could recognize the energy of soul force in resistance. Ashis Nandy hits the nail on its head when he gives out his doubt: "I suspect that there was in Gandhi not only a sophisticated ethical sensitivity but also political and psychological shrewdness" (49). Gandhi with his shrewdness encountered the European masculinity with femininity. This in turn was creating an ambiguous narrative pattern in the colonial realm. The colonialist found no weapon in his armory to counter this method of counter insurgency.

Robert Young in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* remarks that Gandhi's "Adoption of suffragette resistance strategies, his support for certain feminist objectives, and his own self-conscious move in his private and public life towards an androgynous identity, all suggest the connection between his central thesis of non-violence and a gender politics in which he resisted British Imperialism by subverting its hypermasculinity and playing on its responses to the feminine" (327). For a Westerner, Gandhi appears as a

radical, but for Gandhi he is never a radical and for an Indian he is only bringing to light ancient traditional knowledge, though one must remember that it is imported lights from the West. India steeped in mother-cult of religious worship where *Thripurasundari* is the all in all of the universe, the *Mahamaya* who creates "*Maya*" and "*Leela*" in the world, Feminine is something that is worshipped. It is from this unconscious realm of social psyche that Gandhi came to recognize the power of the feminine. In the modern theoretical light it appears as psychological and Robert Young declares that Gandhi,

Introduced psychology as a weapon of the weak (. . .) as a means of agency for anti-colonial practice that has been so fully developed in postcolonial historical reappraisals of the forms and means of anti-colonial resistance (. . .) Whereas Fanon responded to the feminization of the colonial subject by asserting a hypermasculinity, Gandhi engaged in a complex play between the two with his notion of *Satyagraha*, or an apparently 'feminine' passive resistance; 'soul-power', *shakti*, was also a feminine principle. By invoking the feminine in a political situation whose norm were masculine, he unsettled gender and colonial politics at once (327).

Gandhi was being a postmodern in the modern age. He revealed alternative ways of looking at things in his dialectical formulation of ideologies. His concept of acceptance of the feminine as possessing '*shakti*' itself destroyed the base of colonial pedagogy of cultural notions in the occupied land..

Thus, Gandhi was developing through his concept of soul-force, *satyagraha*, non-violent passive struggle and personal reformation a new feminine power to encounter colonial domination. It cut the very cultural base of colonialism.

Gandhian Socialism/ Nationalism.

Robert Young in *Post-colonialism: A Historical Introduction* argues that Marxism played a crucial role in all national liberalism movements in the European colonies. He writes "Anti and Post-colonial thought has always been engaged in a process of reformulating, translating and transforming Marxism for its own purposes (. . .)" (167). These statements echoes Frantz Fanon's postulations in *The Wretched of the Earth*. Fanon argues that:

In the colonies the economic substructure is also a superstructure. The cause is the consequence. You are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. This is why Marxist analysis should always be slightly stretched every time we have to do with the colonial problem (40).

The Indian case and the African case are different. India had many rich people and a great civilization in the material form and these facts demand a different analysis of the situation. Gandhi could use both the rich and the rich Indian tradition viably to create a momentum. Therefore, Marxism found a contestant in the Indian National Congress and Gandhi, as Robert Young writes:

The histories of liberation movements were all individual, but the Indian freedom movement was unique in its operation as well as in the ideological range of its participants (. . .) Two factors (. . .) the existence of Congress Party whose organizational structures, skills and ability to control its members deprived the communist party of an advantage which elsewhere it used to maximum effect; and second, the singular, eccentric and unique role played within and outside the Congress Party by the man who became by far the best known of all anti-colonial leaders, Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi achieved a popular following of a dimension that the Communist Party could not begin to rival (308).

The influence that Gandhi had on the masses is revealed here. As Saroj Sharma gives out in *Indian Elite and Nationalism*, "Gandhi purified and spiritualized politics and imparted to it a religious flavor. It was the means to

attain salvation, which lay in the Indian context, which meant political freedom" (76). A great deal of myth-making went into the Gandhian discourse that created Gandhi as a great figure, but we must not doubt the extent of the actual changes that this discourse wrought. India was colonial even before the arrival of the British: protocolonialism, so to call it, had remained in this country in the form of caste system. Gandhi gave a new dimension to postcolonial struggle by trying to break all these shackles for the liberation of all concerned. The subtle minded Indian, Gandhi, knew very well as to how to mend the ways of others as well as his own ways. In order to achieve social changes he undertook the hazardous tasks of traveling all across India, fasting, *satyagraha*, jail going, writing, public speeches, political deliberations and so on. He wanted to make a united India where every individual is liberated and we may even say that his project was a universal change.

The figure of universality that the image of Gandhi generated allowed him to develop his discourse into wider realms, effecting social changes. The essentially syncretic nature he assimilated became useful in producing a new ontological presumptive. His association with all sections of the society, especially the village peasants, enabled him to organize mass movements in India. Partha Chatterjee, as Robert Young points out in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*, "has argued that Gandhi's orientation towards the peasantry constituted a key move in the history of the Indian freedom

movement, through which the struggles of the peasantry and subaltern classes very often conducted against local *Zamindars* rather than the British administration, were articulated with the independence campaign conducted by the national bourgeois elite" (321). Partha Chatterjee discerns from the colonial situation that Gandhi's association with peasantry constituted a key move in the history of the Indian freedom movement through which all struggles began to assume the position of national liberation movement. Gandhi was appealing to the general and particular consciousness of masses and individuals at once. This became more evident in the picture of Gandhi himself. Along with symbols like *Khadi*, *charkha*, national flag, national language and new ideas he tried to "identify himself with the masses by dressing in loin cloth, living with austerity in *ashramas*, taking cheapest food, traveling like a commoner by third class and talking to them in their language" (79), as Saroj Sharma writes in *Indian Elite and Nationalism*.

Gandhi's Postcolonialism

Gandhi was a true postcolonial, but modern theoretical enterprises have ignored him is a fault that Robert Young has rightly pointed out in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*. What makes him postcolonial? My contention is that the discourse that he had generated itself is the answer and therefore he is quintessentially postcolonial. With his syncretic temporality that he assumes contextually allowed Gandhi to transcend

religious and national divides. Louis Fischer in *The Life of Mahatma Gandhi* writes, "The bridges of the West are made of concrete, steel, wire, words. The Eastern are of spirit. To communicate the West moves or talks. The East sits, contemplates, suffers. Gandhi partook of West and East when western methods failed him, he used eastern methods" (281). His quest for liberation was not in secluded contemplation, as he himself declares in *My Experiments with Truth*, "I live and move and have my being in pursuit of this goal. All that I do by way of speaking and writing, and all my ventures in the political field, are directed to this same end." (x). He wanted everyone to have his own quest, for he says, "I have all along believed that what is possible for one is possible for all, my experiments have not been conducted in the closet, but in the open; and I do not think that this fact detracts from their spiritual value." (x).

To begin with, Gandhi was a product of Western colonialism in more than one sense of the word. He acquired his critical tools in his initial stages of his evolution from its ideological bases, Marxism and Socialism. Leo Tolstoy and John Ruskin were writers who influenced him, as Young has pointed out, "Gandhi foregrounded the operation of cultural nationalism as a major strategy of anti-colonial resistance. While on the one hand he adopted Hindu values and morality, on the other hand he adopted the contemporary European ideology of degeneration to advocate a form of moral rebirth for India and the West alike" (318).

The spiritual regeneration that he wanted for both the East and the West shows the transcending ability of his ideological campaign. Herein he holds on to the superiority of a civilization, Indian, to critique the European civilization, the then "master's civilization" in India. Thereby he shocks the colonialists with his writings and actions. He wanted Indians to be dignified and strong so that England would change (Louis Fischer 286). This assumption of the masters' civilization being a degenerate one cut the basis of colonial pedagogy. Robert Young in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* writes that after some stage Gandhi changed his strategy of looking at Indian civilization and began to compare it with the British and dismissed British civilization as being degenerate:

He subsequently reversed this strategy, suggesting that western civilization far from being the superior civilization that colonialism was bringing to the rest of the world for the benefit of the 'inferior races' was itself degenerate, disgraced and diseased. The effect of British rule in India therefore, far from being progressive, was one of contagious and consequent decay (319).

Gandhi was not just reversing the colonial dichotomy of the self and the other, but attempting at an amalgamation of the two to produce a syncretic one, whereby the question of superiority and inferiority is demolished at the very

inception of the concept. Gandhi could do it only because of the availability of historical resources towards this end. Nandy discusses the validity of Gandhian non-violence in *The Intimate Enemy*:

What I am saying is that Gandhi's non-violence was probably not a one-sided morality play. Nor was it purely a matter of humane Hindus versus the inhuman Britons. The shrewd Bania, a practical idealist, had correctly seen that, at some level of national consciousness in Britain, there was near-perfect legitimacy for the political methodology he was forging (51).

Gandhi thus became a menace in the colonial regime for the British. His philosophy criticized the Western credentials of civilization and even transcended them into a spiritual level which the British could understand but never possess, being caught up in the epistemological constraints created by Western discourse. The British government found it very difficult to manage the rebel as Louis Fischer observes, "It was dangerous not to arrest the rebel, and dangerous to arrest him" (341). Gandhi thus became a carrier of the Indian values in a Western receptacle or vice-versa, too many aspects converged on the image of Gandhi that few people could understand the dynamics^{of} the Gandhian grand discourse. Emanating from his actions were two ideas, by^{the} 1930s, as Louis Fischer observes:

He made the British people aware that they are cruelly subjugating India, and he gave, Indians the conviction that they could, by lifting their heads and straightening their spines, lift the yoke from their shoulders. After that, it was inevitable that Britain should someday refuse to rule Indian and Indian should someday refuse to be ruled.

The British beat the Indians with batons and rifle butts. The Indians neither cringed nor complained nor retreated. That made England powerless and the Indian invincible (352).

It was on a basis of moral dignity that Gandhi began his quest for freedom. His liberation movement was based on a strong ideological foundation based on a self-sacrificing, suffering femininity, which in turn made bizarre the colonial masculine narrative. Fasting was one such feminine suffering taken up to achieve political ends, having its base in religious endeavor. Here I would like to point out that all three religions that came up in colonial discourse, Hinduism, Islam and Christianity have fasting as a penance to achieve moral and spiritual regeneration. Gandhi gave it a new dimension by adding the objective of political regeneration. Robert Young points out, in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*, that

As with the use of fasting as a means of political protest, (. . .) *satyagraha* worked as a statement whose force was

psychological. Like the refusal of communication through silence, fasting exerts a form of pressure and even power. As a strategy it discomfited and embarrassed the colonial authorities, taking the form of a private demonstration that they were unable to control or repress, which nevertheless also worked very effectively as a public event. By this means Gandhi also took the moral high ground in his object of political and socio-economic dominance (323).

Gandhi's greatness and sparkle were in his adoption of religious concepts to focus not on the Indian condition or colonialism alone but it endeavored a critique of modern Western civilization also. In "his dress and cultural identification, Gandhi constructed an eccentric subject position at the outer limits of marginalization and social exclusion" (Young 321). This enabled him a position or stance outside the system, even while being within it, from where he could make critical analysis. It is quite interesting to note as Young has said, "No colonial leader identified himself publicly and absolutely with the wretched of the earth than Gandhi," (321). This enabled him two advantageous strong points simultaneously: he became one of them by image and by being among them he could easily transform the masses. And secondly, these "sartorial semiotics", the semiotics of clothes, of which he is a master as Robert Young proclaims, he could shake the foundation of British imperialism and claims of civilizing mission. Bill Ashcroft *et al* write in *The*

Post-colonial Studies Reader, "The body itself has also been the literal 'text' on which colonization has written some of its most graphic and suitable messages (. . .) The body (. . .) has become then the literal site on which resistance and oppressed have struggled, with the weapons being in both cases the physical sign of cultural difference (. . .) "(322). Gandhi added many semiotic elements to his figure: economic, social, cultural, and philosophic.

Gandhi as an image with his lean short figure, loincloth, stick, spectacles and, of course a chain clock, wooden chapels – incorporated economic, political, social, cultural, colonial and postcolonial aspects at once. From this figure emanated certain semiotic call for struggle and simplification of life - spiritual and political regeneration. It produced an assumption and proved that war of ideas determines the future of any community or for that fact a nation or the world at large. Gandhi could produce through his discourses a moral and cultural superiority of Indian civilization. Through these, Robert Young postulates, Gandhi was able to destroy the main ideological argument used to sustain British rule that India was incapable of ruling itself.

In the context of Indian counter narrative to British colonial narrative the fact that Gandhi played a crucial role is made clear through my reworking of the ideas by great scholars. Gandhi who could place himself epistemically outside the thematic of post-enlightenment thought, and of modernity, could

envisage a greater civilization. Through his narratives in various semiotic fields he could release the mystified Indian embedded in colonial narrative. He could produce a new image of a dignified, spiritual and materialistic, though ready to forgo it for the need of the needy, India which the West found too difficult to encounter. Some people called him a saint, some a politician or a shrewd bania or a sage, but all in all he was a man of character who did change a nations history.

Violent Nationalism

Harpal Brar in his foreword to the book *Challenge to Imperial Hegemony: The Life Story of a Great Indian Patriot, Udham Singh*, declares:

Two myths are widespread in bourgeois historiography, in India as well as abroad. First, that Gandhi and Indian National Congress, with the methods of non-violence and peaceful non-cooperation and civil disobedience, were instrumental in achieving India's independence from the much-hated British Raj. Second, that, revolutionaries such as Bhagat Singh, Rajguru, Sukhdev and Udham Singh were individual terrorists pure and simple, who believed in bloodshed and armed robberies just for the fun of it. Is it, therefore, not fortunate, assert the despicable purveyors of these myths, composed in equal part of the ignorant and the malicious, that India adopted

Gandhi's path rather than taking the line advocated by the revolutionaries?(vi)

During Gandhian era there were many armed rebellions as a consequence of nationalist and socialist ideologies having an upsurge. They were great heroes of rebellion who advocated violence to counter the colonial atrocities.

Hindu Republican Association, formed by Shachindra Nath Sanyal, Ghadar party, Hindustan Socialist Republican Association, formed at the initiative of Bhagat Singh are some of the organizations that took up armed struggle (Harpal Brar). The revolutionary urge, that all these organizations shared, demanded an armed struggle in the wake of brutalities being inflicted by the imperial British government. A strong sense of violence engulfed all their deliberations. The quotes and an advertisement in Ghadar, the weekly of Ghadar party are relevant to show the spirit.

Today there begins in foreign lands a war against the British Raj. What is our name? Mutiny. What is its work? Mutiny. Where will mutiny break out? in India. The time will soon come when rifles and blood will take the place of pen and ink.

Wanted enthusiastic and heroic soldiers for organizing Ghadar in Hindustan. Remuneration – Death; Reward – Martyrdom; Pension – Freedom; field of work-Hindustan.

All rebellious movements adhered to Marxist ideals and as Bipan Chandra says in India's Struggle for Independence had their influences from "upsurge of working class trade unionism after the war. They could see the revolutionary potential of the new class and desired to harness it to the nationalist revolution. The second major influence was that of the Russian Revolution (. . .) The third influence was that of the newly sprouting communist groups with their emphasis on Marxism, Socialism and the proletariat" (247-8). Pranab Bandyopadhyay in *Armed Revolutions in India* finds out that, "The rise of radical nationalism was a conservative and revolutionary phenomenon. It was inspired by Indian religions and the Western methods of mass agitation and even terrorism" (25).

All these revolutionary movements and later the attempt by INA of Subash Chandra Bose failed in their attempts to secure freedom for India, through it served a crucial purpose in the discourse. All those men were patriots and wanted revolution to free their motherland but Gandhian presence with its immeasurable magnitude and Indian National Congress with its organizational strength marginalized these activities as Robert Young had declared (Quoted elsewhere in the thesis). Gandhi's voice against these types of violent action helped the nationalist cause by bringing into the discourse the reasoning of Indian deliberations. However, the British remained silent and under the pretext of actions against these activities they inflicted cruel suppressive measures which in turn boomeranged on their claims of just rule.

Therefore, Gandhian discourse could criticize both parties concerned, the revolutionaries and the British, and the Indian National Congress with the support of Gandhi wrested control of the moment exploiting the particular nature of the episteme, the "underground" grid or network which allows thought to organize itself. The Gandhian counter narrative consisted of attitudes and actions, gestures and images, movements and struggles. It was a new kind of writing; after all, writing need not be always in the familiar scripts.

Novel as Counter Discourse

The novel, with its heteroglossic discursive aspect in its very form assumes a greater realm of importance in counter discursive environments. Novels of resistance can be called as meta-narratives or meta-discourses of the discourse that they are a part of. One of the characteristics of the novel is that it can be a discourse of the discourse it is part of. Few other genres can claim this advantage. As Jeremy Hawthorn states in *A Concise Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*: "A meta-narrative can thus be either a narrative which talk about other, embedded narratives, or a narrative which refers to itself and to its own narrative procedures" (104). Frederic Jameson's statement that all postcolonial literatures are national allegories becomes important here (detailed in the second chapter of the thesis). I refuse to use the term allegories because resistance narratives, though they use symbolic

narratives, they are not just symbolic, they attempt to be more precise and narrate the condition, and it is to involve the desired consciousness that the narrative is attempted to. Anti-colonial resistance novels attempt to contain through representation the totality of the colonial society at a given moment. These novels have a strong sense of ideology and through representation of the colonial situation they venture to drive it to both the colonizer and the colonized.

In my attempt to draw a picture of the evolution of the novel in Gandhian era, I would like to suggest that Indian novels of this era can be seen as belonging to two groups: one written in the native languages and the other, the novels in English. That India is a land divided by languages is a fact that is known to all. In the colonial context the love for national or native language will rise and determine various anti-colonial aspects. Language is not just a tool and through certain codes the native intellectuals highlight the importance of national language. It is a means of opposition, opposition to cultural practices that arrive along with the colonial language. But colonial situation, essentially being a hybrid one, inevitably reduces the importance of this opposition as Said observes in *Culture and Imperialism*:

The concept of language is central, but without the practice of a national culture – from slogans to pamphlets and newspapers, from folk tales and heroes to epic poetry, novels, and drama –

the language is inert; national cultural organizes and sustains communal memory (. . .) it re-inhabits the landscape using restored ways of life, heroes, heroines, and exploits; it formulates expressions and emotions of pride as well as defiance, which in turn form the backbone of the principal national independence parties. Local slave narratives, spiritual autobiographies, prison memoirs from a counterpoint to Western powers' monumental histories, official discourses and panoptic quasi-scientific view points (260).

In the Indian context both national and native languages and English served the cause of the nationalists. It is interesting to note that Gandhi's decision to write only in Gujarati can^f be seen as an emotional aspect of the struggle, but his ideas got wide circulation only when it got translated into English and other vernaculars. Therefore, language serves certain ideological function in rather more complex ways than it appears on the surface. In the very assumption of rejection of or acceptance of a language itself there are ideological imperatives, it gives forth certain signals, statements and valid socio-psycho compulsions.

Meenakshi Mukhreejee is of the view that in the Indian colonial context, as she declares in *The Perishable Empire*:

Language-centered nationalism and the concept of a nation that transcends linguistic divisions reinforced each other in this period and the novel in India emerged at the cusp of these twin impulses. One without the other could not have sustained a genre that served a complex function in a colonial society, providing a vehicle for the emergence of political aspirations, imaginative adventure, historical reconstruction as well as a desire to document contemporary life. The novel as well as Indian nationalism stand at the conjunction of English - which not only opened out a new literary horizon but introduced new knowledge – and the Indian languages which became the conduct for processing this knowledge to suit regional needs (22-23).

Novel by its very form has resistance encoded in it, because as Lennard, J. Davis argues in *Resisting Novels*:

The novel is a form which depends on mimesis – the imitation of reality through realist techniques – and because of that fact, novels depend on their abilities to make readers feel as if they are witnessing not art but life. In this sense novels parallel ideology which attempts to destroy the veil of its own artifice and to appear as natural common sense (26).

The very fact that novels parallel ideologies enables the writers of resistance literature to produce their ideology in that form of art. Novel, emanating from the cultural discourse they are part of, thus serves in turn the same cultural discourse by reproducing in a temporal frame the ideologies within a system facilitating the furthering and concretization of those ideologies. Herein lies the disguise within the presence of novel; the organization of systems of experience provides the stage for fixing of ideologies. Lennard Davis, in the same work, contends that: "Novels are pre-organized system of experience in which characters, actions, and objects have to mean something in relation to the system of each novel itself – in relation to the culture in which the novel is written, and in relation to the readers who are in that culture" (24). What Davis views as an aspect of early modern European culture can be extended to anti-colonial struggles everywhere: novels provided a strong tool for counter narration. Davis contends that novel is critical in nature:

The novel provides a resistance to dominant trends in early modern culture in the sense that it provides controlled ideological locations, as sense of community and belonging through identification with characters, a special significance to conversation that elevates those who engage in it (. . .) In this sense, the novel resists society and in a kind of mass cultural defense, as are ideological structures in general(16).

In the postcolonial context the freedom fighters hear their own voice echoed in the novel. And the heroic or even epic stature that some freedom fighters are given provides added energy for the individual leader. While the regional language novels highlighted the regional, class and caste realities and complexities, the novels in English had a different purpose to serve. Gobinda Prasada Sharma states in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction*, "English is not an Indian language, but it has served so many useful and eventual purposes of a developing society(. . .)." (xi). He further acknowledges that:

The Indo-Anglican fiction writers, whose mother tongue is not generally English, have written their novels and stories in this language to give expression to their nationalist spirit as Indians. By giving expression to the spirit in this language, they can hope to draw and hold the attention of readers abroad, English being the only all India language besides being international (xiii).

English novels had the figures of the constructed readers abroad, the Anglo-Indians and the Indian elite within the consolidated system of colonial cultural representation. The colonial cultural system which envisaged, from the side of Indians, radical changes in the social system gave the novelists enough substance for exploration in the fictional world. What is significant is that when early Indian English novels assumed the implicit adherence to be

outside the culture, as Meenakshi Mukherjee argues in *The Perishable Empire*, the novels during the Gandhian era addressed the native as well as the colonizer at once (14). The attitude of testifying to the alien reader, as we find in the early novels is transformed to a clarion call for national liberation, political changes and social reformations in the novels during the Gandhian era.

Novels during the Gandhian age produced a considerable body of work which has Gandhian values and socialism as the main ingredients of their discourse. These novels are more coercive or more intellectually self-critical than early novels. At its best, nationalist resistance to imperialism through these novels were both resistant to colonialism and critical of the social condition prevalent in India. Rama Jha says in *Gandhian Thought and Indo-Anglican Novelists*, "The liberation of Indian spirit through the development of cultural and political identity opened new arenas of creation for the novelists" (24). Rama Jha believes that it can be shown, that "The novels of these two decades, when analyzed in the context of Gandhian thought, fall into a pattern and present a clear contrast to the novels written and published in the nineteenth century" (20). The beginning stages had their own limitations, the novelists mostly drew upon Western myths and literature to substantiate the work as Meenakshi Mukherjee says in *The Perishable Empire*, "The new experience of being exposed to a different culture was too overwhelming and the events described in novels seemed to be unreal and strange that it was

possible to place all of it outside the axis of history" (6). But during the Gandhian era the fully-grown national consciousness held a different picture. Susie Tharu's general formulation, about the addresser's discursive relationship with the addressee can be extended to both these cases, "(T)hough the addresser and the addressee are assumed to be prior to and independent of the discourse, in other words, as 'already there', both these figures are not only positioned, but also constructed by the logic of the discourse, they are its producers" (Qtd in Meenakshi Mukherjee, 14).

Rama Jha's opinion is that the pattern created by the Gandhian thought, as he affirms in the above-mentioned work, "emerges out of a sense of national identity that Gandhian thought injected into the supine intellectual world which was churning out mere 'echoes' of the novels written by Anglo-Indians who were their literary models" (20). Venkata Reddy in his work *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose* opines that Indian novels, "Arose as much from the political social problem of a colonized country as from indigenous narrative tradition of ancient culture (. . .). The socio-political movement that had caught the imagination of the entire nation also inspired the Indian novelists in English who rightly realized the novel too had a vital role to play in it" (1,2).

These historical-social novels of Gandhian era not only presented various problems but also offered solutions in terms of fictional

conceptualizations. As Venkata Reddy and Bayyapa Reddy say in their work, *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose*:

By imaginatively treating the contemporary themes, the Indian English novelists sought to explore and interpret India significantly in its various aspects – social, political, economic and cultural. And, inspired by a vision of just social order, they artistically expressed the urges and aspiration of people who were heroically involved in the struggle for equality and liberation (iii).

What makes the novels of this age unique is that all the pictures that they created did not remain mere pictures showing the freedom struggle in the surface alone, but they amalgamated to show the true spirit of the age of Gandhi – the spirit that urged to win freedom both politically and morally. Meenakshi Mukherjee states in the same work, "It may not be a coincidence that the novel in English emerged in India in the (1930) decade prior to independence, when there was an urgency to foreground the idea of a composite nation" (17).

English novels, in the Gandhi Era, attempted defining Indian condition rather than local and regional issues. Meenakshi Mukherjee points out in *The Perishable Empire*, that early Indian novels, "Barring an unusual novel like *Gora*, which is a long reflection of identity, nationality and the impact of

colonialism, most of our fictional literature has been conditioned by other, either older or newer, mere local, diverse and complex pressures and intricate social hierarchies than can be explained entirely by British rule in India" (180).

The colonial discourse of the 1930s, and 40s facilitated a momentum - getting its ingredients from Gandhi, INC, Marxism and other Indian events and events of the world at large – which enabled the writers to create novels with a purpose, as an ideological tool to garner social and national changes. The unique position that English as an overarching linguistic bond held cannot be denied. It had within its historical conditioning the necessary components for constructing a national identity. Meenakshi Mukherjee identifies it thus in the earlier mentioned work:

Any project of constructing a national identity is predicated upon two simultaneous imperatives: an erasure of differences within the border and accentuating the difference with what lies outside. As a language English in India automatically achieves the first, and the second is facilitated when a homogeneous Indian tradition is pitted against an equally unified imaginary West (174).

Indian novels in English, compelled and facilitated by the historical imperatives of colonial India, in the Gandhian era, could evolve an imagined

united India. Their India was united in many ways, of course, Gandhi as a universal symbol served them very well, and they could imbibe into their narratives a national consciousness which served in more than one way to unite India and to fight the British narratives. Gandhi dominated the narratives in the novel as he did in the political field. He was the hope that Indians had. Novels that showed Gandhi, it does not matter whether to criticize or to applaud his values, created a visionary and fine future. And novels that failed to recognize him ended in despair during his age.

Kanthapura

During the national liberation struggle the native intellectual addresses the nation at large to dialectically consider, the grasping of opposites in their unity, the immediate necessities of the community to evolve an ideological structure. Pitted against the colonial master's ideological terrain, the native consciousness absorbs a different conceptualization of the self from that is available in the colonial narration.⁴ The native naturally ~~self~~-projects ^{the self} and eulogizes the native value system, and motivates the individual consciousness to arrive at the site of struggle. The novel as a genre capable of producing in its polyphonic diversity, ideological build-ups, functions in the cusp of the national discourse for liberation. The novel reproduces the ideological terrain in a systematic pattern that builds up the ideology in the consciousness of the reader. Lennard Davis in *Resisting Novels*, proposes this very idea:

The novel is a form which depends on mimesis – the imitation of reality through realist techniques – and because of that fact, novels depend on their ability to make readers feel as if they are witnessing not art but life. In this sense novels parallel ideology. (. . .) Novels attempt to contain through representation the totality of a society at a given moment (26).

In the Indian struggle for independence, the Gandhian ideology permitted a visualization of a liberated society that became the "normal" or should be "natural" state of human existence against which all other cultures and cultural concepts were reanalyzed, and the Indian novelists in English celebrated in their narratives this visualization of a "new" society. The "universal" nature that these ideas began to gain in the Indian consciousness is manifested in the novels. In *Kanthapura* Raja Rao attempts successfully at a semantic reconfiguration of the Gandhian ideology, fixing it into the Indian consciousness. The ideological resources get stamped into the consciousness through the novel; it is achieved by recreating the Independence struggle. Raja Rao has been able to do the same in his work *Kanthapura*. Adlai Murdoch argues in "(Dis)placing Marginality: Cultural Identity and Creole, Resistance in Glissant and Maximin":

The articulation of resistance holds particular resonance for the literature of the colonized.(. . .) Literary texts are interwoven

into historical phenomena, and literary criticism is increasingly being integrated into a broad cultural critique of the world (47).

The novel form has a special nature in depicting the realities as Lennard J. Davis in his work *Resisting Novels* states:

Ideology's major function, according to Louis Althusser, is the "reproduction of the conditions of reproduction". The reproductive process here allows things to keep on going, and ideological structures need to replicate themselves in cultural forms and in the cognitive and affective processes of the people. The novel in this sense is uniquely reproductive" (25).

The ideology that Raja Rao adheres to in the novel is definitely Gandhian and he delineates the colonial situation in a new paradigm, a new native paradigm and it is conforming to the Indian past (consciousness). The novel serves the special purpose of fixing or bringing to consciousness the latent knowledge that almost every Indian shared during the age of Gandhi; the Red-man was always an alien, an intruder.

In the novel those who do not conform to Gandhian ideology is marginalized. Bhatta and Bade Khan along with the Sahib of the Skeffington Coffee Estate belong to the group that opposes the ideology that evolves in the context.⁵ They join together against the "national" unity and are therefore

removed to the darker side of human values: jealousy, brutality, sexual indulgence, pride and greed embody their personality.

Unity in Diversity

In the Indian consciousness of the Gandhian Era three sects of people formed the national unity, Mulk Raj Anand's *Coolie, Untouchable and Two Leaves and a Bud*, and Raja Rao's *Kanthapura* delineate this reality vividly and attempt at a revisualization of these sects working in unity to form a national community. The town people or the city dwellers form the first group; they provide the ideological basis of the struggle. The second group, the major group, is the peasants who really provide the strength and provide the main force that moved the struggle forward. The third group includes the coolies and the untouchables; they are represented as requiring support from the other two groups. In *Kanthapura*, Raja Rao focuses on all these sects and desires a unity among these groups. Moorthy goes to the city and comes back a Gandhi man, Vasudev and Gangadhar come from the city to infuse Gandhian ideals into the peasants of the village and the coolies of the Estate. Peasants become political activists, deriving inspiration from Gandhi through their 'little' Gandhis; they fight the imperial yoke and social maladies. The estate coolies in turn garner energy from the peasants and the "little" Gandhis.

We can clearly discern the mind surging for the evolution of a concept of unity in diversity under the "universal" image of Gandhi in the novel; Rao

brings about a consciousness of unity by infusing Gandhian ideological presence throughout the novel. Two aspects that are impediments to national unity, the divide on religious questions and the malaise of untouchability predominate the dialectics, the grasping of the opposites in their unity, of the novel and the Gandhian ideology is justified and attempts at the removal of all barriers – caste and religion.

People are visualized as being very co-operative and understanding. All "characters" appear as if they are eager to contribute to the welfare of the society. Individual wishes are sacrificed for the sake of collective benefit. A sense of belonging and being in the society is developed in the narrative. When the question of *Sankarajayanthi* celebration is put up, everyone eagerly comes forward to offer dinner (10). Virtually there is a race for being the first provider for the celebrations. There is a dream element of unity in that visualization. Likewise, when Moorthy is arrested, the villagers support him and are ready to suffer for him. Moorthy becomes their Mahatma. As K.R.S. Srinivas Iyengar suggests in *Indian Writing in English* "The style of narration makes the book more a Gandhi Purana than a piece of mere fiction, Gandhi is invisible God, Moorthy is the visible avatar" (391).

The "avatar" is embraced by all the communities. The narrator always uses the term "Our Moorthy", "Our Moorthapa", which shows the sense of belonging that Moorthy acquires in the community and that the community

shows towards Moorthy. The first part of the novel is an all-permeating effort to conceptualize the unity of the Indian nation, destroying and demolishing caste and religious differences. G.P. Sharma in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction* opines that the author has created

An idealized character after the image of Gandhi, like Kandan of Venkataramani. Both play the part of Gandhi in their own villages and stand amongst the villagers as pillars of Gandhian ideals, firm and yet humble. But Raja Rao's Moorthy is more distinct, more real and more of an active leader with a definite programme of the movement before him (214).

Gandhis are created all over India and the special technique of Raja Rao to make Gandhi a saint is made evident in the transformation that Moorthy undergoes upon meeting the Mahatma. Moorthy becomes a mouth-piece of Gandhian ideals and we can observe Gandhian ideas projected through the image and dialogues of Moorthy.

Fight, says he, but harm no soul. Love all, says he, Hindu, Mohomedan, Christian or Pariah, for all are equal before God. Don't be attached to riches, says he, for riches create passions, and passions create attachment, and attachment hides the face of Truth. Truth must you tell, he says, for Truth is God, and verily, it is the only God I know (17).

The sense of unity that Indians share is blended and flows through the Gandhian image. The spiritual nature that Gandhiji adopted in his struggle could easily influence the common Indian mind. It is through the already available cultural artifacts and the latent knowledge of the Indian culture available in the Indian consciousness that Mahatma touched the millions of hearts in India. Raja Rao in this novel does the same by resorting to myths, *puranas* and epics to inspire the Indian mind. A national image is blended into this polyphonic diversity. Indians are united under the image of Gandhi and those who do not agree with Gandhian – national – ideology are manipulators and contrivers.

Then come youngster after youngster and said Moorthy was excommunicated by the Swami, for Moorthy was for Gandhiji and the Untouchables, and the Swami was paid by the British to do their dirty work. 'I have grown in the Mutt', says one 'and I have known what they do. The Mutt, brothers, is the best place for retired High Court Judges, Police Inspectors and God-dedicated combiner, and they are not with us, are they?' (56)

When the characters are pictured as not belonging with the activists and not conforming to Gandhian ideology, they are removed to the level of *asuras* who are archetypal negative characters. Bhatta, the money lender, Bade Khan the policeman, the *maistris* of the Estate are thus characterized. All others are

strongly persuaded to conform to the national ideology, Range Gowda, the most powerful man of Kanthapura is ready to become a slave of Moorthy. Range Gowda says in the novel, "If you think I should become a member of the congress, let me be a member of the Congress. If you want me to be a slave, I shall be your slave. All I know is that what you told me about the Mahatma is very fine, and the Mahatma in a holy man, and if the Mahatma says what you say, let the Mahatma's word be the word of God" (100).

The novel is a celebration of Gandhian existence. B.A. Pathan says in *Gandhian Myth in English Literature in India*, "Gandhiji embodied the best qualities of the mythological heroes in the past, the celibacy of Rama, the statemanship of Vidur, the Ahimsa of Buddha and the love and tolerance of the Christ. Gandhiji was a living Myth" (24). He continues to state that, "the life of Gandhiji became the life of our nation. As Gandhiji grew in stature, the nation also grew in self-consciousness" (31). *Kanthapura* unites the Gandhian present to the mythical and legendary past of India, and elements of Indian consciousness get transfused into the narrative consciousness. Through the imagined subjective positioning from the veritable multiplicity of Indian society, Raja Rao builds up an imagined society that is united. Gandhi adorns the position of the head of the society from where he transmits his energy to numerous individuals who take up the vow to become like him: and thereby India generates many "little" Gandhis. The transmission of Gandhian

soul-force to Moorthy is similar to the transmission of divine energy to the *abhyasi* by the Guru:

The Mahatma lifted him up and, before them all, he said, "What can I do for you, my son?" and Moorthy said, like Hanuman to Rama, "Any command", and the Mahatma said, "I give no commands save to seek Truth," and Moorthy said, "I am ignorant, how can I seek truth?" and the people around him were trying to hush him and to take him away, but the Mahatma said, " You wear foreign cloth my son" – It will go, Mahatmaji - "You perhaps. go to foreign Universities – " It will go, Mahatmaji " - "You can help your country by going and working among the dumb millions of the villages' – "So be it, Mahatmaji," and the Mahatma patted him on the back, and through that touch was revealed to him as the day is revealed to the night the sheathless being of his soul; and Moorthy drew away, and as it were with shut eyes groped his way through the crowd to the bank of the river. And wandered about the fields and the lanes and the canals and when he came back to the College that evening, he threw his foreign clothes and his foreign books into the bonfire, and walked out, a Gandhi's man (49).

Uday Shanker Osha in, "Gandhian Ideology: A study of Raja Rao's *Kanthapura*" has observed that Rao's confidence in Gandhian thought led him to idealize Mahatma Gandhi as a true saint. Indian saints transmit their soul-force or energy to their disciples and Gandhi as a political saint created disciples all around India by transmitting his ideals into them. The Gandhi men were strong. "What is a hyena before a lion or jackal before a elephant? What is a policeman before a gandhiman?" By infusing confidence and unity Rao was creating new kinds of truth that were eternal for Indians. The novel assimilates various section of the society into a union and towards the end of the novel it is a full-fledged Gandhian struggle for Independence that gets visualised in the Skeffington Coffee Estate. As Lennard Davis makes clear in *Resisting Novels*: "The eternal truths embodied in novels will become in effect through the process of reproduction, eternal truths in fact novels make sense because of ideology they embody ideologies; and they promulgate ideology. They exist by virtue of ideology (. . .) (26). The full-fledged struggle to free coolies from the Skeffington Coffee Estate, which explicitly projects the atrocities of the "Red-man's government", becomes the goal towards which the narrative goads its ideologies throughout the novel. The atrocities of the police and the miserable plight of the satyagrahis however do not reduce the spirits:

They say the Mahatma will go to the Red-man's country and he will get us Swaraj. He will bring us swaraj, the Mahatma. And

we shall be happy. And Rama will come back from exile, and Sita will be with him, for Ravana will be slain and Sita freed, and he will come back with Sita on his right in a chariot of the air, and brother Bharatha will go to meet them with the worshipped sandal of the master on his head. And as they enter Ayodhya there will be a rain of flowers (58).

The placing of the situation in a village, where the diversity of Indian condition is deciphered, allowed the novelist the space to build a national consciousness because India consisted of villages. The narrator resides in another village where the story is recollected and she suggests that it is now the turn of that village to embark on the path of struggle, thereby suggesting the ever-expanding nature of the struggle. Sreenivas Iyengar in *Indian Writing is English* states: Kanthapura is remarkable in many ways: the theme is the impact of Gandhi's name and idea on an Indian village, anyone of the seven-lakh Indian villages.

Raja Rao is aware of the necessity to find a suitable method of appropriation of the genre novel, Western in form to the Indian experience. He creates the narrator as a female to tell the story to make it appear more interesting. The often quoted lines of Raja Rao in postcolonial studies reveal the style of the language of the novel: "The telling has not been easy. One has to convey the various shades and omissions of a certain thought-movement

that looks maltreated in an alien language" (v). The presenting of the novel through the mouthpiece of a grandmother endorses a new dimension to it, as Sreenivas Iyengar says in *Indian Writing in English*:

The story-teller is a "grandmother" (the most gifted of story-tellers, because the art of story-telling is second nature to Indian Grandmother!) who narrates for the edification of a newcomer the annals of her village long after the actual events in which she had herself participated; and the manner of her telling too is characteristically Indian, feminine with a spontaneity that is coupled with sunflower, vivid with a raciness suffused with native vigor, and exciting with a rich scene of drama, shot through and through with humor and lyricism (390).

Gajendra Kumar is of the opinion that the story is narrated in the puranic style. He states in "Kanthapura: A Stylistic Feat": "Raja Rao has presented the story in the *Puranic "Akhyam Style"* which he terms in the "Foreword" as *Sthalapurana* in which "the past mingles with the present and the gods mingle with men (. . .) mingling the contemporaneous socio-political history with the rich and religious mythology" (18).

The attempt is on a grand scale: Raja Rao tries to encompass the spirit of the Indian movement for liberation - spiritual, social and political - within the short space of the novel. Rama Jha opines in *Gandhian Thought in Indo-*

Anglican Fiction that, "Instead of taking up any of the various issues of Gandhian thought like untouchability, anti-mechanization, ahimsa, colonial and racial exploitation as particular themes, like Mulk Raj Anand does in his novels, Raja Rao deals with the overall spiritual regeneration that Gandhian thought revealed" (94). The slow visualization of Kanthapura brings into consciousness the awakening of a nation at large towards the goal of *purna swaraj* – complete independence - under the leadership of Gandhi. C.D. Narasimhaiah in his "Introduction" to the novel writes, "*Kanthapura* is no political novel any more than is Gandhi's movement a mere political movement. It pictures vividly, truthfully and touchingly the story of the resurgence of India under Gandhi's leadership" (ix).

The matter of spiritual regeneration, the questions of untouchability and foreign rule, the necessity of national unity, the issue of social reformation etc. find place in the narrative. Against these the cruelty and the atrocities of the foreign rule are delineated. The case of Skeffington Coffee Estate liberation struggle and the violence visualized through Bade Khan and the police inspector show the cruel image of imperial yoke, clearly demanding the removal of it. The racial as well as the economic exploitation hinted at in the first paragraph of the novel emerges in its demonic form at the Skeffington Coffee Estate owned by "Hunter Sahib who used his hunter and his hand *to reap the first fruits* of his plantation" (67).⁶ The way the coolies are lured to come to the Coffee Estate by the maistris, never to be allowed to

leave ever after, the rampant corruption and the rapes of young women by Hunter Sahib remind the reader of Anand's treatment of the same issues in his novel, *Two Leaves and a Bud*. The novel incorporates very many aspects of the freedom struggle projecting the kernel of the social priorities. G.P. Sarma in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction* opines:

What makes this novel a distinctive success is that all these pictures have not remained mere pictures showing the freedom struggle in the surface alone, but they have all combined together to reveal the true spirit of the age of Gandhi – the spirit that strove to win freedom both politically in the common sense and morally in the Gandhian sense (212).

By locating the novel in historical time and in a recognizable space, the novelist was giving a "true" picture of the society, making the reader feel as if he is witnessing the reality of Indian condition. By infusing Gandhian ideology into it, he was helping the national cause for the conceptualization of a new reality. The wholeness of the novel provided any Indian reader of that age the option of identifying himself with one or the other character in the novel. The novel is ideologically pro-Gandhian that people wished to be Moorthy, Vasudeva, Range Gowde, Rangamma and the like, who conform to Gandhian scheme of things and avoid becoming Bhatta and Bade Khan. Thus, this novel served the purpose of allowing the realization of a national

consciousness to develop and it provided emotional and intellectual needs of the Indian society during a crucial period of India's intellectual growth for Independence.

Alpana Sharma Knippling in her article, "R.K. Narayan, Raja Rao and Modern English Discourse in Colonial India", critiques the language used by Raja Rao and denounces it by arguing that it is limited:

In fact, the mark of writing is such that it institutes both the grounds for its possibility in utterance and simultaneously, its impossibility to fully or actually utter. As such, Rao's project to nativise English is, from the start, already implicated in and delimited by its failure. For, in order to nativise English, he must also provide the de-nativizing indices which will render intelligible those instances of the nativization to Western readers. Specifically, he must engage a nationalist agenda by nativizing English, but he must also provide a fifty-nine-page glossary of terms as an appendix to the book, which de-nativizes his nativizations (182).

The problem dealt with by Knippling here is a natural phenomenon in the colonial context. The need for nativization cannot be separated from the need to address the coloniser and that very "limitation" can also be seen as possessing strength. The novel in the coloniser language aims at the coloniser

as well as the native and to inherit the native spirit; a bit of assimilation of the foreign tongue to the native style is a requisite, it is not unnatural or limited but is different to that of the colonial language. The effort of the writer specifically is to infuse a spirit into the consciousness and *Kanthapura* as a novel has gained that end. It provided a different language, different angle and a different conceptualization of the Indian mind.

Mulk Raj Anand

Mulk Raj Anand as an Indian English novelist served the cause of national liberation struggle during the Gandhian Era as no other writer did. His novels invented a set pattern of narrative that could picture the zeigiest of the struggle. His three novels *Untouchable*, *Coolie*, and *Two Leaves and a Bud* project the causes of the downtrodden and the national liberation struggle simultaneously. C. Rajappan, in his article "Synthesis of Marxism and Gandhianism in Anand's *Untouchable*" writes that "Anand's choice of proletarian characters brings him close to Marx but his delineation of characters brings him close to the influence of Gandhi"(38). Anand's treatment of the life of characters like the untouchable Bakha, the Coolies, Munoo and Gangu reveal the urge for social emancipation along with national liberation. Most of his English characters are imaged as cruel exploiters who shunned and hated Indians and India. The worst sufferers of the social injustices are the coolies and the untouchables. S.M.R Azam in "Humanism

and Mulk Raj Anand" states that "Like *Untouchable* and *Coolie*, *Two Leaves and a Bud* deals with the problem of poverty which is an evil in the whole human society, particularly more in India. Gangu, the protagonist, represents the labour class, and like Bakha and Munoo, he suffers the same fate of maltreatment and mortification everywhere (5).

Anand's novels assimilated into their wombs the idea of Gandhian socialist ideas and Marxist ideas that came in the form of reflection of labour class struggle in Europe. Anand's Munoo, Bakha and Gangu are placed within a frame of socialist ideals. Rama Jha in *Gandhian Thought in Indo-Anglican Fiction* opines that

Gandhian thought ultimately aims at creating a society that ensures the common man's improvement, though in his thought it is man himself, the individual, who, by being, a free agent of his actions, would ensure that improved status for himself. It is this humanistic aspect of Gandhian thought helped Anand the novelist divide the choice of themes as well as protagonists and also his fictional technique of stark realism(58).

Through the delineation of "characters" of Bakha and Munoo or Gangu, the transformation they undergo, the realization they gain, the society they reside in all contribute to it - Anand was evolving in his world a conceptualization of a society undergoing a struggle. Whether it is the microcosmic world of

Bakha in *Untouchable* or the wider world of Munoo in *Coolie* Anand was creating the picture ^{of} a slow transformation, which is a desire. The British presence function at various levels: as an exploiter, as an oppressor, or as a society that has got contrasting elements and definitely unacceptable to the Indian mind. The horror of being a hybrid is clearly dealt out in the character of Bakha in *Untouchable* and Mrs. Mannwaring in *Coolie*.

Untouchable

Mulk Raj Anand exploited the genre novel to the maximum as a medium of social criticism. The novelist's consciousness got preoccupied with two aspects simultaneously: the malice of social injustice towards the untouchable and the question of British rule in India. And the image of Gandhi serves the two purposes simultaneously in the novel, *Untouchable*.

Kai Nicholson states:

The high point of the novel is when Gandhi speaks out against untouchability, but praises the humble origin of the untouchable making him a man of God and denouncing those who believe that because of his dharma a man is polluted and can pollute others. Thus the novel expresses ideas, which are in alignment with Mahatma Gandhi's on untouchability as a problem in the Hindu society (Qtd in C. Rajappan, 39).

Anand as a writer was trying to evolve a picture of an Indian society that could recognize the need to remove the worst criminality that it possessed in the nature of untouchability. Anand writes in "The Sources of Protest in My Novels" that:

I was just then writing *Untouchable*. I left London and went to Gandhi's Sabarmati Ashram in 1927. There I learnt some sincerity, truthfulness and simplicity. The Mahatma sent me to the people before I should write any more before I should write any more novels. From that time onwards my protest about the human predicament, under the empire, and in the atmosphere of our own decay, often resulting from blind acceptance of bad habits and the taboos of the Sage Manu and the Hadith tradition of Islam became self-conscious(19).

The self-conscious Anand was aiming at infusing a consciousness, a consciousness that aims at social equality and freedom, into the Indian consciousness. Anand's novels were literature of propaganda, he knew of the arduous task that the coolies had to face and he successfully brought to light their miseries in the novels. In the above-mentioned article he further states:

I would have to recognize my own identify as an Indian, not subservient to the white rulers or the indigenous upstarts. I would have to be a man without the help of an anthropomorphic

God. I know it would be difficult to free men from all the fears, but I had hunches about freeing myself and some others, through my passion for breaking away from the accepted certainties and for rediscovering importance, the needs of men and women in travail (22).

So the question of nationalism and quest for a new identity that is totally different in nature from the already available ones and evolving a socialist ideology. ^{was the main one} Gandhian ideologies formed the backdrop, against which he delineated his conceptualization of a society in the novel.

The protagonist Bakha evolves as a hybrid, of ^{the} West and ^{the} Indian. The traditional Indian class system splits and suffocates his existence. Through the delineation of his character and the incidents that overtake him, the writer was projecting the horrible nature of his existence. The dress that Bakha wears is English, but Anand's hero's inner soul appears to be truly Indian and Hindu. The author, who belongs to the upper class, visualizes that Bakha too is Hindu because his god is Rama and his disciple Hanuman. But Bakha neither is a Hindu nor a non-Hindu, he belongs to that space that has no label ~~except~~ that he is untouchable. The question of belonging to boundary demands delineation, he is a transforming figure who can easily be influenced by any ideology of emancipation. The author wanted to reiterate his claim over this outcaste :

His father had been angry at his extravagance, and the boys of the outcastes' colony, even Chota and Ram Charan, cut jokes with him on account of his new rig out, calling him 'Pipali Sahib'. And he knew, of course that except for his English clothes there was nothing English in his life(14).

The image of the Western man is used on two levels on the novel. On the first level he is the ruler who dominates the land and the writer expects a struggle against him through the symbol of Gandhi. He is an image of a unity, unity in the sense he sees and describes India as being a single entity, the colonised people. He visualizes little difference among the Indian community. He neither oppresses them or tries to control them on various levels. The Englishman of the second level performs a different semantic operation on the Indian reader. He is also the symbol of a Englishman who performs two functions at a time. He is a threat who will take away the outcastes (the author categorically denies every chance in the narrative itself) into their fold, because he attempts at embracing all humanity into one fold. The writer describes Colonel Hutchinson, chief of the local Salvation Army, who is an Englishman, belonging to the second level, in this manner:

He had thrown aside every weight - pride of birth and race and colour in adopting the customs of the natives and in garbing himself in their manner, to build up the Salvation Army in

northern India. And he had swamped the overbearing strain of the upper middle-class Englishman in him, by his hackneyed effusions of Christian sentiment, camouflaged the narrow, insular patriotism of his character in the lingo of the white-livered humanitarian(138)

In the Indian colonial society the British occupied a position that disturbed the workings of the caste system by their approach to Indians as "Indians" destroying all disparities prevalent in the social system. The new reality created struggle in the Indian consciousness and that consciousness desired a new socialistic approach. Mulk Raj Anand, a Brahmin - an upper class Hindu - writes in the novel, "They don't mind touching us, the Mohammedans and the sahibs. It is only the Hindus, and the outcastes who are not sweepers. For them a sweeper, a sweeper-untouchable! Untouchable! Untouchable! That's the word! Untouchable! I am an Untouchable!"(59). The novelist deliberately brings in the British image for the specific purpose of delineating the menace of protocolonialism: colonialism within the Indian society. The upper caste Hindus are projected as the group to be opposed. Anand visualizes this reality for the sake of the untouchables. The novelist assumes the role of the philosopher who leads the liberation struggle, the visualization is not just for the sake of the untouchables alone, the upper class Hindus are warned and their hypocrisy and malaise that the creeds of untouchability breeds are split open for the realization of that society. The image of Jesus

Christ is used to show that all people are equal, though the possibility of an Indian accepting Christian faith is dismissed the image of Jesus served the writer well. The idea of equality of men is stressed through this image which later merges with Gandhian ideals:

The last sentence went home. "He sacrificed himself for us, for the rich and the poor, for the Brahmin and the Bhangi". That meant there was no difference in his eyes between the rich and the poor, between the Brahmins and the Bhangis, between the pandit of the morning, for instance and himself (144).

The discourse of the novel, depicting the Gandhian era, did not merely counter the colonial discourse but aimed at radical changes in the attitudes and assumptions of the Indian society. It was a liberation of the self from the shackles of ignorance and evil practices. Anand as a writer was attempting at forcing these elements into the Indian consciousness. The turning of the table by the priest, who attempted to molest her, on Sohini reveals the hypocrisy of untouchability (70). The novel thus is an outright cry for social revamping. The glorified sweeper is a creation of the socialist mind that urges for social revolution and changes. Critics like Arun P. Mukherjee believe that *Untouchable* aligns with the nationalist-historiographic narrative which uphold and which as Ranajit Guha says in *Subaltern Studies I*, eulogize the role of the Indian elite. Quoting E. M. Forster (Preface to *Untouchable*),

Arun Mukherjee argues that the voice in the novel is that of a nationalist bourgeois. Arun Mukherjee writes in "The exclusions of Postcolonial Theory, Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable: A Case Study*" that "The discourse of sympathy presents the protagonist Bakha, as a mere passive recipient of other's action and discourse"(37).

Arun Mukherjee's reading definitely produces a different angle to post-colonial reading of the novel but inescapably in every society the "enlightened" upper class or middle class determines the fate of revolutions. The middle class determines the fate of revolutions. The question of reachability to education and framing of ideology is essentially crucial in evolving a new socio-cultural paradigm. It is quite possible to discern the upper class tendencies of Mulk Raj Anand's discourse but the need and zeal for social emancipation will be observed with such an effort and thus it is difficult to agree with Arun Mukherjee when she makes a "subaltern" reading of *Untouchable*. In the Indian national liberation struggle against social inequalities and British dominance, writers belonging to upper classes, like Raja Rao and Mulk Raj Anand, played a very significant part by systematically reproducing the postcolonial consciousness. The question of representation, as Arun Mukherjee poses, is only an ontological one: the historical compulsion determined the sympathy and enthusiasm that these writers shared.

Arun Mukherjee denounces *Untouchable*, the novel, by arguing that it does not show the real untouchables' version, she writes: "The novel does not only render Bakha mute, it even appropriates his subjectivity to suit the dominant discourse"(40). The essential heterogeneity of being that a colonized subject is^m, where protocolonialism is also available, does not allow the writer to produce a master narrative that will satisfy all concerned classes. Mulk Raj Anand was reproducing in his fictional narratives the dominant discourse, the dominant discourse always remain in the political unconscious even though there will be apprehensions in the minds of various communities in myriad forms against these narratives. Arun Mukherjee calls leaders of untouchables, who also belonged that class, as militant leaders and that makes her lose her ground because she too takes up the nationalist historiography attitude of seeing them as militants (41). What makes Mulk Raj Anand's novel's significant is that the discourse recognizes the need for immediate social changes, his Bakha and Munoo are tragic-hero figures who reveal an available social reality. Anand's attitude is questioned not only by Arun Mukherjee, Susie Tharu in her article, "Decoding Anand's Humanism" argues that:

Anand's sympathy for the downtrodden, as well as his broader commitment to the individual freedom to live humanly is always limited, its scope stunted (. . .) the categories of humanism remain, not just liberal and is keeping with the

commitments of his time, but those of a liberalism transmitted by the biases of British racism (31).

My contention is that the working of the Indian consciousness advocated radical social changes in these novels. The narrative may contain certain elements that appear to appropriate the representational space of the untouchables, but that does not diminish the special purpose the novel served in developing a national consciousness and the questioning of the assumptions of a corrupt and a hypocritical society.

The colonial Indian scene demanded these types of texts, and every writer carries traits of his discursive field into his narratives, and, therefore, one can detect ideological differences in them. Arun Mukherjee has the right to point out the fact that these aspects should not be neglected but as a whole during the Gandhian age Anand's novels provided a systematic dialectical space, where the discussion of various aspects of the issue are delineated for deliberation, and his Bakha as a sartorial and cultural image questions the hypocrisy of the Indian mind.

The narrative can be seen to be divided into two parts. In the first part, the miserable condition of the untouchable and the hypocrisy of the Hindu society are revealed. In the second part, solutions are suggested, however vaguely to remove this malice. Of course, the Gandhian theory gets acclaim as far as the question of untouchability is concerned. The image of Mahatma

acquires the status of a saint, who writes everything, "He has made Hindu and Mussulman one', remarked a citizen"(160). Gandhi becomes everything for a moment, "The word 'Mahatma' was like a magical magnet, to which he, like all the other people about him, rushed blindly"(151). The revolutionary clarion ~~is~~ merged into the rhythm of the text, later:

It was as if the crowd had determined to crush everything, however ancient or beautiful, that lay in the way of their achievement of all that Gandhi stood for. It was as if they knew, by an instinct surer than that of conscious knowledge, that the things of the old decay must be destroyed in order to make room for those of the new. It seemed as if, in trampling on the blades of green grass, they were deliberately, brutally trampling on a part of themselves which they had begun to abhor, and from which they wanted to escape to Gandhi(153-154).

The revolutionary mind of Mulk Raj Anand yearns for more reformation than what Gandhi's policies could encompass, the writer transcends all these stages and we can see Anand coming in the novel in the image of ^{the} poet proclaiming all he needed. The hybridity of Indian intellectual where there is a blend of Gandhi and Bernard Shaw is revealed through the image of the poet. Anand

is practical and advocates industrial changes too, he cries for shading spiritualism and encourages the acceptance of boons of material world:

It was as if in order to give a philosophical background to their exploitation of Indian that they ingeniously convicted a nice little fairy story: "You don't believe in this world; to you all this is Maya. Let us look after your country for you and you can dedicate yourself to achieving nirvana". But that is all is over now (170).

The postcolonial attitude of the author achieves new heights in the concluding pages where, it is merely propaganda that the author projects, deliberately pushing it on to the novel. The past and present, the Indian and the British attitudes, and the Gandhian and Marxist ideals are considered and evaluated in this part of the novel:

We can see through the idiocy of these Europeans who deified money. They were barbarians and lost their heads in the worship of gold. We can steer clear of the pitfalls, because we have the advantage of a race-consciousness six thousand years old, a race-consciousness which accepted all visible and invisible values(171).

The language acquires the chanting of a slogan or "mantra" that reiterates the value of the Indians and in their ability to acquire new heights when time demands it:

We can feel new feelings! We can learn to be aware with a new awareness! We can envisage the possibility of creating new races from the latent heat in our dark brown bodies. Life is still an adventure for us. We are still eager to learn. *We cannot go wrong. Our enslavers muddle through things. We can see things clearly* (emphasis mine 171).

The writer is critical about all things and conscious of the need for a well planned strategy to master the situation. He is against aping of English habits and English attitudes by Indians. The call for understanding the Indian past is in its own terms a judicious assimilation and appropriation of Western values and ideas; a pragmatic approach in essence. He does not blindly follow Gandhi:

Let me tell you that with regard to untouchability the Mahatma is sounder than he is in his politics. You have swallowed all those cheap phrases about inferiority complex and superiority complex at Oxford without understanding what they mean. You slavishly copy the English in everything (. . .) (172).

In the end what attracts Bakha and the reader as well is the fact that the machine flush is introduced and untouchability is removed through it, "The old, mechanical formulas of lives must-go; the old, stereotyped form must give place to a new dynamic"(173). In the contours of creating writing, as Gajendra Kumar points out in "*Untouchable: A Manifesto of Indian Socio-political Realism*", Mulk Raj Anand emerges as an ideologue abreast with crosscurrents of ideas on the subject. The image of flush system is one such aspect, "The Gandhian set up is idealistic but Bakha's adolescent impression of the machine symbolized the new mode of production and a set of new values for the eradication of untouchability" (15). The structure of the novel has its climax in this conclusion. Mulk Raj Anand was being true to his words when he wrote the novel. In "The Sources of Protest in My Novels" he writes.

The Mahatma was talking of bloodless sacrifice, of accepting lathi blows against the stars and bullets of the ruling power. I felt the vast oppression from behind an invisible wall, which prevented the gods in white-hall from listening to the Mahatma's "still small voice". In between there were the preachers of Christian ethics. But the rulers were sulfated up dummies of an automatic power, hollow inside, while the abstract Sarkar was an organized oppression, with bayonets and machine guns, which were to ensure the carrying out of the

white man's burden of responsibility. Kipling's Indian "Child and Savage", accepted the hollow men as masters, so long as they got the paltry silver coins at the end of every month (24-25).

In the novel, *Untouchable*, Mulk Raj Anand is doing exactly the same. What Anand attempts at is a visualization of the stark realities of existence of an untouchable, as he, a nationalist thinker, conceives it to be. The enlightened Bakha is Anand's consciousness urging for social reformation and national liberation, he lays open the realities of the malaise of caste distinction. While the narratives of colonialism attempted to divide, the postcolonial narratives attempted to unite them. *Untouchable* reveals a different reality where the British saw the Indians as belonging to two blocks: the Hindu and the Muslim. The novel is a serious attempt to engage Indians on war over the caste-based division. Whereas the British narration looked for divisions, Indian narrations yearned for unity. The narration is the image of Gandhi looking for reunification of a disrupted society. The narration is critical in nature but it is also an earnest effort to re-educate Indians and make them aware of the dangers of the caste-divide.

Coolie

Mulk Raj Anand's second novel Coolie ironically depicts the miserable plight of a Coolie in a country getting industrialized. The irony is that the

novel followed *Untouchable* a novel that advocated industrialization for the sake of the upliftment of Bhangis. Anand, in *Untouchable* and *Coolie*, is trying to give shape to a picture that shows the colonial situation from a critical angle, criticizing both the Indian condition and the British exploitation. Rama Jha says in *Gandhianism in Indo-Anglican Fiction*, "Thus Munoo's misadventures in Bombay are marked (...) by the evil that the machine civilization turns out to be. It is the evil of the social system corrupted by machine that finishes off Munoo"(70). The industrial machine destroys a downtrodden Coolie. K.N. Sinha in *Mulk Raj Anand* states says that "Coolie touches the pathetic and the sublime areas of human experience . Here, Anand explores the limits of pain central to existence. He places Munoo in opposition to a debasing and debased society – a frail, defenseless figure in a predominantly hostile world" (33).

The English Characters

Unlike *Untouchable*, *Coolie* has many English people including the hybrid Mrs. Mannwaring appearing at different stages in the novel. They fall into a pattern and they detest all that is Indian and appear as exploiters and neurotic.

Mr. England who visits Nathoo Ram's house, where Munoo was a servant, is the first of them. Mr. England's attitude is not very commendable to Indians; he detests everything in the house. The Englishman is ridiculed

when the chance is offered: he was realizing that, "he had to pose as a big top to these natives" (53). The ironic name Mr. England bears the later pungent comments:

He remembered that he had never been to a university and knew nothing about "courses of study", except those of Pitman's Typewriting and Shorthand School in Southampton Row, which he had attended for a season before going to the Midland Bank. He felt he should make a clean breast of it all, as he was really extremely honest. But his compatriots at the club had always exhorted him to show himself off as the son of King George himself if need be. A guilty conscience added its weight of misery to his embarrassment (53).

Metaphorically, Mulk Raj Anand was digging at the English culture that assumed superiority even while it was hollow when compared to Indian civilization. Dr. Perm Chand, brother-in-law of Nattoo Ram, questions the dislike and disgust shown by Mr. England. For Anand, learned Indians became a subject of confidence: as the poet is in *Untouchable* Dr. Prem Chand is in *Coolie*

The second Englishman is the police officer, who is brutal and insolent. The imagery is that of "the mighty symbol of the Angrezi Sarkar," and the servile merchants, "dreaded and respected" that figure, "as they

dreaded and respected nothing else" (131). The dreaded image of the Englishman later become conspicuous in the images of Sir George White, the owner of the mill, where Munoo worked, and the factory. Mulk Raj Anand invents the image of the wrestler, strong, big and lucid, Ratan to control the British atrocities. K.N. Sinha in *Mulk Raj Anand* states that "Munoo's hero, however, is Ratan the wrestler, who faces life in calm confidence. He wants to emulate Ratan and be like him" (83). In the text Munoo says "I want live, I want to work, to work this machine. I shall grow up to be a man, a strong man like wrestler" (32-33).

Stanley Jackson, though an Englishman, is portrayed with enthusiasm by Anand. He is a "coolie" from England, a Red Flag Union member. He also has suffered the pains and pangs of poverty in his country, and, therefore, he could understand the miserable plight of coolies in India. The dialogue that takes place between the Red Flag Union members and the coolies vividly shows the revolutionary spirit of Mulk Raj Anand. He brings in the image of Jackson to show the similarity of the working class around the world: "The Sahib loves you. He, too, has suffered from poverty. And he knows a law with which to remove poverty if you will learn it"(25). The dialogue continues to reiterate Anand's arguments and drives home the point. "You are a clever man and like a Sahib. So you can fight the other Sahibs, but who are we to protest?"(251). Sanda, a Red Flag Union leader explains: "You are human beings, have you forgotten your notion of izzat? Would you let

anyone throw away the turbans off your head" (251). The dialogue continues: 'No', replied the Coolie. 'But then where in your idea of izzat gone?' asked Sanda. 'Where is your dignity? Where is your manhood?'(251). Anand advocates Kshatriyahood is the nature of Indians and wanted them to struggle against caste, class and national oppression. While the image of the other Englishmen as oppressors served the purpose of the implied opposition, the image of Stanley Jackson shows the equality among coolies and the need for building up of confidence to fight the colonial injustice.

The Anglo-Indian women bring in a neurotic atmosphere in the novel. The first significant white woman in the novel is Jimmie's (the foreman) wife, Mrs. Nellie Thomas. Her presence in the dressing gown creates frustration in all Englishman present, revealing the frenzy and jealousy of those people. The incident of throwing a whisky bottle at Munoo and the events that followed showcases the near bursting compression of the family life of Anglo-Indians in India.

The next woman, a hybrid, Mrs. Mannwaring is a very interesting case of colonial neurotic split personality. The fact that she has parentage in two distinctive cultures disrupts her consciousness. She is displaced, disjoint^{ed} and disfigured into a type that belongs to nowhere and she searches for identity and peace all around and finds them nowhere. Anand writes:

For although she had outdone him in her display of physical passion, she had really remained a virgin at heart, as if pulled back always by the fear of sin which has sunk deep into her sub-consciousness through her early Christian training. Her warmth, her ardor, her intense capacity for desire, must have been due to the blood of her pagan Indian grandmother in her; her curious coldness of mind, the frigidity which had once made her jump into a bath of ice water in order to quell the passion in her body, was conditioned by the idea of sin. The fundamental contradiction in her nature resulted in perversity. She indulged in a strange, furtive, surreptitious promiscuity. She gave herself to people at the least felt impulse and, of course, invariably regretted having done so afterwards(286).

The complexity of colonial transposition and transcreations of individuals of hybridity, where they are in the unconscious realm neither Christians nor Hindus, Indians nor Europeans, – culturally lacking in origin – produces the very acute neurosis. The worst form of lack of coherence is available in the colonial psychology of hybrids, and Anand's Anglo-Indian character Mrs. Mannwaring is a set-piece.

Coolies

As the title indicates, the novel is about that class of people who emerged in the society with the industrialization of India. A coolie is a person who does heavy work on a paltry payment. Through this social novel Mulk Raj Anand attempted to direct the attention of the reader to the sad plight of an Indian Coolie, Munoo. Munoo is not alone in his suffering coolies who come in contact with this narrative thread complete the picture of India as a sight of misery. The struggle is against all forms of social inequalities and oppression, protocolonial and colonial. Like his *Untouchable*, *Coolie* too weaves around the struggle of an adolescent who is guided by destiny alone. Unlike *Untouchable*, this novel ends in a tragic note, purposefully to reveal the miserable condition of a Coolie. Neither the Indian middle class nor the upper class show any sympathy to the Coolie; and the Coolies among themselves form a group of sufferers who are united in their suffering. Every where - in Prabha's factory, in the company of Hari and Ratan and even in Simla – only the Coolies support Munoo. The novelist is imagining a unity, which most probably may not be available among the poor class people where they fight for shelter and food. All kinds of negative passions, like jealousy or hatred which very often grip the lives of such people, are not given any place in the life of the coolies in the book. The author has a design. He wants to suggest that the sufferers get united.

Coolie also can be seen as divided into two parts like *Untouchable*, the first part delineates the struggle that Munoo undergoes, however the narrative lacks the vigor that *Untouchable* has. The second part shows the growth of trade union movement and criticizes the proneness of the ruling class to vulgar luxury. G. P. Sarma in *Nationalism in Indian English Fiction* states that, "The author shows that it is not just the British rule which is responsible for the sufferings of the people in India. It is their system of administration that favours the rich in their exploitation of the poor which is really responsible for the woes of the people in the country"(117). G.P. Sarma is speaking the truth.

The idea of trade union and the power to fight for the rights of the people are visualized through the image of wrestler Ratan, Sanda, Muzaffar and Stanley Jackson. The practice of appropriating ideas from the West is made after proper filtration. While Baboo Nathoo Ram, Sir Todar Mal, Major Merchant are sycophants, who are servile to the "Angrezi Sarkar", Ratan, Mohan Sanda, and Muzaffar take up a different stature. The latter group, though is Western educated and is influenced by Western ideologies, embark on a different journey to emancipate the downtrodden coolies. The former group bears the contempt of the author's consciousness, "For, however much the Indian disliked the English in India, most of them have a servile admiration for the White official and enjoy the thrill of contact with him" (103-104).

G.P. Sharma states in *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction* that "Anand is a nationalist-writer only in this sense of trying to evolve a better and happier society for his countrymen, not in the sense of upholding whatever is Indian or detesting whatever is foreign"(124). Anand, much more than just an anti-colonialist writer, writes against all forms of oppression, and his writings imagine a society where there is mutual respect and no class and economic differences. Anand visualizes the Indian society in such a way that many kinds of hypocrisy are exposed and he expects a radical social change. He is critical of all social injustices, both from the coloniser from outside and within the country.

His revolutionary characters are very sensible and powerful. The novel *Coolie* introduces Mohan, a Western educated revolutionary, as the poet emerges in *Untouchable* to take up the voice of the author. About the "day of the dance" he states:

"I should think not, from what I have seen of them," replied Mohan. "It is strange how these people can think that it is amusing to spend all the money they do, *to come and meet people they really do not want to meet*. For they have a caste system more rigid than ours. Any Angrezi woman whose husband earns twelve hundred rupees a month will not leave cards at the house of a woman whose husband earns five

hundred. And the woman whose husband earns five hundred looks down upon the woman whose husband earns three hundred. The rich don't really want to mix with each other. The women perspire in their furs and their underclothes get wet. And the men are uncomfortable in their tight trousers as they flirt with other men's wives. And then they say how smart it all was as they drink tea at Davico's while you starve"(313).

His revolutionary zeal sharpens Anand's criticism of social inequalities that persist unchecked and that have no legal or rational sanctity. The author's mouthpiece, Mohan, continues, "You don't need to dance about to go to bed with women, you roughs. You are superior to all these colonels and generals and Maharajahs. But still you go on driving their rickshaws"(314).

What makes *Coolie* distinct from *Untouchable* is that it ends on a deep note of failure. Neither Munoo, the protagonist, is able to survive under the perilous condition nor Prabha or Ratan: the only hope remains in Mohan - "The Western educated leader". The strike called in favour of Ratan gets dissolved in a Hindu-Muslim riot. We can clearly see how the British officials and sycophants from Indian bourgeois class join hands to torpedo all the efforts of the working class. The author is daring to say that, "These Pathans have been kidnapping the children of the poor people for months (. . .). The Mill owners set them on, and the Sarkar connives at all this"(270).

The crowd loses its sense and a general pandemonium prevails. Nothing emerges out of it and Munoo is then transported to Simla. The violence among the natives which the colonialists fondly anticipated and enthusiastically waited for has now been shown as a social reality in *Coolie*.

Two Leaves and a Bud

Two leaves and a Bud is a more overt anti-colonial novel in comparison with *Coolie and Untouchable*, the exploration is to understand the exploitation of the coolies by the colonial machinery at ^{the} Macpherson Tea Estate in Assam. The atrocities that are perpetuated among the coolies by the indifferent manager Croft-Cooke, his assistant Reggie Hunt, and the Indian moneylenders and the bullies of the estate are detailed to show the pathetic and defenseless condition of the coolies. The novel is more inclined to Marxist ideology than to Gandhian ideology. As Rama Jha states in *Gandhian Thoughts in Indo-Anglican fiction*, "It is not Gangu the individual so much, who is in conflict with his own society, but Gangu the representative peasant, turned landless like many of his class, who is shown in conflict with Croft-Cooke and Reggie Hunt, the authorities of the tea gardens. It is the helplessness of the mute Gangu against the evils of the Empire that is the focus of the narration"(63). Here also through the subtext Mulk Raj Anand is able to give a true picture of India. He reflects the plight of Gangu who is a victim of the *Zamindari* system, but who finds himself, though a surrogate

coolie, among many of his class which infuses camaraderie and a sense of rebellion in him. However, in this novel the protagonist does not come up with solid strategies of struggle.

Mulk Raj Anand, whose creative imagination and whose natural sympathy for the coolies get combined in the novel, has created this intensely tragic figure of Gangu. The journey into the abyss of Macpherson Tea Estate by Gangu is an explication of the cruelty and self-complacency of the British tea planters that compresses his whole being to naught. Stanly Jackson of *Coolie* arrives in this novel in the figure of Dr. De la Havre, a Marxist from London.

The creation of the figure of the doctor by Anand suits his concept of Marxist-socialist intellectual conception of the union of working class around the world. Only an Indian narrator can imagine such a character; Dr. De la Havre, though an Englishman, can be completely sympathetic and unbiased. He can fully share and rationalize the Indian view point projected by Anand. When I compare Mr. Fielding of E.M. Forster's *A Passage of India* with Dr. De la Havre is evident that the two narrations create two characters who are caught up in a similar situation but who react strikingly different ways. Dr. De la Havre is like Mulk Raj Anand, Indian, Marxist, sympathetic to the people of low class. His words and actions are in harmony with the Indian counter discourse. De la Havre rationalizes some of the supposedly Indian

superstitions unlike Mr. Fielding, who mocks at them. After examining Shashi Bhushan's wife, De la Havre in Mulk Raj Anand's novel thinks in this manner:

Superstition dies hard, he said to himself, as he walked along, and he felt chagrined with the world. Then, almost involuntarily, he began to debate with himself. Was there not some meaning in the burning of the thup? (. . .) But all the same, he hated it all, especially these Indian superstitions. Such practices would always give the English a chance to cavil at the Indian. And it weakened his defense of them(154).

The quote reveals that De la Havre is the mouth-piece of the novelist. The novel is centered around three characters, Gangu, the coolie who suffers all the possible miseries – representing coolie class – De la Havre the "sympathetic" doctor who takes up the Marxist ideologies to question the validity of British superiority, and Reggie Hunt, the evil incarnation of colonial regime. Though Gangu appears as the protagonist, the novelist has chosen the figure of De la Havre to narrate his ideologies. There is a subtle power play on the part of ^{the} author in choosing De la Havre for this purpose. Being an Englishman his arguments will strike disturbance in the European readers through the narrative space created by the author. The psychology behind such a plot on the part of the author is to arrive at the conscience of

the foreign reader. ~~By~~ taking up of a position within the coloniser's community the author could easily create disturbance as well as infuse his ideology into them. The novel was written during a period when Marxist – Socialist ideas were gaining momentum in India and De la Havre introduces them to the readers. Barbara, daughter of Croft–Cooke, becomes a mere tool in the hands of the author to bring about the philosophy through De la Havre. However, the novelist, at the same time digs at the attitudes of Anglo –Indian women through her. The intimacy and distance that De la Havre and Barbara shared in both sex and philosophy revealed the contrasting elements in their nature and attitude to the social priorities. The creation of Barbara served the novelist very well in the Englishwomen ^{ko chow} how ignorant, foolish and posing they are.

The character of De la Havre also serves as a tool to generate some discussion on Marxism, the working class around the world, the question of Indians passing I. M.S., the issue of equality, the false pride of British nationalism, the cruelty of British planters and much more. The character of De la Havre can be seen as Anand's reply to the E. M. Forster's Mr. Fielding of *A Passage to India*, and the novel a reply to the novel *A Passage to India*, because similar incidents, though in inverted form get projected in this novel. K. N. Sinha in *Mulk Raj Anand* states that "*Two Leaves and a Bud* bears a superficial resemblance to E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, so far as the plot is concerned; but by analogy does not go any deeper" (37). Sinha has not

dealt in detail, I could see resemblances much more than just plot, characters too show a different picture. The question of Anglo-Indian clubs being sites of frivolous activity is emphasized in both the novels: but while Forster's attitude is condescending, Anand is pragmatically critical. While in *A Passage to India* we see the unclear case of molestation, in this novel we can see rape and adultery dominating the narrative where the Anglo-Indian is the victimizer and the poor Indian coolies are the victims. While in *A Passage to India* Indian middle class is ridiculed, in this novel even coolies receive great importance, in fact they form the thrust of ^{the} narrative. Dr. Chuni Lal in this novel receives dignified status while all the Indian doctors in *A Passage to India* appear as semi-comic figures. Mr. Fielding's responses to India are those of the coloniser, but Dr. De la Havre's reactions to India are in resonance with the views of the colonized. This happens obviously, because Forster is a part of the colonizing narrative strategy, but Anand takes part in the counter narration. Both of them use British characters, but for different purposes.

Reggie Hunt, the Assistant manager of the estate, is violent, reductive and foolish, and through this character the novelist is projecting the ugly and wicked nature of colonial occupation. He is strong and insensitive. He enjoys women, seduces, rapes, and treats them badly. The coolies are badly treated and physical abused by the complex individuality of the colonizer who is simultaneously passing through states of inferiority and superiority

complexes. The large number of helpless coolies whom he can manipulate to fulfill all his desires makes him elated. The fact that he is uneducated and that he draws a salary which do not sustain his extravagance makes him depressed. The poor victims of all these maladies are the coolies who are groaning under the weight of his whims and fancies. The brutality of his nature reveals that aspect of colonization that everyone detests and his positioning in the novel serves the novelist to depict the cruelty of colonial rule.

Wives and daughters of the coolies are not safe from him. Leila, the daughter of Gangu, is his last victim and in his panic he shoots and kills her and her father too. But the colonial authorities do not punish him and let him free. The verdict is, "An impartial jury has found you 'not guilty' on the charge of murder or culpable homicide" (276). The jury is considered impartial because two "silent" Indian members formed a part of it.

Gangu is another of victims of social evils that are common in colonized countries. Gangu is oppressed not only by the colonizers but Indian bourgeois also exploits him. The Zamindar in his village in Punjab, Bhuta in Assam, money lenders in both the places show no mercy to this man. His family undergoes displacements, suffers from corruption, experiences acute disillusionment, live in poverty under the cruel yoke of unsympathetic authorities everywhere.

Sajani, wife of Gangu succumbs to malaria in the hostile climate of Assam. Leila the daughter of Gangu is attacked by a python and is seduced by Reggie Hunt and she is killed towards the end. His son Buddhu, in its true sense as the name signifies in Hindi, appears not to be bothered of all the happenings. He is too young to understand the "Maya" of life and is killed before prime, at the age of eight. And in the end Gangu also is killed by Reggie Hunt making the tragedy complete for the family. In life they had no peace and they were violently overtaken by death.

Gangu, however accommodated himself to the coolies of Assam because he like them was familiar with suffering, and the coolies there were fellow sufferers and he could develop a camaraderie with them, "The world was full of possible friends. He (Gangu) felt comradely towards Narian, for instance, though this man was a perfect stranger to him when he came here" (173). Like in *Coolie*, in this novel also the people in the low class show a kind of unity in their suffering: the author is urging them to recognize their similarity in conditions. The suffering inflicted upon the downtrodden and the exploitation of the helpless in the colonial situation are indeed messages for the ruling class of the time.

The Hunt and "The mutiny"

The hunt that was arranged by Charles Croft-Cooke for Sir Geoffrey Boyd, the Governor of Assam, has all the ingredients of a typical farcical

hunting that the Sahibs had in India during the colonial era. The hunt is symbolic for it reveals how the British without much effort and efficiency could acquire "prestigious glories" against their name in India. The actual hunting is done by the coolies who worked day and night to drive the elephant herd to the *Kheddah*, the elephant trap. The writer spares no chance in belittling Reggie Hunt and His Excellency, the Governor:

But three other heavy tuskers required the best efforts, not so much of Reggie Hunt's whip, *which even Croft-Cooke now thought was an embarrassment*, but of the coolies, for the courage, the sense and the skills of men on the ground was the only thing that could have brought about the temporary arrest of the animals (Emphasis mine 255).

His excellency had to arrive at the "psychological moment, the occurrence of which it was impossible to predict" (255). Lady Lucy Boyd, wife of the governor, fainted on seeing the herd and "when the herd was safely in its prison. *His excellency walked up with the more daring members of the party and dropped the gate: the capture was complete*" (Emphasis mine, 257)

The tiger hunt is more satirical than the elephant hunt, and symbolic as the elephant hunt is. Both the Governor and the professional *shikari* confront the tiger. The tiger, trapped by the bait, is killed by the *shikari* but the credit goes to the Governor, who actually misfires and wounds an elephant. The

tiger attacks a coolie, before it gets killed, and the coolie loses his face and shoulders. The Englishwomen do not see the magnitude of the affair and mistakes the tiger for a rabbit. I am compelled to compare it with the episode of the Indians and Adela Quested mistaking a tree stump for a snake in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*. In Forster's novel the Indians are ridiculed as irrational creatures. Anand replies in this novel by saying that Englishmen are cowards who ruled a disorganized group and that Englishwomen are frivolous, indolent, ignorant and foolish. They do not see the tragic reality of a human being losing his face and his shoulders, for them, after all he is only a "coolie".

The whole episode of the hunt can be interpreted, as many critics have pointed out as symbolic of the trapping of coolies in the Estate. The elephants are the coolies who are trapped into the Estate by Indian brokers. The English people remain only as indifferent masters of cruel exploiters. The trapping of the tiger with the baits re-invokes the trapping of Gangu in the Estate. The tiger is killed and Gangu too encounters the same fate. Incidentally, in the novel it is Indians who trap Indian coolies. It is they who drive them to the estate and imprison them and the indifferent white people enjoy all the fruits. It is Indians who betray Indians and bring upon sufferings to all: give away all dignity and self-respect to the foreigners. The hunt however gave the coolie a little relaxation because they got money and "budmashes" of mutiny were pardoned.

The quarrel between two women, Chambeli, Narain's wife and Neogi's wife, created too much confusion that it later turned out to be a "mutiny". The general commotion that gathered force there was worsened by Reggie Hunt. When somebody questioned him he tried to cow them down with threats, but it didn't work, and he hit them and made the warders to do the same and made his horse kick the coolies. Many were wounded and one was killed. De la Havre takes up the case and he sends them to see Croft-Cooke and on their way Reggie Hunt and five riflemen encounter them. They are peaceful and are going to Croft-Cooke to complain but they are driven away by Reggie Hunt.

The coolies meet at night and describe similar cases of uprisings. The miserable case of coolies of Jorhat is described to show the mammoth nature of the struggle. The episode is described to show the failure of congressman in saving the coolies everywhere. Like in *coolie*, in *Two Leaves and a Bud* too we can see clearly Marxist ideologies dominating the narrative and Anand is not able to provide a clear strategy of struggle for the coolies in this novel. In my opinion, though Anand advocates Marxist trade union and mass rebellion in these two novels they fail to bear fruit and both the protagonist meet with tragic end. Marxist ideologies did permeate into nationalist struggle, in scattered places of India, ^{but} they couldn't build up momentum. Mulk Raj Anand could counter narrate many of the assumptions and presumptions of the colonial narrative in both the novels, *Coolie* and *Two Leaves and a*

Bud. However, both the novels end on a tragic note, Munoo and Gangu fall prey to the evils of their respective societies. Counter narrative novels generally envisages a rapid action and demands struggles and passion from the colonized community. Anand does make his stand clear, he is Marxist and demands unity and vigour among his downtrodden characters. Anand warns the Indian community of the catastrophe that would overtake them in the future if they do not struggle against such social evils. Even then, the failure of his heroes point to important fact of that era. His other novel, that I have analyzed, *Untouchable*, clearly shows a vision and the protagonist has both choice and hope in the end. I deduce from this point that the novels exposes the fact that Gandhi was a crucial factor in the Indian struggle for independence. Anand was probably looking for a more radical change in the society but his dreams does not provide a strong alternative method to that of Gandhian struggle. This is what Robert J. C. Young in *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction* has exactly stated, when he stated that Gandhi dominated the Indian struggle for Independence and did not allow the Marxist group any space for furthering their projects.

In *Untouchable* the story reaches the climax with the arrival of Gandhi on the scene. The narrative centre around Gandhi from then on. Though his ideas and concepts are questioned by the novelist Gandhi becomes a magic figure who transforms the atmosphere.

In *Coolie and Two Leaves and a Bud*, ^{Mulk Raj Anand} moves away from Gandhi and the Indian National Congress. When he drifted away ^{from} Gandhian ideologies and tried to use Marxist ideas, the events and the characters in his narration do not get a focus. The picture is blurred, the events end in disaster and tragedy overtakes the protagonist, reiterating the Gandhian supremacy.

Meanwhile, to continue with the "Mutiny", the despair among coolies are countered by capriciousness among the white people. Being caught up, as a minority, in an isolated hill range, against an "uprising" labour class, creates panic among them and they become nervous. They join together in the club, with armoury and calls for ammunition from the police, army and air-force, making it a big affair. Most of them are timid but adorn an assumed casual nature. The novelist reduces them to semi-comic figures on those moments, indicating the nervousness that the colonisers had in a colony. They imagine a mutiny and become too cautious. For R.A.F bombers come to suppress a mutiny which did not taken place, "There is a platoon of the Yorkshire Light Infantry with one N. C.O. in those. And the G.O.C. has ordered two companies of the Eastern Frontier Rifles to be dispatched here" (222).

The coolies on the other hand now become panic-stricken and think that the bombers are spirits: "They be spirits risen from the earth to destroy us, even as the demons sometimes arise out ^{of} the nether worlds, said an old

coolie "The dooths of Yama"(223). De la Havre collects the coolies and tries to clear the confusion:

He beckoned them and started towards the road. He walked with difficulty, trying to avoid trampling on the weeping urchins. He felt feeble and stiff and worn. But he had the consolation that he was acting for freedom, for personal liberty and private virtue – that he was acting for the lives of these people. He knew that for the moment his cause was doomed, but he believed he might be able to do something, anything (226).

De la Havre could do nothing to them and he was doomed and he had to leave Assam. Marxist ideas are there but no one is there to take it as ^{an} weapon to counter colonialism. Whoever appears on the scene are weak and they are lacking in their capacity to garner the strength to oppose the imperial yoke. Hence the "mutiny" fails miserably resulting in unprecedented cruelties being inflicted on the coolies. The description of the "mutiny" by the author is a fitting reply to the colonial narratives. Colonial narratives imagined violence from the colonized, it was only a fashion of theirs. The extravagance, the inappropriateness, the exploitation and the neurosis of those narratives are exposed in satirical language by the author.

The Indian counter narratives through these novels vividly portrayed a different reality, a totally different reality, in contrast to that is available in the colonial narratives. Raja Rao and Mulk Raj Anand could modulate between fact and fiction, and , there-by they could produce strong ideological tools in their narration which helped the nationalist cause of India's struggle for independence. These novels were addressing the British as well as the Indians. By ^{bringing} into the framework of the novels, microcosmic worlds of individuals like Moorthy, Bakha, Gangu and Munoo these novelists could evolve a macrocosmic reality of the nation at large.

While the colonial narratives projected their ^{presence} as emancipators, educators of the colonized and justified the role in India as rulers Indian counter narratives ^{with} opposed them a different picture. In Indian counter narrative the British become cruel exploiters and brutal villains who destroyed humanity at large.

Of the four novels I have discussed as counter narratives, *Kanthapura* stands distinct as a visionary novel that could forge a dynamic struggle against the colonial narratives. It is the clear-sighted and bold formulation of a native aspiration for social revamping and desire for freedom. *Untouchable* showed several aspects of a hopeful struggle, and in both these novels the presence of Gandhi like a halo enriched them with hope and vision of the future. In *Coolie* and *Two Leaves and a Bud* the miserable

plight of the ordinary people finds rich and splendid dramatization, and the atrocities of the coloniser and the Indian bourgeois are also exposed. But a clear vision of a hopeful future is missing. In both the novels the protagonists meet with tragic end. Gandhi was missing in these novels. According to me therefore Gandhi was a strong force who could give a dream of a future that was bright, though inadequacies may be cited in his views too. Therefore, during the Gandhian era it was definitely Gandhi who dominated the Indian consciousness and provided social, political and spiritual methodologies for India during its crucial stage of evolution.

Raja Rao and Mulk Raj Anand were successful in delineating the true spirit of the age in their novels. Both of them exploited the genre ^{As} novel to bring about a consciousness that revealed an India that was reiterating its relevance. Raja Rao's *Kanthapura*, however, will remain ^{as} the epitome of resistance narrative in the postcolonial mode. Their novels appear to be direct responses to colonial assumptions. They make more sense when read in comparison with the narratives in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Paul Scott's *The Day of the Scorpion*.

Notes

¹ Fanon, Bill Ashcroft, Helen Tiffin and Gareth Griffith. 1995: 155.

² Bipan Chandra. *India's Struggle for Independence*. 1988:69.

³ Michel Foucault. *Archeology of Knowledge*. 1980.

⁴ The native in his state of inferiority complex in the colonial situation is depressed: using defensive mechanisms like self-projection and self-motivation he recreates his ideals of an exalted state. That colonial narration emerges out of a pre-logically conceived phobic state of assumption and attributions makes it vulnerable and questionable. The native intellectual attempts to dismantle these false notions of colonial narration and he is better equipped, due to the availability of multiple sites of knowledge production - the native's and the colonizers'. When counter narratives attempt to dismantle colonial narratives it essentially produces a hybrid state of understanding for both coloniser and colonised. The colonial narration began with the intention of acquiring power; it is the struggle for power that compels the production of narratives. In my view the attempt to speak or write asserts the necessity to control, hence aim at power, the micro levels of power play may remain hidden. It is human compulsion to justify the lack of control over self that compels speech. Colonialism is an uncontrolled site, hence too much of deliberations and violence take place in the colonial context.

⁵ The name of the Sahib is Hunter, connoting through the imagery a hunter who hunts and he preys upon innocent coolie women. Hunter Sahib embodied sexual violence. India is being raped not once but many times.

⁶ The allusion is to the rape of young women in the coffee estate (emphasis mine).

The Colonial Experience

Ajay Kumar M.P. "Colonial narrative on India counter narrative and colonial experience in gandhian era " Thesis. Department of English , University of Calicut, 2003

Chapter 7

Conclusion:

The Colonial Experience

To know how I am and how I have fared, you must understand why I resist all kinds of domination, including that of being given something.

Nuruddin Farah, "Gifts"

If the colonial experience has any meaning at all it gestures to a hybrid existence, linguistic, political, racial and cultural. The mutual construction of subjectivities of the colonizer and the colonized in the colonial situation involves complex and complicated cultural synergy, mixing up of diverse values. The question of identity was in a flux, during the Gandhian era, for both the colonizer and the colonized. A new reality was on the horizon during the Gandhian era and it dawned upon the colonized and that created enthusiasm for them and bewilderment for the colonizer. Homi Bhabha opines in *Location of Culture* that "In the restless drive for cultural translation, hybrid sites of meaning open up a cleavage in the language of culture which suggests that the similitude of the *Symbol* as it plays across cultural sites must not obscure the fact that repetition of the *sign* is, in each specific social practice, both different and differential" (163).

The sharing of cultural signs and symbols which dislodge certain centered assumptions converge temporality and ambiguity in the shared

space. Transculturation, reciprocal influences of modes of representation and cultural practices, demands continual rewriting and re-representation of the situation, and, thus, the trans-cultural India of 1920s, '30s and '40s was an intricate site of encounter between the colonial narratives and the resistance narratives.

Resistance narratives formed against the dominant narratives show some leanings towards the same dominant narrative, as Michael Parker and Roger Starkey say in *Postcolonial Literatures*: "The determining opposition of revolutionary nationalist aesthetics on the one hand, cultural pluralism on the other, are responses to historic oppositions of the colonized and the colonizers. As such, these responses are at least partly governed by the term of the dominant discourse" (3). Likewise, the dominant discourse is also dependent on the colonizing situation; it changes its attitudes and aspirations contextually to suit the emerging and evolving conditions. It too shows resistance to anti-colonial writings, writing in the sense of narrative which can be in multitude forms. In the colonial realm, it is always a give and take process that decides the growth of experience. These narratives are available in the policies that the coloniser makes.

It was historical compulsion that forced the regime to change its attitude at different phases of colonial evolution. This is, as Chinua Achebe argues in "Colonialist Criticism":

Meanwhile a new situation was slowly developing as a handful of natives began to acquire European education and then to challenge Europe's presence and position in their native land with the intellectual weapons of Europe itself. To deal with this phenomenal presumption the colonialist devised two contradictory arguments. He created the man of two worlds' theory to prove that no matter how much the native was exposed to European influences he could never truly absorb them; like Pester John he would always discard the mask of civilization when the crucial hour came and reveal his true face" (57).

The creation of Aziz, even Godbole, in E. M. Forster's novel *A Passage to India* reveals the the attitude of the colonial mind that worked behind the narrative. Aziz can never come on par with any Englishman, though he may come in contact with them and win their "sympathy", sympathy being another method of colonial differentiation, sympathy exposes the assumed superiority of the coloniser. The idea of sympathy got shaped in a realm where the hybrid Westernized Indian tries to mimic the Westerner. The artistic recreation of colonial situation by E. M. Forster in *A Passage to India* exposes the guiding principles of colonial discourse. They show a change in attitude from blind degradation to sympathetic degradation: the reciprocity of the colonial condition, where ideologies are contextually shaped and shared to evolve justification for power. This aspect reveals the mutual dependency of

both discourses, the colonial and its counter. Bill Ashcroft *et al.* in *Post-colonial Studies Reader* stresses the fact that "the transaction of the post-colonial world is not a one-way process in which oppressor obliterates the oppressed or the colonizer silences the colonized in silent terms" (183). In their opinion, hybridity occurs as a result of this, and it is produced in two ways: "Hybridity occurs in post-colonial societies both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control or when settler invaders dispossessed indigenous peoples and force them to 'assimilate' to new social patterns" (183).

The Schizophrenic Coloniser

The above mentioned writers, Bill Ashcroft *et. al.* are concerned with the colonized only, but essentially the colonizer is also producing sites of hybridity, through his accession to native language, literature and cultural practices; but it remains out of focus in postcolonial deliberations precisely because he is the oppressor and the dominant. I, specifically, mean the effect of colonial condition on the individual colonialist, not on his colonialist narratives that facilitated the colonial hegemony which are very much at the centre of academic consultations. The colonizers, who settle in the colony, the Anglo-Indians in the Indian case, are seen as a different group by visitors from Britain. They, the visitors or those who are in the mother country, are

seen differentiated from the settlers. The Anglo-Indians are placed in an in-between space – inferior to the visitors and superior to the natives - where they always felt the obligation to appear justified before both parties. I have tried to show the ideological variations these groups show in my analyses of *A Passage to India*: "Cultural experience or indeed every cultural form is radically, quintessentially hybrid (. . .)" says Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (68).

The Gandhian era was a period where the British were "not at home in empire,": they found their major assumption of being superior crumbling down. A neurotic condition developed in them as counter narrative practices evolved various useful tools and encountered the colonial narrative in all spaces of deliberations. Ranajit Guha says in "Not at Home in Empire":

"I shivered," he writes, "at the millions and immensities and secrecies of India." Number, dimension, and depth are all apparently a measure of the colonizer's difficulty in coping with the responsibility called empire. He feels diminished: used to freedom to the Western metropolis, he now regards himself as caged in India; *born to an open society, he has his status frozen into a castelike structure*. The empire has shrunk into an uncanny trap for him, and he seeks refuge in the club. For that is a surrogate for home (483) (My emphasis).

I emphasized certain parts of the quote to show the acceptance of all prevailing notion of opinion in the Western society, that colony is a "burden", and the frozen state of India. Ranajit Guha too falls prey to the old dichotomy, however his critique of Francis Yeats-Brown, a British Officer in Colonial India, exposes the predicament of the colonialist in the Gandhian era. The fantasy of conquering was reaching the limits of the expansion and the colonizer feels the "burden" in the real sense of the word. Ranajit Guha observes, it is a "symptom of an irredeemably bad conscience, it developed the habit of insinuating itself into all manner of colonial discourse, ranging from homiletics to politics, from the novel to the lyric to the common joke" (485). In Guha's opinion, the conquest and romanticism that followed it desired to give an image of the empire as a:

Sort of machine operated crew who know only how to decide but not to doubt, who know only action but no circumspection, and, in the event of a breakdown only fear and no anxiety. However, the picture does not look nearly so neat when we step outside official discourse and meet individual members of that crew agonizing like Yeats-Brown over the immensity of things in a world whose limits are not known to them (488).

Ranjit Guha states that the colonizer is caught between two worlds from which he has no escape: neither he wishes to, for other reasons. He continues,

"They have lost their freedom no less than their subjects. Caught between two hatreds – that of the raj and of the natives – Orwell speaks for his colleagues as well. 'Feelings like these,' he says, 'are the *normal* byproducts of imperialism; ask any Anglo-Indian official, if you can catch him off duty" (490).

Trapped in the image of a colonizer created by the colonial discourse and the counter discourse, the Anglo-Indian is compelled to behave in a specific way that is foreign to him. This creates a schizophrenic personality, unable to link his thought, emotion and behavior to the situation. He finds it difficult to understand his position; he imagines being one and appears in reality as another. Being divided in consciousness disrupts his actions and appears to have lost control of himself and over-acts in crucial situations, the case of Merrick in *The Day of the Scorpion*, Mrs. Mannwaring in *Coolie*, the suppression of the "mutiny" in *Two Leaves and a Bud* are all sign-posts to this reality. The image that the colonialist adorned, as being part of the orientalist tradition, was replaced or mutilated by the emergence of resistance narratives and the colonising individual becomes neurotic because of their effects. As Ranajit Guha has made clear in another occasion, in "Not at Home in Empire,": "Seized by anxiety, he has to decide whether to throw off his mask or continue to wear it, to assert his own will or be guided by that of others (. . .)" (492): his threatening choices are too many.

The colonial rationalization fails the colonialist, the individual and the colonialist as a class; both are caught up in this predicament. Terry Eagleton in one of his essays in *The Eagleton Reader* reveals how ideology function as a mask, which some rulers recognize to their destruction:

Whether all ruling powers fail to perceive how discreditable their true motives really are in fact questionable. Someone who behaves disreputably but conceals the fact from himself is known as self-deceived – a concept which is of vital importance in the study of ideology. And it is true that ruling powers are often engaged in what the linguistician would call a "performative contradiction" between what they say they are doing and what they are actually doing, a contradiction which it may be part of the function of their discourse to mask even from themselves (235).

The colonizer, the ruling class, creates a deceptive rhetoric to be in the colonial premises as a superior master. It is not only the colonized who is deceived here, but even the colonizer falls into the trap of these ideological permutations. This situation creates a split in their identity of being and inevitably results in paranoid neurosis, unable to find what or where he is. The catering to two different mindsets, and constantly being in debate with the self to justify the position the colonialist-self holds, divides the colonizer's

mind during the period of postcolonial resistance. The concept of masking the effect of colonialism by the colonialist narrative by bringing in the concept of progress and growth of civilization thus doesn't help the colonialist's own cause in the psychological realm. The famous example given by Frantz Fanon in *Wretched of the Earth* of an imperial policeman behaving cruelly to his wife and children (215-17) is a pointer to this fact. Ashis Nandy in *The Intimate Enemy* says, "Behind all the rhetoric of the European intelligentsia on the evils of colonialism lay their unstated faith that the gain from colonialism to Europe, to the extent that they primarily involved material products, were real, and the losses, to the extent they involved social relations and psychological states, false" (30).

The colonial situation is essentially neurotic as Frantz Fanon postulates in "Concerning violence": "The colonized enslaved by his inferiority the colonizer enslaved by his superiority alike behave in accordance with a neurotic condition" (30). The superiority complex that develops in the colonizer is partly his own doing and partly results from the historical condition of his being a master in the colony. The superiority complex is shattered during the anti-colonial movements, and being caught up in the ideological conditioning of the situation, the colonizer is compelled to act under pressure in such situations. The result is a violent eruption of suppressive measures, which in turn, creates an enigmatic situation. His actions deceive him and his assumed role in the colony and necessarily

becomes that of a cruel oppressor which creates paranoia in him. As Bhabha says in *The Location of Culture*, "The very nature of humanity becomes estranged in the colonial condition and from the 'naked decivility' it emerges, not as an assertion of will nor as an evocation of freedom, but as an enigmatic question" (42).

Colonial discourse by its very nature is neurotic, it is form a realm of fear that the discourses emerge. Homi Bhabha takes the tools of psychological analysis to show the neurotic nature. He in *Location of Culture* states: "Like fantasies of the origin of sexuality, the production of 'colonial desire' mask the discourse as 'a favored spot for the most primitive defensive reaction such as turning against oneself, into an opposite, projection, negation" (81). The narratives that developed in the pre-colonial, pre-logical period had many disparities, which never got resolved even in the post-colonial period.

The very nature of colonial narrative had in it the essentialist forces of its own downfall. That it is based on absolutely exploitative ideologies under the veneer of cultural emancipation and development of the colonized land became conspicuous with the emergence of counter narratives and the downfall became inevitable. These very assumptions, which were unreal, sowed the seeds of counter cultural practices to evolve and capture authority. The ideological discourse on which colonialism developed upon has no

safety catch; it is made vulnerable by its attempt to define the colonial situation out of a differentiation principle: the colonizer from the colonized. Culture being very flexible and in a state of flux does not allow compartmentalization of cultural groups, but colonial discourse has the very same important feature in its conception, as Bhabha attempts to make clear in *Location of Culture*: "An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of other men. Fixity as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism is a paradoxical mode of representation; it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as a disorder, degeneracy and daemonic representation" (66).

Resistance narratives question this very nature of colonial discourse and as Homi Bhabha puts it, "The subversive character of the native questions will be realized only once we recognize the strategic disavowal of cultural/historical difference (. . .)" (17). Graham Huggan, in "A Tale of Two Parrots: Walcott, Rhys, and the Uses of Colonial Mimicry", states "Mimicry (...) does not connote subservience, but rather resistance: by showing the relationship between metropolitan and colonial cultures to be based on changing strategies of domination and coercion rather than on the static comparison of "essential" attributes, mimicry may paradoxically destabilize even as it reinforces (644).

The mimicking of English attitudes by the Indians, which deleted the categorical distinction of being into two distinct groups diluted the dichotomizing principles of colonial narratives. The English too mimic the Indians at crucial movements and the search to understand those attitudes become rather complicated. Graham Huggan continues: "The colonial "mimic man" may set off to the metropolis in search of "genuine" culture, only to find there other, metropolitan, "mimic men" (644).

The natives' questioning of colonial assumptions brings about a site of contestation. During the Gandhian era in India, the situation had become very vulnerable for colonialists and their assumed value system. Partly produced by colonial authority, by its inception of education, political system and cultural artifacts in the colony and partly ^{by the} development of indigenous modes of resistance by the colonized. The demands the colonized make from this hybrid state in Bhabha's terms,

Are both challenging the boundaries of discourse and subtly changing its term by setting up another specifically colonial space of the negotiations of cultural authority. And they do this under the eye of power, through the "partial" knowledges. (. . .) such objects of knowledges make the signifiers of authority enigmatic in a way that is "less than one and double". They change their condition of recognition while maintaining their

visibility; they introduce a lack that is then represented as a doubling of mimicry (118).

The condition created by mimicry and hybridity disturbs the colonial authority and questions the validity of imperial rule. The colonizer thus finds it difficult to remove the cultural/racial meshes that he had woven into the colonial space. The importance of cultural values and the ideologies in postcolonial academic deliberations thus become significant. The interwoven nature of culture is thus emphatically reaffirmed in the colonial context. As Homi Bhabha postulates in *Location of Culture*:

Cultural difference does not simply represent the contention between oppositional contents or antagonistic tradition of cultural value. Cultural difference introduces into the process of cultural judgement and interpretation that sudden shock of the successive, non-synchronic time of signification (. . .) The very possibility of cultural contestation, the ability to shift the ground of knowledges, or to engage in the "war of position", marks the establishment of new forms of meaning, and strategies of identification (162).

The study of Ashis Nandy about Kipling being a "White *Sahib*" is a guiding chapter in the analysis of the predicament of the Anglo-Indian and the permeability of cultural artifacts. He states in *The Intimate Enemy*, "Kipling's

dilemma can be stated simply: he could not be both Western *and* Indiaⁿ; he could be either Western or Indian. It was this imposed choice which linked his self-destructiveness to the tragedy of his life" (71). Nandy continues to state that this trivial hypothetical difference is the first clue, "to the way colonialism tried to take over the Western consciousness, to make it congruent with the needs of colonialism (. . .)" (71).

Racial dichotomization essentially created the colonial schizophrasia: Schizophrenia in the sense of not being able to understand the situation, being caught up in two ideological realm and the awareness of illogicality of the traditional colonial narratives, of which he is also a part. The colonial officers keep themselves aloof from the empowered nationalist as well as the detective eyes of those in the mother country. He is neither in homeland and has the fear of losing the colony. The anxiety contributes to the creation of a split personality and his actions become faulty and bizarre at a crucial juncture of the colonial history. These actions on the part of the colonizer gives more strength to freedom struggle, whereby the position of the colonizer becomes more susceptible to dethronement.

The Enlightened Colonized

The colonized is enlightened; enlightened in the specific colonial situation where he has an understanding of the situation and the enlightenment that he has acquired through suffering. The colonized

assimilates and appropriates, as I have already substantiated, the Western views of life. It is obvious that only from this understanding that he could invent, adopt, or produce viable resistance methodologies. As Ashis Nandy states in *The Intimate Enemy*, "Let us not forget that the most violent denunciation of the West produced by Frantz Fanon is written in the elegant style of a Jean-Paul Sartre. The West has not merely produced colonialism, it in—forms most interpretations of colonialism. It colours even this interpretation of interpretation" (xii). However, it is essentially important to remember that the site of contestation is truly a hybrid one. It is true that, as Bhabha puts in *Location of Culture*, "There is no master narrative or realist perspective that provides a background of social and historical facts against which emerge the problems of the individual or collective psyche" (42).

The question of enlightenment on the part of the colonized is a complex one. Essentially, the desire of the colonized to be in the position of the colonizer thus dominates his actions. As Frantz Fanon metaphorically affirms in "Concerning Violence": "When their glances meet he [the settler] ascertain bitterly, always in the defensive, 'They want to take our place.' It is true for there in no native who does not dream at least once a day of setting himself up in the settler's place" (30).

The colonized suffered a serious blow as Memmi observes in *The Colonizer and the Colonized* by being removed from history and from the community (91). The effort, therefore, on the part the colonized is to

envisage a future on the basis of his tradition, for his reentry in a very complex condition. The oppressed personality compels self-promotion and he does that by resorting to manifold methods. Frantz Fanon advises a scholar of colonialism in *Black Skin, White Masks* that, "If one chooses to understand the colonial system, he must admit that it is unstable and its equilibrium constantly threatened" (120). This is true of all situations, and the adaptability of the subject involved matters more. Fanon continues, "One can be reconciled to every situation, and the colonized can wait a long time to live" (120). It is this stage of attaining the knowledge, by the colonized, that I prefer to call as being enlightened in colonial situation. "But, regardless of how soon or how violently the colonized rejects his situation, he will one day begin to overthrow his unbelievable existence with the whole force of his oppressed personality" (120).

India and Indians share an unique space in the world. To understand the India as a once-colonized people demands more subtle analysis. It becomes a very clear and obvious fact in the case of negro culture when Fanon says, *Black Skin and White Masks*, that "A normal Negro child having grown up within a normal family, will become abnormal on the slightest contact with the white world" (143). But, in the Indian case it is a different picture that emerges.

India with its myriad social, religious, and caste system has simultaneous existence on multiple levels. The colonizers came here as

traders and later, when history allowed them the space, they became the rulers. The gaining of power and its maintenance were achieved in various ways. India under colonialism demanded neglecting and discarding a cultural existence, that it had for centuries in its well constructed buildings, temples, books, traditional folk knowledge, Ayurveda, - the so-called 'quack' medical system which at times worked wonders -, Vedas, Puranas, Epics and a system based on class and age hierarchy. The colonizers were not bringing their cultural, social and political systems in a vacuum. They were effecting only a laying over. The Indian system still remained alive and only it needed to re-emerge.

The "enlightened" citizens of India, those who were aware of this cultural past of India were projecting this image of India to the West. The India of Gandian era was buoyant with many ideas that had its basis in the rich civilization that India is. Through mass movements it was rediscovering what had been hidden and resisting what had been imposed. Indians do not become abnormal with the contact of the white people, though psychological complexities can be identified, but reaffirms a cultural past and creates a new image.

Farewell

Through the access to the tools of postcolonial, poststructuralist ^{theories} of analyses I have been able to find out that the narrative of colonialism was not

false but forked. There is no truth as such, but there are many facts in what they narrated. Truth is only an assumption, it is definitely associated with varied cultural and social practices, as Michel Foucault says in *Power/Knowledge*, "The true and false are separated and specific effects of power [are] attached to the true, it being understood also that it is not a matter of a battle 'on behalf' of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays" (132). There were many facts in colonial narratives, truths as Foucault calls it, but how the "truth" is produced matters more. Colonialism began on materialist terms, trade and geographical gain being the primary aspects, but cultural baggage that had on its shoulder soon entered the arena. As cultural practices become dominant its effect achieves profundity.

Colonialism is violence. It is with violence that it enters a new domain. It is with violence that it maintains its status in that space. It is with violence that it permeates into the cultures of that society. It is with violence that it accepts the society it conquers. It is with violence that it retreats. Violence not in ^{the} sense of bloodshed alone; violence in emotion, violence in strong and sudden action. Since too much violence is affected on to the culture and psyche of the colonizer and the colonized it eventually creates neurotic existence for mankind. I feel like making the same comments that Jamaica Kincaid makes in "A Small Place."

And so all this fuss over empire – what went wrong here, what went wrong there always makes me quite crazy, for I can say to them what went wrong: they should never have left their home, their precious England, a place they loved so much, a place they had to leave but could never forget. And so everywhere they went they turned it into England; and everybody they met they turned English. But no place could ever really be England, and nobody who did not look exactly like them would ever be English, so you can imagine the destruction of people and land that came after that (92).

Ashis Nandy too proposes a similar opinion in *The Intimate Enemy*, "West is now everywhere, within the West and outside; in structures and in minds" (xi). Ultimately it is historical mutations, in Foucaultian sense, that determined the existence of West in East, South and North. Colonialism creates a culture, in Nandy's view as he affirms in the same book, "Particularly strong is the inner resistance to recognizing the ultimate violence which colonialism does to its victims, namely it creates a culture in which the ruled are constantly tempted to fight their rulers within the psychological limits set by the latter" (3).

It is true that Gandhi's non-violence proved the case of ^{an} Indian as being _n capable of accepting suffering to gain its ends. The cruel suppressive measures of the British in turn helped the nationalist ~~cause~~. Monica Whately

in her work *India in Pre-Independence* attempts at reproducing individual cases of atrocities of the Raj to prove the ruthless nature of the Raj. Beatings and Lathi-charges in Agra, Culcutta, Bengal, Madras etc. are given in detail to show the cruelty of the colonial Police Raj. Processions, anti liquor protests, flag raising etc. were met with cruelty. By firing on crowds for dispersing unlawful Assemblies in 1932 alone killed 79 people and injured more than 300 (Monica Whately, 1995-186-187). Both peasants in villages and city dwellers were victimized. Raids and searches became the order of the day. Rape and molestation and other similar cases embarrassed the nationalists and the government as well. Caning of women, stranding them at far away places were a practice to suppress the freedom movement. The government's denial of all these incidents is also cited to expose the imperial strategies.

Beatings in lock-ups were common. Some, like Kumaraswami and B.S. Sundram were beaten to death in prison (Whately, 1995, 210-211). Even medical relief to victims of police excesses were denied (Whately, 214). Doctors were beaten and hospitals were closed. Gruesome cases like *lathi* blows on children, hair being set on fire (Whately, 224) etc. open one's eyes to the violence on the physical level on which the Raj held India. Whately states, "In every town and village in India innocent members of the public have suffered at the hands of the police" (227). Displacements, forced labour, banishment, exploitation etc. added to the agony.

Violence on all levels remained a part and parcel of colonial existence. Violence by the extremist from the Indian side to gain freedom also added to the violent aspect of colonialism. Gandhian non-violence was again violence, the psyche that undergoes radical changes in the process of accepting suffering against the natural tendency to resist was also undergoing violence and they had to suffer the worst form of inhuman brutality from the coloniser. Colonialism thus created violence in all aspects of life. Aime Cesaire has rightly pointed out in "Discourse on Colonialism": "I look around and wherever there are colonizers and colonized face to face, I see force, brutality, cruelty, sadism, conflict" (80).

Analysis of emergence of new hybrid states of being in the colonial context has given the knowledge that because of British colonialism Indian culture and British culture, being involved in one another, do not remain pure: both have become hybrid, heterogeneous, extremely differentiated and fragmented. Edward Said had stated it in *Culture and Imperialism*:

Gone are the binary oppositions clear to the nationalist and imperialist enterprise. Instead we begin to sense that old authority cannot simply be replaced by new authority, but that new alignments made across borders, hyper and nations, and excences are rapidly coming into view, and it in these new alignments that now provoke and challenge the fundamentally

static notion of *identity* that has been the case of cultural thought during the era of imperialism (xxviii).

We are in the milieu where the Western historicist idea of time as a progressive, structured whole is challenged and the emergence of analysis of discursive fields of knowledge furthering and constantly shifting its axis of analysis. Postcolonial studies as such has enabled the working of diverse methods of analysis to bring into light certain hidden aspects of human existence in a complex situation like colonialism. It permits a larger scope of comparison, evaluation and re-representation of certain aspects of life. E. M. Forster as a writer reveals the meshes of colonial paradigms. He is supposed to be anti-imperialist but he also uses the same narrative as that of an early Orientalist. He is caught up in the meshes of a narrative pattern available in the colonial discourse, which he cannot escape. The man and his intentions are divided from what his subconscious and unconscious desires are, the pride and prejudice that he had inherited as being part of that discourse as a master is revealed in his narrative. Paul Scott walks on the steps of his master and reproduces the same paradigm.

Likewise, counter narrative aspects found in the Indian novels in English expose as to how set patterns under a historical circumstance determine the evolution and growth of specific kinds of counter narratives, in other words, how the situation expected development of narratives. The

narratives, the colonial and its counter, that develop are all interwoven, latter being part of the former and essentially resisting, nourishing and developing the former. It is a complex and complicated consciousness at work during a period of disturbances. Essentially, the site of contact is spatially split woven and interwoven into one another, - and there is always a struggle, a struggle that decides the growth of the discourse.

Literature works at the cusp of historical growth of all movements. The colonial suppression was facilitated by narratives that imagined a historical consciousness. The history that got shaped by these narratives was, essentially, reciprocally shaped by the narratives. Being caught up in the colonial narrative pattern, the British could only narrate India in a specific way: that narrative pattern which evolved out of varying and various cultural artifacts. Likewise, the counter narrative from the Indian side was at the same time limited and given scope by the colonial historical situation. To separate history from the narratives in these novels, the British and the Indian, is virtually impossible. They were taking ideas from the social and cultural milieu and ~~were~~ supplying them with new and novel ideas. These novel narratives are a recapturing of a historical movement, managing and forwarding the movement. Human life will always remain a contested site and literature will play a crucial role in this contest. What I have learnt is that "reality" will be that which will be projected and sometimes silence determines and condemns all that are spoken.

Bibliography

- Achebe, Chinua. "Colonialist Criticism". Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin eds. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader* London: Routledge, 1995. 56-61.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the National Allegory," *Social Text* (17), 1987. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin Eds. *Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge 1995 77-86.
- Althusser, Louis. *Montesquieu, Rousseau, Marx*. London: Verso, 1972.
- Anand Mulk Raj. *Untouchable*. London: Lawrence and Wishart., 1935.
- . "The Sources of Protest in My Novels", *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1999.
- . *Coolie*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1936.
- : *Across the Black Waters*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1940.
- : *The Sword and the Sickle*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1942.
- : *The Sword and the sickle*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1942.
- : *Two Leaves and a Bud*. Lawrence and Wishart, 1937.
- : *The Village*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 1983.

- An Indian. (A. S. B.) "Homage a M Forster" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 289-292.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Is the Post – in Postmodernism the Post – in Postcolonial," *Critical Inquiry* 17(2) (Winter): 336-57, 1991.
- - -. "Topologies of Nativism," *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan eds. London: Blackwell, 1998.
- Ashcroft, Bill and Pal Ahluwalia. *Edward Said*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Ashcroft, Bill Gareth, Griffiths and Helen Tiffin Eds. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- - -. Eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- - -. *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Azam, S.M.R. "Humanism and Mulk Raj Anand," *Indian Literature in English*. K.V. Surendran Ed. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2002.
- Bandyopadhyay, Pranab. *Armed Revolutions in India*. Culcutta: Book club, 1993.
- Barker, Francis eds. *et al. Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Manchester and NewYork: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Bart-Moore-Gilbert, Gareth Stanton and Willy Maley Eds. *Postcolonial Criticism*. New York: Longman, 1997.

- Baucom, Ian. "Mournful Histories: Narratives of Post-imperial Melancholy" *Modern Fiction Studies*, 42(2), Summer 1996, 259-288.
- Bernard-Donals, Michal, F. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Between Phenomenology and Marxism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Bhabha, Homi, K. ed. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Bharucha, Nilufer. E. "From Commonwealth to Postcolonial Literatures: Old Wine in New Bottles." *The Journal of Indian Writing in English*, 1997.
- Bhaskara Rao, *Rudyard Kipling's India*. University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.
- Bhupal Singh, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Bohmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literatures: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Booth, Wayne, C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1961.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. "A Postindustrial Prelude to Postcolonialism: John Ruskin, William Morris and Gandhism." *Critical Inquiry*. Spring, 22, 1996.
- Brennan, Timothy. "Preface". *Modern Fiction Studies*, 35(1), Spring 1989, 1-8.

- Brydon, Diana. "Commonwealth or Common Poverty? The New Literatures in English and the New Discourse of Marginality," *Kunapipi*. ix (1), 1989.
- Cesaire, Aime. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Trans. Joan Pinkham, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972.
- Chakraborty, Dipesh. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speak for Indian Past's?", *Representations* 32(Winter): 1026, 1992.
- Chambers, Lain and Lidia Curti. *The Post-Colonial Question*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Chandra, Bipan. *India's Struggle for Independence 1857-1947*. New Delhi: Viking, 1988. Penguin. 1989.
- Chatterjee, Partha. "Nationalism as a Problem", *In Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. Tokyo and London: Zed Books for United Nations University, 1986.
- C . M. "Review" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 212-213.
- Cohn, B. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Cohn, Bernard, S. *The Development and Impact of British Administration in India*. New Delhi: The Indian Institute of Public Administration, 1961.

- Colebrooke, Claire, *New Literary Histories: New Historicism and Contemporary Criticism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.
- Coleman, Mary. *Success Signs*. India: Penguin Books, 2001.
- Collins, Larry and Dominique Lapierre. *Freedom at Midnight*, New Delhi: Vikas Pub. House, 1976.
- Colmer, John. "Promise and Withdrawal in *A Passage to India*," *E.M. Forster: A Human Exploration, Centenary Essays*. G.K. Das and John Beer Eds. London: Macmillan, 1979.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*, ed. Paul O'Prey (1983), Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1902.
- . *Nigger of the Narcissus*. London: Dent, 1925, 1945.
- Cowasjee, Saros. *So Many Freedoms (A study of the major novels of Mulk Raj Anand)* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- C. W. G. "A Review". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 270-272.
- Das, G. K. *E. M. Forster's India*. New Delhi: Macmillan, 1977.
- Dhareshwar, Vivek. "Fortunate Traveling: Location, Theory and Post-Colonial Identity," *Journal of Contemporary Thought*, 1992, 37-55.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Post-colonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry* (Winter) 20, 1994.

- Drieson, Cynthia Vanden. *Centering the Margins: Perspective on Literatures in English from India, Africa, Australia*. New Delhi: Prestige, 1995.
- During, Simon. "Postmodernism or Post-colonialism Today." *Textual Practice* 1(1), 1987.
- Eagleton, Terry and Drew Milne Eds. *Marxist Literary Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- . *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- . *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- . *Criticism and Ideology: A Study of Marxist Literary Theory*. London and New York: Verso, 1975.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. trans. Charles Lam Markmann (1968), London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1965.
- . *The Wretched of the Earth*, Constance Farrington (1963), 1st Evergreen Edn, New York: Grove Press, 1991.
- Fisher Louis. *Life of Mahatma Gandhi*. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Forster, E.M. *A Passage to India*. London: Dent, 1942.
- . *Aspects of the Novel*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1966.
- . *The Hill of Devi*. London: Penguin, 1965.
- Foucault, Michel. "Subject and Power" *Critical Inquiry*.

- - -. "The Order of Discourse", Robert Young Ed. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- - -. *Power/Knowledge*. Trans. Colin Gordon. Great Britain: The Harvester Press, (1972) 1980.
- - -. *The Archeology of Knowledge (and the Discourse on Language)*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon, 1972.
- - -. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York and London: Tavistock, 1994.
- Fry, Roger. "A Passage to India" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 296.
- Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchand. *Satyagraha in South Africa*. Madras: Ganesan, 1928.
- - -. *Young India: 1927-1928*.
- - -. *Gokhale: My Political Guru*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1955.
- - -. *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 1938.
- - -. *Songs from Prison*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1934.
- - -. *The Story of My Experiments with Truth* ('An Autobiography'), Ahmedabad: Navajivan, Vol. 1, 1927.
- - -. *Non-violence in Peace & War* (Vol. I, II, III). Ahmedabad: Navajivan Pub. House, 1942.

- - -. *Gandhiji's Correspondence with the Government, 1942-44.*

Ahmedabad: Navajivan, 2nd ed., 1945.

Gardner, Philip Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage.* London and Boston:

Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Giddings, Robert. *Literature and Imperialism.* London; Macmillan, 1991.

Goldberg, David Theo. "In/visibility and Super/vision: Fanon on Race, Veils, and Discourses of Resistance," *Fanon: A Critical Reader*, Lewis R. Gordon, T. Denean Sharpley – Whiting and Renee T. White, Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Gordon, Lewis R. "Fanon's Tragic Revolutionary Violence," *Fanon: A Critical Reader.* Lewis. R. Gordon *et al.* Eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Gramsci: Prison Notebooks.* Madras: Orient Longman Limited, 1996.

Guha, Ranajit. "Not at Home in Empire," *Critical Inquiry* 25, Spring 1997, 482-493.

Guha. Ranajit ed. *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Harlow, Barbara. *Resistance Literature.* New York and London: Methuen, 1987.

- Hawthron, Jeremy. *Cunning Passages: New Historicism Cultural Materialism and Marxism in the Contemporary Literary Debate*. London: Arnold, 1996.
- Hodge, Bob and Vijay Mishra. *The Dark Side of the Dream: Australian Literature and the Post-colonial Mind*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991.
- Horne, E. A. "An Anglo-Indian View" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 246-251.
- Horz, Judith Echeuz and Robert. K. Martin. *E.M. Forster: Centenary Evaluations*. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Hubel, Teresa. *Whose India? The Independence Struggle in British and Indian Fiction*. London: Leicester University Press, 1998.
- - -. " 'The Bride of His Country': Love, Marriage, and the Imperialist Paradox in the Indian Fiction of Sara Jeannette Duncan and Rudyard Kipling." *ARIEL*, Vol. 21, No. 1 January 1990.
- Huggan, Graham. "Decolonizing the Map: Post-colonialisms, Post-structuralism and the Cartographic Connection," *Ariel*, 20(4): 115-29, (1989).
- - -. "A Tale of Two Parrots: Walcott, Rhys, and the Uses of Colonial Mimicry." *Contemporary Literature*, Winter 1994, Vol, 35, No. 4.

- Ian, Adam and Helen Tiffin Eds. *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-colonialism and Postmodernism* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.
- Indira, C.T. and Meenakshi Shivram, Eds. *Post-coloniality: Reading Literature*. New Delhi: Vikas Pub. House, 1999.
- Iyengar, K.R. Srinivas. *Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1962.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," *Social Text*, 15(Fall): 65-88, 1986.
- JanMohammed, Abdul. R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature" *Critical Inquiry* 12(1): 59-87, 1985.
- JanMohammed. Abdul R. *Manichean Aesthetics: The Politics of Literature in Colonial Africa*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983.
- Jha, Rama. *Gandhian Thought and Indo-Anglican Novels*. Delhi: Chanakya Publishers, 1983.
- Kaul, Suvir. "Colonial Figures and Post-colonial Reading" *Diacritics*, Spring 26(1), 1996.
- Kenneth, Kadiata. *African Identities: Race, Nation and Culture in Ethnography, Pan-Africanism and Black Literature*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

- Kincaid, Jamaica. "A Small Place." Rpt. Ashcroft, Bill Gareth, Griffiths and Helen Tiffin Eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. London: Dell, 1901.
- . *Life's Handicap*. London: Dell, 1891.
- Knippling, Alpana Sharma. "R.K. Narayan, Raja Rao and Modern English Discourse in India," *Modern Fiction Studies*, 39(1) Winter 1993, 169-186.
- Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. D. Van Nostrand Co., New York: 1955.
- Kripal, Vinay. "Has the Indian Novel Been Understood," *From Commonwealth To Post-colonial*. Anna Rutherford ed. Sydney: Dangaroo Press, 1992.
- Kripalani, Krishna. *Gandhi: A Life*. New Delhi: National Book Trust, 2001.
- Kumar, Gajendra. "Kanthapura: A stylistic Feat" *Indian Literature in English*. K.V. Surendran Ed. Sarup & Sons, New Delhi: 2002.
- Kurks, Sonia. "Fanon, Sartre, and Identity Politics." *Fanon: A Critical Reader*. Lewis. R. Gordon *et al.* Eds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996
- Lal, Vinay. "Representing India" *New Quest* March-April (86), 1991.
- Lawrence, D. H. "Letter to Martin Secker". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 235.

- Lazarus, Neil. "National Consciousness and the Specificity of (Post) Colonial Intellectualism," Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iverson Eds. *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
- Levine, June Perry. *Creation and Criticism: A Passage to India*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1971.
- Lloyd, David. "Writing in the Shit: Beckett, Nationalism, and the Colonial Subject" *Modern Fiction Studies*, 35(1), Spring 1989, 71-86.
- Lodge, David. *20th Century Literary Criticism*. Essex: Longman, 1972.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1980.
- - -. *Gender, Race and Renaissance Drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Lynd, Sylvia. "A Great Novel at Last" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 215-218.
- Macaulay, Rose. "Women in the East". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 196-198.
- Macaulay, T.B. *Critical and Historical Essays*. 2 Vols., London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1963.
- - -. B. *Minute on Indian Education*. Selected with an introduction and notes by G.M. Young (1935) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1935.

- Massingham, H. W. "The Price of India's Friendship" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 207-210.
- McClintock, Anne. "The Angels of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Postcolonialism'" *Colonial and Postcolonial Discourse*. Francis Barker *et al.* eds. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1994, 251-266.
- Memmi, Albert. *The Coloniser and the Colonized*. New York: Orion, 1965.
- Metcalf, Thomas, R. *Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, (1995pp).
- Miller, D., M. Rowlands, C. Tilley. *Domination and Resistance*, London: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
- Mills, Sara, *Discourse*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Minogue, K.R. *Nationalism*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1967.
- Mohanty, Satya P. "Colonial legacies, Multicultural Futures: Relativism, Objectivity, and the Challenge of Otherness." *PMLA* January 1995.
- Mongia, Padmini. Ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Monier, Williams. *Religious Thought and Life in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1883.
- Morris, Pam. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. Londong: Arnold, 1994.

- Mukherjee, Arun. P. "The Exclusions of Post-colonial Theory and Mulk Raj Anand's *Untouchable*: A Case Study." *ARIEL*, 22(3), July 1991, 27-48.
- Mukherjee, Meenakshi. "On Teaching: *A Passage to India*," *Focus on Forster's A Passage to India*. A Shahane, Ed. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1975.
- - -. *The Perishable Empire: Essays in Indian Writing in English*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Mukherjee, Sujit. *Forster and Further: The Tradition of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. Bombay: Orient Longman, 1993.
- Murdoch, Adlai. H. (Dis)placing Marginality: Cultural Identity and Creole. Resistance in Glissant and Maximin." *Research in African Literatures*, Summer 1994, Vol. 25, No. 2.
- Muir, Edwin. "A Passage to more than India". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 278-280.
- Murry, John Middleton. "Bo-oum or Ou-boum?" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 236-238.
- Naik. M.K. *et al.* Eds. *The Image of India in Western Creative Writing*. Madras: Macmillan 1971

- Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Narayanan, R.K. *Waiting for the Mahatma*. London: Methuen 1955.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. *An Autobiography*. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- - -. *The Discovery of India*, New Delhi: Nehru Memorial Foundation, 1982.
- Ngugi Wa Thiong'o. "The Language of African Literature," in *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey, 1981.
- - -. *A Grain of Wheat*. London: Heinemann, 1967.
- Nietzsche, Ferderick. *Will to Power*, 1901.
- Nirad C. Chaudhuri. *The Continent of Circe: An Eassy on the People of India*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1965.
- Parameswaran, Uma. *A study of Representative Indo-English Novelists*. Delhi: V. Publishers, 1976.
- Parkash, Bhagban. *Indian Themes in English Fiction: A Socio-literary Study*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications, 1994.
- Parker, Michael and Roger Strakey. Eds. *Postcolonial Literatures: Acebhe, Ngugi, Desai, Walcott*. London: Macmillan, 1995.
- Parry, Benita. "A Passage to India: Epitaph or Manifests?" in *E.M. Forster: A Human Exploration, Centenary Essays*. G.K. Das and John Beer Eds. London: Macmillan, 1979.

- - -. "A Passage to More Than India." *Forster: A collection of Critical Essays*, Malcom Bradbury Ed. New York: Prentice Hall, 1966.
 - - -. "Resistance Theory, Theorizing Resistance." Francis Barker, Peter Hulme and Margaret Iverson Eds. *Colonial Discourse/Post Colonial Theory*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994.
 - - -. *Delusions and Discoveries studies on the India in the British Imagination 1880-1930*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1972.
 - - -. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *Oxford Literary Review* 9(1&2): 27-58, 1987.
- Pathan, B.A. *Gandhian Myth in English Literature in India*, New Delhi: Deep & Deep. Publishers, 1987.
- Payne, Michael. *Reading knowledge: An Introduction to Barthes, Foucault and Althusser*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Pennycook, Alastair. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Phillips, K.J. "Hindua Avatars, Moslem Martyrs, and Primitive Dying Gods in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*". *Journal of Modern Literature*, Vol. 15, No.1 Summer 1988. 121-140.
- Priestly, J. B. "Review". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 218-219.

- Radhakrishnan, S. *Indian Philosophy*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1923.
- Radhakrishnan, S. Ed. *Mahatma Gandhi: Essays and Reflections on His Life and Work*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1939.
- Rajan, Rajeshwari Sunder. Ed. *The Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Rajappan, C. "Synthesis of Marxism and Gandhism in Anand's *Untouchable*," *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1999.
- Ramamurthi, K. S. *Rise of the Indian Novel in English*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1987.
- Rao, Raja. "The Caste of English" in C.D. Narasimhaiah (ed.) *Awakened Conscience: Studies in Commonwealth Literature*, New Delhi: Sterling London: Heinemann, 1978.
- . *Kanthapura*. (1938) Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- . *The Cat and Shakespeare*. Delhi: Hind Pocket Books, 1947.
- . *The Cow of the Barricades*. Madras: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- . *The Meaning of India*. New Delhi: Vision Books, 1996.
- . *The Serpent and the Rope*. London: John Murray, 1960.
- Ratcliffe, S. K. "Another Anglo-Indian View". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 241-253.

- Reddy, K. Venkata and P. Bayapa Reddy, Eds. *The Indian Novels with a Social Purpose*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1999.
- Regan, Stephan Ed. *Eagleton Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Rosecrance, Barbara. "A Passage to India: The Dominant voice," *E.M. Forster: Centenary Revaluations*. Judith Echez Herz and Robert. K. Martin Eds. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Said, Edward, W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- - -. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge, 1978.
- - -. "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors". *Critical Inquiry* 15, Winter, 1989.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. *Orientalism*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2002.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism* Azzedine Haddour, Steve Brewer and Terry Mc Williams, Translators, London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Sharma, Gobind Prasad. *Nationalism in Indo-Anglican Fiction*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1978.
- Sharma, K.K. *Four Great Indian English Novelists*. New Delhi: Sarup & Sons, 2002.
- Sharma, Saroj. *Indian Elite and Nationalism*, New Delhi: Rawat Publishers, 1997.
- Sharpe, Jenny. "Figures of Colonial Resistance." *Modern Fiction Studies*, 35(1) Spring 1989, 137-156.

- Simons, Jon. *Foucault and the Political*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Singh, Avatar. *The Novels of E.M. Forster*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1986.
- Singh, Bhupal. *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. London: Curzon Press, 1974.
- Singh, Joytsna G. *Colonial Narratives: Cultural Dialogues, "Discoveries of India in the Language of Colonialism,"* London: Routledge, 1996.
- Singh, St. Nihal. "Indians and Anglo-Indians: As Portrayed to Britons". Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 264-269.
- Singh, Veena Ed. *Literature and Ideology: Essays in Interpretations*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications, 1998.
- Sinha, K. N. *Mulk Raj Anand*. New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers, 1989.
- Slemon, Stephen. "Magic Realism as Post-Colonial Discourse," *Canadian Literature* 116: 9-23, 1988.
- - -. "Monuments of Empire: Allegory/Counter-Discourse/Post-Colonial Writings," *Kunapipi*, 9(3): 1-16, 1987.
- - -. "Modernisms Last Post". *ARIEL*, Vol. 20, No. 4, October 1989.
- - -. "Revisioning Allegory: Wilson Harris's Carnival," *Kunapipi*, 8(2): 45-55, 1986.
- - -. "The Scramble for Post-colonialism," in Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson (eds) *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*, London: Routledge, 1994.

- - -. "Unsettling the Empire: Resistance Theory for the Second World," *World Literature Written in English*. 30(2): 30-41, 1991.
- Spivak, G. C. "Imperialism and Sexual Difference," *Oxford Literary Review* 8: 1-2, 1985.
- - -. "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism," *Critical Inquiry* 12(1): 43-61, 1985.
- - -. [1987]. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen, 1988.
- - -. "The Rani of Simur," in Francis Barker *et al.* (eds) *Europe and Its Others* Vol. 1 Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature July 1984, Colchester. University Essex, 1985.
- - -. "Can the Subaltern Speak?: Speculations on Widow Sacrifice." *Wedge* winter/spring 7(8).
- - -. "The Burden of English" *The Lie of the Land: English Literary Studies in India*. Rajeshwari Sundar Rajan Ed. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Srinivas. V. "Myth and Experiment in Kanthapura," *Indian Fiction in English*, P. Mallikarjuna Rao & M. Rajeshwara Rao, Eds. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 1999.
- Suleri, Sara. "Woman Skin Deep: Feminism and the Postcolonial Condition," *Critical Inquiry*, 18(4) (Summer) 756-69, 1992.

- - -. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Swinden, Patrick. *Paul Scott: Images of India*, London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Tagore, Rabindranath. *Nationalism*. Macmillan, London, 1950.
- Tharu, Susie. "Decoding Anand's Humanism". *Kunapipi*. Vol. 4, No. 2 1982.
- Thompson, Edward John. *A Farewell to India*. London; Benn, 1931.
- Thompson, Edward. *An Indian Day*. London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.
- Tiffin, Chris and Alan Lawson, Eds. *De-Scribing Empire: Post-colonialism and Textuality*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Tiffin, Helen. "Post-Colonial History," *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 23(1): 169-81, 1988.
- - -. "Post-colonial Literature and Counter-Discourse" *Kunapipi*, 9(3): 17-34, 1987.
- Tinsley, Molly, B. "*Muddle Et. cetra: A Passage to India*". *E.M. Forster: Centenary Revaluations*, Judith Echerez Herz and Robert. K. Martin Eds. London: Macmillan, 1982.
- Trilling, Lionel. *E.M. Forster: A Study*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1969.
- Trivedi, Harish. "India and Postcolonial Discourse." *Journal of Contemporary Thought* (5), 1993.
- - -. *Colonial Transactions – English Literature and India*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.

- - -. Colonial Transactions: *English Literature and India*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.
- Usha, Udhay Shanker. "Gandhian Ideology: A study of Raja Rao's *Kanthapura*," *The Fiction of Raja Rao: Critical Studies*. Rajeshwar Mittapalli & Pier Paolo Ricincco Eds. Delhi: Atlantic Publishers, 2001.
- Venkatsaramani, K.S. *Murugan, the Tiller*. London: Simpkin Marshall Ltd., 1927. Svetaranya Ashrama, Madras, 1929.
- - -. *Kandam, the Patriot*, Madras, Svetsya Ashrama, 1934.
- Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and the British Rule in India*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- - -. "The Beginnings of English Literary Study in British India." *Oxford Literary Review* 9(1-2), 1987.
- - -. *Outside the Fold: Religion, Conversion, Modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.
- Vivekananda, Swami. *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*, Ab. Ed. Calcutta: Advaita Ashram, 1985.
- West, Rebecca. "Interpreters of Their Age" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 253.
- Whately, Monica. *India In Pre-Independence*. Modern Book Distributers, Delhi: 1995.

- Wolfreys, Julian and William Baker. *Literary Theories: A Case Study in Critical Performance*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Woolf, Leonard. "Arch Beyond Arch" Philip Gardner, Ed. *E. M. Forster: The Critical Heritage*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973. 204-206.
- Young, Robert Ed. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Young Robert, J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*; London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- . *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- . *White Mythologies: Writing Histories and the West*. London: Routledge, 1990