

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS A STEREOTYPE?

WHAT DOES IT HAVE TO DO WITH POST-COLONIAL THEORY?

A stereotype is a generalized representation of a group, composed of the typical characteristics of members of the group. The use of stereotypes is usually humiliating even when the characteristics might be considered positive because it tends to discount the importance and uniqueness of the individual. A character may be associated with a group through accent, appearance, style of dress, or any readily identifiable group characteristic. Examples are stingy Scottish, lazy Arab etc.

Since the term 'stereotype' is a literary term and literature is an element of language, the views that are grounded on postcolonial theories will be reflected from a psychoanalytic point of view. Since psychoanalysis underpins, as well as other factors, language to base its point, it is going to be proved that language interpellate 'the other' through discourse. The advantage that psychoanalysis offers in post-colonial studies can be stated as follows:

Moreover, although "classical" psychoanalytic discourse tends to emphasize sexual difference over and above other varieties of difference or dialectics of "otherness," it maintains a significant, if equivocal, relation to postcolonial theory and practice. Indeed, it is not surprising that most extant modes of postcolonial theory either employ

psychoanalytic heuristic procedures or formulate (counter) discursive applications that oppose them. From Freud to Memmi, from Fanon to Lacan and Octave Mannoni, from Rey Chow to Homi Bhabha, psychoanalysis may be specified in terms either of the machinery of the colonial enterprise or as the instrumental agency against forces of imperialism.¹

One of the equivalents of the term stereotype in post-colonial discourse is 'essentialism'. In its broadest meaning, essentialism is a means used in the colonial discourse to operate and manipulate dominant norms and models in order to categorize the colonial subject first as 'other' then as 'inferior'. However, in time, it is introduced by the post-colonial critics that the same rigid fixations can be done also by the colonized peoples about the colonizer to disparage or denigrate him. This usage may be intentional or unintentional. Whether it is used by the colonized or the colonizer, the reason, process and the result is almost the same.

How important are stereotypes or essentialism? Homi Bhabha puts ambivalence in the very center of stereotype. Paying attention to how discourse affects the mental development of the individuals, he states that this instability of the mind and images leads the people to discriminate one another by stereotypes:

¹ John C. Hawley, and Emmanuel S. Nelson, eds., *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Studies* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001) 365, [Questia](http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102144441), 20 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102144441>>.

For it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalization; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in *excess* of what can be empirically proved or logically construed.²

It can be inferred from that quotation that according to Bhabha, stereotypes are used in colonial discourse repeatedly and regardless of the time concept. There is no need for a stereotype to be proved scientifically and no one is eager to hear so, because once it is used, the goal is achieved.

There is a passage in *Orientalism* in which Edward Said points out the essentialism problem through which experiences these fixations or essentialisms occur and what they do:

Altogether an internal structured archive is built up from the literature that belongs to these experiences. Out of this comes a restricted number of typical encapsulations: the journey, the history, the fable, the stereotype, the polemical confrontation. These are lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape the language, perception and form of the encounter between East and West.³

² Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006.p.95

³ Edward Said. *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 2003. p. 58

In the eyes of the stranger who pursues money or lust or power in the land of Orient, the natives are inferior and primitive. He experiences pettiness in natives' nature and uses it as a means, an apparatus of power and domination. The ensured repeatability of the essentialisms –as Bhabha says- leads it to become ordinary and everyday knowledge in general culture for common people. As time passes, this 'everyday knowledge' is used to prove certain facts against common benefit but for the benefit of colonial power or post-colonial bourgeoisie. That is to say, once used an apparatus of power, now they become the power itself. Bhabha quotes a related part to my discussion from Michel Foucault from his book *Power/Knowledge*:

The apparatus is essentially of a strategic nature, which means assuming that it is a matter of a certain manipulation of relations of forces, either developing them in a particular direction, blocking them stabilizing them, utilizing them, etc. The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting and supported by, types of knowledge.⁴

These types of knowledge are mainly representations of the 'the Other.' These representations construct a body of a common culture which is circulated by a

⁴ As quoted in Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p. 105-106

discourse. In time, the discourse can easily turn phantasms of disavowal into reality. This is because of abusing power that is enabled by colonial discourse.

In *The Jewel in the Crown*, for example, the rape incident is chosen intentionally, because there is a fixed view, essentialism in colonial discourse about the Indians as they are licentious. This view is portrayed in an event that exists in the very center of the plot. On the other hand, there is another rape which is referred committed by the British against India. This is another aspect of the novel. Paul Scott seems to have been fair to both sides.

One can claim that stereotyping is a kind of simplification of a subject or facilitating a complex phenomenon, which is not true because it can't be done incidentally, yet the process of essentializing works by the attempt of negating 'the Other' is not as it is but as it is seen. Once 'the Other' is essentialized with a certain element in discourse, this negative differentiation is worked out for a long time and chased by another and another etc. Bhabha quotes from Fanon, from his famous work *Black Skin, White Masks*, a scene that Fanon experienced himself. The scene is mentioned in his essay "The Fact of Blackness." That scene, without any comment, shows what the result of marking the colonial subject in terms of colonial and racist discourse is. It is about a little girl who sees Fanon and how she showed her reaction:

'Look a Negro... Mama, see the Negro! I'm frightened'

'What else could it for me', Fanon concludes, 'but an amputation, an

excision, a haemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black blood.⁵

This deadly representation that found its way in the words of the little girl through the colonial discourse and lives in the daily lives of ordinary people oppresses the colonized or the subject-the Other- in his mind and subconscious, naming and assuring him that he is bad, evil, weak, etc.

This process of using discourse to slander one side is not specific to the colonizer. The same operation takes place in colonized people's discourse against the colonizer, with a difference: it is done in an immature and an unorganized way. Nirad Chaudhuri tells us that because of their fair complexion, the British are regarded as evil or malicious . So the same conditioning and essentializing can be seen among the colonized, in order to 'other' the colonized.

These totally distorted and inflected images are a result of deformations of language, as Edward Said says, agreeing with Roland Barthes.⁶ According to Said, 'The Orient' is formed-or deformed- out of a more specific sensitivity towards a geographical region, that is 'The east.' It is then the experts of the region, the Orientalist, provide their own societies with these representations, later become essentialism. From this perspective, it is not wrong to say that Ronald Merrick's views about India and Indians were formed before he came to India. Even we can claim that Colin Lindsey, Hari Kumar's best friend, came to India with a similar insight to Merrick's about India and because of that he

⁵ Ibid, p, 108

⁶ Edward Said. *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 2003. p, 273.

avoided all kinds of communication in a positive way with all Indians, even with the best one he knows personally.

It is very enlightening to analyze the position of Hari Kumar under the light of Bhabha's hybridity theory. Hari's 'in-between' situation, both culturally and linguistically, shows us his troublesome exchange of cross-cultural values and acquisitions between his 'British' past and 'Indian' present. On the other hand, hybridity is not a problematic specific to the colonized. For the 'values' which are brought and imposed by the colonizer to the colonized cannot be digested in the colonized society as they are, another issue occurs for the colonizer as these 'values' reborn and reinterpreted as they are used in and by a different culture, that is the 'other's'.

Hybridity shifts power, questions discursive authority, and suggests contrary to the implication of Said's concept of Orientalism, that colonial discourse is never wholly in the control of the colonizer. Its authority is always reinflected, split, syncretized, and to an extent menaced by its confrontation with its object.⁷

It is this hybridity that enables and lets Indian intellectuals rise or emerge, like Chaudhuri and many others. Once imposed in their colonial discourse for certain goals of British Empire by the British, these values, customized and adapted to Indian society, are used by enlightened Indians.

⁷ Peter Childs and R.J. Patrick. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. Great Britain: T.J Press, 1997 p. 136

From another perspective, the essentialisms in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *The Jewel in the Crown* can be analyzed in light of ‘subaltern’ concept, which is first used in postcolonial discourse by Subaltern Studies group of historians and then argued by Gayatri Spivak. Yet it is dealt with the stereotypical aspect of British-Indian relationship in this work, Gayatri Spivak’s critique of defining any group as ‘subaltern’ is an essentialism done by the élite, is important. Secondly, she emphasizes on the identity of the ‘subaltern’ rather than the possibilities of being heard in political arena.⁸ In that sense, two forms of ‘subalternization’ can be discussed. First, the suppression of the colonized done by the colonizer in way that essentializes the colonized elite or intellectuals as subaltern; secondly, the colonized elite’s disdain of the ordinary colonized people. The first form is seen clearly in the examples from *The Jewel in the Crown*. Namely, it is seen best in the words of Brigadier Reid about ‘so-called educated Indians’ and their ‘deeds’. The second form of ‘subalternization’ is sensed in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* where Chaudhuri criticizes Indians’ lack of organization and plan.

After these interpretations, it won’t be wrong to emphasize the psychological, linguistic and sociological effects of colonialism and its postcolonial effects in the light of psychoanalysis. The problematic question of ‘other’ and its propagation through discourse should be analyzed from the point where first colonial encounter take place and it goes on now.

⁸ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies The Key Concepts*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2005. p.218-219

As a last word, Fanon's words from *Racism and Culture* will fit to my discussion. The quotation is quoted by Homi Bhabha, as a closing of the part 'The Other Question' in his *The Location of Culture* which enlightened the views of this work:

This behavior [of the colonizer] betrays a determination to objectify, to confine, to imprison, to harden. Phrases such as 'I know them', 'that's the way they are', show this maximum objectification successfully achieved... There is one hand a culture in which qualities of dynamism, of growth, of depth can be recognized. As against this, [in colonial cultures] we find characteristics, curiosities, things, never a structure.⁹

⁹ As quoted in Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p.120

PART 1

Looking Closely at Indian Stereotypes in *The Jewel in the Crown*

As a whole, *The Raj Quartet* deals with the times starting with the Quit India campaign of the Congress Committee under the leadership of Gandhi to Indian Independence. The writer's attitude to all sides attracts the attention of the readers to different grounds of discussion. Paul Scott is a writer who simply felt the feelings of both sides, the English and the Indian. As an English writer, he has the ability and conscience to look inside India and feel the grief of Indian people as well as knowing the imperial insight. In one of his talks, he explains why he wrote on India so much in his career:

The special fascination that India has for me is the almost tragic atmosphere I see as attaching to it then--and indeed still--as the mausoleum containing the remains of the last two great senses of public duty we had as a people. I mean of course the sense of duty that was part and parcel of having an empire, and the sense of duty so many of us felt, that to get rid of it was the liberal human thing to do.¹⁰

The Jewel in the Crown is the first novel of the Raj Quartet and it is divided into several parts. Most of the novel is written in the form of letters, diaries, interviews and reports of conversations.

¹⁰ Jason Howard Mezey, "Mourning the Death of the Raj? Melancholia as Historical Engagement in Paul Scott's Raj Quartet," *Studies in the Novel* 38.3 (2006), *Questia*, 14 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5018322392>>.

The Jewel in the Crown opens with a command “Imagine then.” The writer wants us to close our eyes and picture every detail we read. This is good for feeling the sorrows of characters and a nation. The pain is not suffered by Daphne Manners or Edwina Crane, two of the characters in the book, but also, even more deeply, by the people in India.

The story is set in Mayapore, which does not actually exist. “Maya” means “illusion.” But we understand that it is located in northern India. In Mayapore, there is a significant British population, as well as native population and Anglo-Indians. Anyone who has some knowledge about the demographic structure of India can easily understand that Mayapore has similar characteristics to Punjab.

Basically, the novel is a romance but it has lots of hints for the reader to comprehend the insights of colonial India and British imperialism in terms of politics and sociology. It can also be called a historical fiction. There are characters that we can trace back in the history of Raj. The Superintendent police officer Ronald Merrick’s attitude reminds us of General Dyer of Amritsar massacre; the story of Miss Edwina Crane partly reminds of the story an English Superintendent of schools Marcella Sherwood; the story of Sister Ludmilla reminds us of Mother Teresa and so on. The story provided Scott with the seeds of the attack on Miss Crane and also on Daphne Manners, one of the main characters that we meet in the second part of the novel. The extraordinary narrative makes the reading rather difficult but it is also interesting because to fully understand it, you have to refer to other characters speaking through their

letters, diaries etc. That involvement of the reader makes it hard to figure out the events as the reader reads a part. But when another character speaks, the reader can find the missing information to understand the previous parts.

Although we meet the hero and the heroine of the book, Daphne Manners and Hari Kumar, or once in England Harry Coomer, in the second part of the book, the events they took part in their sufferings have great impact on the reader. That belated meeting with the hero and the heroine is because of the story of Edwina Crane, which confuses the reader at first whether Edwina Crane or Daphne Manners is the heroine of the book. It is after a hundred pages or so that the reader finds out that Daphne is the heroine. Daphne Manners, who has lost her parents in England, comes to India to live with her only remaining relative, her aunt, Lady Manners who is an Anglo-Indian. Daphne arrives in India without the racial snobbery of other Anglo-Indians around her. She is an awkward and short-sighted young woman. Lady Manners is an elderly and wise woman who wants her niece to experience new things and forget the misery of losing her beloved parents. She sends Daphne to Mayapore to stay with her Indian friend, Lady Lili Chatterjee, who is a well-off and intellectual Indian woman. As time passes, Daphne loves this Indian woman and starts calling her "Auntie Lili." Lady Chatterjee is a rich widow and lives in MacGregor House, which formerly belonged to an aristocrat and has been very famous in Mayapore. Daphne hears stories about MacGregor House and around being haunted, so she usually senses ghosts. Besides, these stories and her feelings, along with the first part of the novel in which we become familiar with the story of Miss Crane, the missionary

woman, helps the reader sense and think about the ghosts of dead people in Arimitsar Massacre.

Daphne and Hari meet at a party in MacGregor house. It is clear that Lady Chatterjee, being aware of Hari's attraction and knowing his background beforehand, wants Daphne to be close with him. Hari Kumar's background is very complex. He is an Indian but does not speak Urdu because he was brought up in England. He is well-educated and he speaks English perfectly. Indeed, apart from being "black" he is a 'typical' Englishman. We learn that he was "Harry Coomer" in England and all his friends and relations are British. The identity crisis he suffers stands in the center of the novel's Post-colonial aspect. The alterity he is in hinders him to have an identity both in England and in India. He is like an unreal character, someone who doesn't belong anywhere. The mimicry with him in England in order to be a real Englishman leads him in India to the mimicry to be a real Indian. The results of both processes are tragic.

Hari Kumar works as a reporter in Mayapore Gazette but this is the only job he can do. He has received a good education from Chillinborough, England. His father moved to England when he was two and started a business but unfortunately went bankrupt and committed suicide. Hari didn't have anything left from his father and returned to India, penniless. His aunt, Mrs. Gupta Sen helps him and Hari stays with her. The job in the Gazette is not satisfactory for him when his background is considered. Because his English is perfect, he has no difficulty in his job. He is a rather handsome Indian, taller than the average

and because he lived in England nearly all his life he talks and behaves just like a British person.

Among the limited young and working British population that Daphne is acquainted with, she can't find the one to share her time, except Ronald Merrick, the Superintendent of police, who dearly loves and cares for Daphne. But later on, he is disappointed with the refusal of his engagement proposal by Daphne. Ronald Merrick has strict views to apply on Indians. He reminds us of General Dyer of Amritsar Incident. There are many parts in which we see his violent behavior. The tension is high around him and he is always ready to get suspicious about any Indian. To him, all Indians are potential criminals and should be treated as such. Merrick uses his position in India as a means to rise in his career. He has also some problems with the small group of well-educated and aristocratic young British people that he is around with because he has a mediocre background in terms of family and education. He has no connection with an aristocratic or middle class family. Later in the book, we come to a conclusion to the point that he has some problems with that. He reveals this during one of the evenings he dines with Daphne. In one of the letters Daphne writes to her aunt Lady Manners she writes about this conversation:

He said he came of 'a very ordinary family' and although his father had done well enough, he was still only a grammar school boy and his grandparents are 'pretty humble sort of people'.¹¹

Ronald Merrick's character symbolizes the dark side of the British community in India. For there are good-hearted people like Daphne from the same land, there are also evil characters like Merrick. Being aware that he doesn't have the same background as other imperial workers, he sees that he can only rise in his career by hanging around with them.

His attempt to marry Daphne cannot be understood without knowing his ideas. From this point of view it is not difficult how disappointed he feels when he is rejected. After Daphne refuses Ronald Merrick's proposal, she gets closer with Hari Kumar. They meet several times and discover their mutual tastes. This intimacy between two attractive young people in their deserted worlds, results in an inevitable love affair. But that interracial love affair was not common at that time in India. Ronald Merrick's attention is always on them and especially on Hari. So they find themselves in a very difficult position. They can't give up and are attracted to each other both physically and mentally, on the other hand the political controversy upon British rule among Indian people increases. It is not difficult to see that a sharp resolution is not far away. Daphne and Hari are caught in a trap of love in a sea of confusion and hatred. Hari becomes the first

¹¹ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p.83

one to realize the awkward situation and starts to restrain himself. Daphne can't reach him for some while. One evening, just on the day when the riots began after the Quit India campaign started, while Daphne returns to MacGregor House from sister Ludmilla's Sanctuary, where she and Hari used to meet long ago, she stops by the Bibighar Gardens, a spiritual and deserted place where once Hari took her and had a great time together. She doesn't expect to meet him there. Then she sees Hari in the Gardens. Two lovers, having missed each other, hold each other passionately and make love. Meanwhile, outside the gardens and all around the city, there is a mutiny and chaos. Indians lose their self-control and the authorities in the city cannot handle the problem. While Daphne and Hari are making love, six or five Indians – peasants, Daphne says later – attack them, beating Hari badly and raping the young woman.

This is probably the most important part of the book for two reasons. One, it is the climax of the novel; two, the 'rape' incident is referred in the book by several characters in different contexts. The importance of that incident is best understood when Sister Ludmilla's journal is read:

For me Bibighar began on the night we found Kumar on the waste ground near the river, lying as if dead. Some distance off were the huts and hovels of the outcastes, but it was late and no lights were showing.¹²

¹² Ibid, p. 101

The conditions that led Hari Kumar and Daphne Manners to a disaster were all set before they met because it was obvious that the superintendent police chief and his colleagues have the same views about Indians.

The incident has a very heavy impact on both of them. Daphne, without any hesitation promises that she will not tell about Hari's presence there to anyone and asks Hari to do so. Hari reluctantly accepts this and when Daphne arrives home in a mess, Lady Chatterjee calls Ronald Merrick, the Superintendent police officer. From the moment Merrick learns about the event, knowing and envying Hari for getting closer each day with Daphne, he suspects Hari. As readers, we are guided that he suspects Hari in a hostile and envious way for two reasons. One, for Hari's bright and attractive past and background and two for Daphne's refusing his engagement proposal and getting closer to Hari.

He immediately arrests Hari and tortures him to confess that he is the one who raped Daphne. When Daphne insists that there were five or six men, Merrick finds five other men near the crime scene and tells his superiors that they are the other criminals. Later, Daphne asks the District Commissioner, Robin White, to release Hari because he is innocent, Merrick doesn't agree and tells Daphne and everyone that Hari is imprisoned not because of the rape incident but because of the political acts he has been in. Of course, this is a lie and another way of his "revenge" from Hari.

There is no information about Hari afterwards. After Merrick puts him in prison, we never see him again. Everybody, Lady Chatterjee, Ronald Merrick or

Sister Ludmilla are silent about Hari's whereabouts. Being pregnant and life without Hari is too much for Daphne and she leaves Mayapore to another town to bear the child. Unfortunately she dies while she bears the child and her aunt Lady Manners takes care of the baby. She gives the name to the child, Parvati.

As Lady Manners looks after the baby, she writes letters to Lady Chattarjee about how Daphne died or how the baby is doing. She also wants Lady Chatterjee to have Parvati in Macgregor House, as she did once to Daphne in the past. The book finishes with blur scenes of MacGregor house with Lady Chatterjee and Parvati in it.

In order to see the fixed stereotypes about Indians, the writings and the conversations of the characters must be referred. But before that, the name of the book and its origin is worth discussing. It is mentioned in the first part of the book, which is about the story of Miss Edwina Crane, the missionary school teacher, that the name *The Jewel in Her Crown* is the original name of a picture on the wall of her office. It is a semi-historical and semi-allegorical painting that shows Queen Victoria surrounded by the representative figures of her Indian Empire: princes, landowners, merchants etc. There is a man standing behind the queen holding a map of India. The queen sits on her throne proudly. The jewel in the picture is surely the Queen but Miss Crane insists to her students that the true jewel is India itself. Her students have always been fascinated by this comment by their British teacher. Once, Mr Cleghorn, a member of the church in Muzaffarabad would say to her: "Admirable. I would never have thought of it.

To teach English and at the same time love of the English.”¹³ By the “love of the English” he surely meant not the language but the imperial power that colonized India. But after the riots started by the approval of Quit India campaign by the Indian National Congress, Miss Crane’s car was attacked, her Indian assistant was killed and she was wounded badly. After some time she goes mad and commits suicide by burning herself after she recovers and leaves hospital. The disappointment of her dreams and ideals about the Indians makes her so sorry that she can’t face it. The ideal India in her dreams was the one which should be cold-blooded in all conditions and solve its problems with contemplating for a long time. The attitude of National Congress, by approving the Quit India campaign led by Gandhi was the first blow for most people like Miss Crane. But the attack on her car was too much for her and couldn’t bear that burden. But on the other hand, there is the fact that she has done everything out of her idealism but not sincere love for India. Lady Chatterjee writes this to Lady Manners:

(about Miss Crane) She was an old school liberal in the sense I grew to understand the term, someone who as likely as not had no gift for broad friendships. (...) She loved India and all Indians but no particular Indian. She hated British policies, and she disliked all Britons unless they turned out to be adherents to the same rules she abided by..... and I think at the end the reason for her madness was that she

¹³ Ibid, p.18

also had the courage to see the truth if not to live with it, see how all her good works and noble thoughts has been going on in a vacuum.¹⁴

Paul Scott wants the reader to see the parallel ending both for Edwina Crane and for Daphne Manners. Edwina Crane is a liberal school teacher who dares to live among Indians alone, whereas Daphne Manners is a young and bold woman who dares to make love with an Indian in Bibighar. Both women faced the same ending; they are disappointed and dead.

The story of Edwina Crane is important to understand the deeper meaning of what happens to Daphne and Hari. Edwina Crane was fatally wounded and her Indian assistant Mr. Chaudhuri MA and MS, was killed by the rioters. Here, the writer uses his academic titles to stress that he is not an ignorant Indian but a well-educated one. But there is a need to highlight Edwina Crane's ideas about Indians. Mr. Chaudhuri is her assistant and she trusts him and travels with him. On that day, there are riots in Mayapore and they are in a quiet town, Kotali. Mr. Chaudhuri hears that riots begin in Mayapore and he insists not to go until there is control over the riots. But Edwina Crane ignores him and goes. She ignores him because in reality she doesn't give any value to any Indian even if he/she is well-educated or one that is trustworthy. On the way they meet a gang of rioters and they beat Mr. Chaudhuri to death and wound Edwina Crane badly. After rioters leave, Miss Crane goes near the dead man and holds his hand: "It's taken me a long time" she said, meaning not only Mr.

¹⁴ Ibid, p. 87,88

Chaudhuri, 'I'm sorry it was too late.'¹⁵ This statement may be understood well as a confession. Here, she admits her weak side that leads her to underestimate the Indians, even if he is a well-educated one that is worthy and trustful. The ideas that can be related to the bias of the British has also been put into words in a different context by Janis E. Haswell, who wrote a lot on Paul Scott's books:

Because liberals like Edwina serve populations but not singular persons, such bigoted treatment of individuals can easily co-exist with abstract beliefs in human equality and dignity. The Raj were not pure "guardians of a sacred trust" but also "whoring imperialists" who, when it came to proving true to their promise, found the issue of partition "too hot to handle."¹⁶

The introduction of a book generally has some hints about the ideas of the writer as well as the plot and theme of it. Here, in the opening page of the first part, where the writer speaks as the narrator, we read:

This is the story of a rape, of the events that led up to it and followed it and of the place in which it happened. There are the action, the people, and the place; all of which are interrelated but in their

¹⁵ Ibid, p.50

¹⁶ Janis E. Haswell, "Images of Rape and Buggery: Paul Scott's View of the Dual Evils of Empire," *Studies in the Novel* 33.2 (2001): 202, *Questia*, 15 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001024631>>.

totality incommunicable in isolation from the moral continuum of human affairs.¹⁷

The rape issue is raised in the very beginning of the book to evoke the mind of the reader about the rape in two senses. The sexual act, i.e. the common meaning, and the rape the British commit in the light of their imperial goals. Pakistani writer and critic Sara Suleri's views on rape metaphor gives us hints that it can be used to cover some other deeds. Michael Edward Gorra's work on Naipul, Rushdie and Scott highlights it:

Suleri has argued that a metaphor that sees colonialism in terms of rape is now sterile, a "subterfuge to avoid the strikingly symbolic homoeroticism of Anglo-Indian narrative." But Scott's use of that metaphor seems far less tired than the heterosexual versions she has in mind and far more complicated and historically resonant than Rushdie's criticism of it would allow as well. For although Scott suggests that the Raj depends on the sexual contempt it feels for a defeated nation, that nation, however passive and "effeminate," here remains masculine.¹⁸

¹⁷ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 3

¹⁸ Michael Edward Gorra, *Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997) 54, Questia, 15 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=99314052>>.

There is a real difference between Suleri's view on rape metaphor and what Scott meant while using it. Here, in *The Jewel in the Crown*, the masculine side is meant to be the Indian side. In a way Scott switches the subject and the object.

The next paragraph in the book puts it very wisely that something significantly extraordinary and miserable will happen.

In the Bibighar Gardens case there were several arrests and an investigation. There was no trial in the judicial sense....In fact, such people say, the affair that began on the evening of August 9th, 1942, in Mayapore, ended with the spectacle of two nations in violent opposition, not for the first time nor as yet for the last because they were then still locked in an imperial embrace of such long standing and subtlety it was no longer possible for them to know whether they hated or loved one another, or what it was that held them together and seemed to have confused the image of their two destinies.¹⁹

This passage -the two opening paragraphs quoted above- suggests that an organizing key to *The Jewel in the Crown* and we will see the sense of totality and complexity and hints at a connection between the rape and the relationship of England and India. Indeed, we can understand that there are two levels of

¹⁹ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p.3

meaning here, first, the personal and second, historical. And they will be extended through the four novels.

In the third part of the book, we read the notes of Sister Ludmilla. She is not a nun actually but the locals call her such because she dresses like one and helps the poor and collects dead bodies and cares for people who are badly ill by taking them to the sanctuary for which she works voluntarily. As mentioned above, she is a representation of Mother Teresa. We read the first detailed descriptions of the two main characters Hari's and Daphne's from her notes. The first important point she makes is about the love affairs between British women and Indian men.

But, I saw other white women, the way they looked at Hari. Well, they found it easy enough to resist temptation because they saw him as if he stood on the wrong side of the water in which even to dabble their fingers would have filled them with horror.²⁰

Here, the 'horror' is depicted with her words so well that it is very clear that British women see Indian men as wild animals, ones which harm you when you approach.

Sister Ludmilla reveals an important issue by telling the most important aspect of Hari Kumar's problem, probably the most important and crucial problem of Indian people in the eyes of the British. It can be stated as "being no

²⁰ Ibid, p.114

one for the British or not being around when they really are.” Sister Ludmilla in her notes about Kumar emphasizes on that:

But Kumar is another story, isn't he? I will tell you a name that might help you, that possibly no one heard of but myself, or has long ago forgotten. Colin Lindsey. ...In England Colin was Hari Kumar's closest friend. They went to the same school. Colin tried to get his parents to look after Hari when Hari's father died and Hari was forced to come back to India.... With that Englishness. That English voice, that English manner and English name Harry Coomer. Speaking no Indian language. An Englishman with a black skin who in Mayapore became what he called invisible to white people.²¹

The relationship between himself and Colin, apparently, meant many things for Hari in England and after he returned to India. Because it helped Hari feel and see himself as an Englishman. He was not a white and British, though he was called Harry Coomer by his friends and himself also. Their connection with Lindsey went on after he began to live in India with letters. Colin's letters have a positive and encouraging impact on Hari which gives energy to endure all the pain he suffers out of loneliness and despair:

²¹ Ibid, p.122

But the association with Colin continued to be precious to him. Colin's signature at the bottom of a letter was the proof he needed that his English experience had not been imagined.²²

The connection with Colin has always meant many things to Hari. It was a sign of his being different from his original roots. That helped him to overcome the inferiority complex he suffers for not being English but behaving like one. Secondly, Colin's friendship becomes even more valuable for Hari after he comes to India because it remains his only connection with his own past. And his past, although it is not too long ago, seems so very far to him in Mayapore.

One day Colin writes Hari that he will begin working as a policeman in Meerut, India. Then in another one he writes that he was appointed to Mayapore. Hari feels very happily about that because at last someone who truly understands him will come and they will be very close as they were in England. Hari waits for his call or letter that will inform that he is in India but he receives neither a call nor a letter. Time passes and Hari forgets about it. One day, to write news for the newspaper, Hari goes to a cricket match. While he is watching the match he sees Colin and a few British policemen, all in their uniform. He feels wonderful because at last he would meet his best friend nearly after a year. He goes near them smiling and showing interest. But Colin does not say anything; he even doesn't look at his direction. We are not sure, like Hari, if he doesn't recognize him or doesn't want to speak to him but we are sure that at that

²² Ibid, p. 195

moment Hari begins to hate his own identity. He doesn't want to accept the fact about who he is, where he is and why he is. Being aware of his Indianness and blackness makes him hate himself.

...and he hated the black town on this side of the river as much as any white men fresh out from England would hate it. Hated it more, because for him the black town was the place where he had to live, not the place he occasionally had to pass through with his handkerchief held to his nose on the way back across to the civil lines and the world of the club where white people gathered.²³

The theme of "being invisible" to the people of concern is so startling to the reader that it forces us to empathize. Being invisible is surely about vision and has got nothing to do with thoughts, customs or anything related to mind. Only eyes are involved in understanding it. The pain that Hari suffered when rejected by Colin, his once best friend, forces him to think who he is and what he really is. He is not an identity or someone of concern to anyone on earth any longer. He is just an ordinary "black". An ordinary Indian and that is what he always will be.

I am invisible, not only to white people because they are white
and I am black but invisible to my white friend because he can no

²³ Ibid, p. 122

longer distinguish me in a crowd. He thinks-yes this is what Lindsey thinks-: ‘They all look alike.’ He makes me disappear. I am nothing. It is not his fault. He is right. I am nothing, nothing, nothing. I am the son of my father whose own father left home with a begging-bowl in his hand and a cloth round his loins, having blessed his children and committed their mother to their care.²⁴

Like a trapped animal in wilderness, being watched and followed by his caretakers, he loses his faith in his future and hopes. Helplessly and desperately, he needs a shelter where he can speak his inner self. Hari obviously becomes mentally ill. The alterity drives his mind ill. This mental disorder is exactly the same as the one Frantz Fanon writes in *The Wretched of the Earth*. The colonizer’s attitude that makes the colonized people’s mental ability paralyzed:

Because it is systematic negation of the other person and a furious determination to deny the other person all attributes of humanity, colonialism forces the people it dominates to ask themselves the question constantly: ‘In reality, who am I?’²⁵

One can claim that the reason of this systematic ruining the mental codes of the people under the rule of a whether colonial or imperial power cannot be

²⁴ Ibid, p. 216,217

²⁵ Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001. p.200

understood by underestimating the power of political influence. Orientated or being accustomed to same calamities and gloom for years, almost all the people in a society may feel it is normal. About political power and its means, Homi Bhabha may help to understand Hari's situation:

Political empowerment, and the enlargement of multiculturalist cause, comes from posing questions of solidarity and community from the interstitial perspective. Social differences are not simply given to experience through an already authenticated cultural tradition; they are the signs of the emergence of envisaged as a project - at once a vision and a construction - that takes you 'beyond' yourself in order to return, in a spirit of revision and reconstruction, to the political *conditions* of the present.²⁶

Homi Bhabha's comments on the problem about multiculturalism related to political empowerment foreshadow the troubles to come for the ones like Hari Kumar in the real world. The same problem still makes generations concerned about themselves and their identities today.

It is clear to us that Hari feels this emptiness in his bones after his meeting with Colin turned so frustrating. That day, he gives away that cricket match and he meets his Indian friends. He decides to be a true Indian, i.e. behaving nasty and being messy. They drink a lot and get drunk. In fact, this is

²⁶ Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p. 4

one of the most important moments of the book. Because after that night Hari and his friends get drunk, Sister Ludmilla finds him before dawn and that is how she and Hari meet. This is the point where Bibighar incident begins, as Sister Ludmilla states. So this is not the mere important incident of the moment. In the morning, Ronald Merrick comes to Sister Ludmilla's sanctuary to look for a criminal. He suspects the young Indian as soon as he sees him. Hari has a kind of nobler manner than most of the Indians; a kind of manner that few of the Indians- but mostly educated and well-off ones - have. He can't even answer Ronald Merrick's Indian assistant in Urdu because he only speaks English, even better than Ronald Merrick as Sister Ludmilla says²⁷. Apart from being Indian and "black" that kind of manner makes Roland feel uneasy. His skeptical attitude towards all Indians proved itself when his Indian assistant hits and forces Hari to police station for interrogation while nothing can be proved against him. Ronald Merrick's attitude towards Hari at their first encounter helps us to know his character. This kind of character makes the native feel brisk for the sudden reactions from the colonizer. The situation of the colonized is explained by Frantz Fanon:

Confronted a world ruled by the settler, the native is always
presumed guilty. But the native's guilt is never a guilt which he

²⁷ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 108

accepts; it is rather a kind of curse, a sort of sword of Damocles, for in his innermost spirit, the native admits no accusation.²⁸

Hari faces an inevitable accusation which, even he denies million times, he will be found guilty.

The two events, not talking to Colin and being interrogated without any true suspicion, disappoints Hari and he is about to turn a true Indian. He begins to learn Urdu because he can only communicate with the Indians who speak English. He begins to work harder and his political views begin to turn nationalist. For he is an educated young man, people with patriotic views try to inform him about the situation going on in India and assure him to choose a path to go. His ideas are not yet unchanged about the British but his mind is still confused. He is like a ship of which captain looks for an appropriate harbor to anchor. But he seems to have reached a conclusion:

In India an Indian and an Englishman could never meet on equal terms. It was not how a man thought, spoke and behaved that counted. Perhaps this had been true in England as well as the Lindseys had been exceptions to the general rule.²⁹

²⁸ Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001.p. 41

²⁹ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 199

What Hari's identity and presence mean for native Indians is also an extraordinary subject to discuss. Because Hari does not see himself belonging to one part meanwhile his friends and colleagues are in mixed feelings about him:

The room in the Chillianwallah Bazaar office was larger than the rest. He shared it with other English-speaking clerks. They were afraid of him because of his manner and his family connection with their employer. Proud of their own fluency in what passed among them for English—a language not generally in use at Romesh Chand's warehouse—they resented his intrusion but in a perverse way were flattered sense of further elevation his presence gave them....they sickened him. He thought them spineless, worse than a bunch of girls, giggling one day and sulking the next. ... but this absence of Englishness in his exterior public life he saw as a logical projection of the fantasy that informed his private inner one.³⁰

Both Hari and his Indian friends have insincere feelings for each other. They can't help seeing Hari as an alien, one who is purely Indian in appearance but certainly not one when he speaks and behaves like English. In this situation, it is very difficult for anyone to experience such identity crisis.

Then he meets Daphne Manners. For sure, he does not know the end of their relationship will be like that and doesn't even expect a love affair between

³⁰ Ibid, p. 194, 195

him and Daphne. Here Daphne's situation and character should be examined first. We get to know Daphne in the last part of the novel, which is composed of letters she wrote her aunt, Lady Manners. Daphne is a very straight and open-hearted girl. There is no question behind her acts. She always means what she says. It can be said that this openness leads her to a tragedy. At first, she tries to find an English companion but none of them seems more British and sincere than Hari does to her. As for Ronald Merrick, she once feels something romantically but as she gets lonelier she finds herself more attracted to Hari. But there are also generalized descriptions or hints of these when she speaks about Hari and their relationship.

However, she is always nervous and uncomfortable about her British friends' attitudes toward Indians. Once, she and her friends attend to a War Week Exhibition. She describes the atmosphere:

There was an atmosphere of 'We will show them.' The boy I was dancing with said War Week had given the bloody Indians something to think about. ... No it's wrong, wrong. And later, back in the lounge-bar, deafened by the thumping band, I thought 'I haven't this time to waste. I haven't this time to spare.'³¹

³¹ Ibid, p. 301

Her attitude towards Indians is always different maybe because she has not been living in India or maybe she meets Hari, an extraordinary Indian to meet in India. But we are sure that she is not content with her friends' ideas about Indians.

There are some lines in the letters that Daphne writes to Lady Manners about Hari personally but giving hints of her generalizations about Indians too.

But what I said to Hari that night made him think I was only angry with him, and even accusing him of deceit, which is supposed to be a typically Indian failing so far as the stolid good old no-nonsense Englishwoman is concerned.³²

We see that phrase, 'typically Indian failing', in many places where Daphne speaks. "He was awfully embarrassed about being late, which I think he thought I'd see as a typical Indian failing."³³

Considering her ideas about Indians and her relationship with Hari, it is not true to say that her intention in doing so is the same as other friends' 'We will show them.' attitude. It can easily be understood that Hari also has never been offended by her such acts because they surely speak the same language when their backgrounds and characters are compared. When we think about the time Daphne came to India, we can assume that these generalizations about

³² Ibid, p. 292

³³ Ibid, p. 309

Indians have been shaped in England from the books or newspapers she read or from the stories she listened from people who 'knew' India well.

Daphne figures things out very quickly in India about how people look when an Indian and English have a love affair. "But it was a conspiracy that seemed to be rooted in love as well as fear.-terrifying because even they couldn't face with equanimity the breaking of the most fundamental law of all- that although a white man could make love to a black girl, the black man and white girl association is still a taboo."³⁴ A critic of post-colonial theory, Ania Loomba's comment on sexual relationship between, especially European, settlers and colonized peoples helps us to understand how Daphne's friends and environment may see their love affair:

While cross-cultural sexual contact was certainly transgressive (and is celebrated as such in contemporary commentary on European sexual practices) we should not forget that colonial sexual encounters, both heterosexual and homosexual, often exploited inequities of class, age, gender, race and power. In colonial fictions and travelogues, however, they are often embedded within a myth of reciprocity.³⁵

³⁴ Ibid p. 293

³⁵ Ania Loomba. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, 2005. p. 134

That's very true in Hari's and Daphne's case. As Daphne says, it is a taboo for a white English woman and black Indian man to love each other because it destroys the unspoken cast or it ruins the patriarchal order of colonizers.

Just stating the truth, and explaining awful doubts I had, the suspicion that perhaps what people said was true, that a colored man who goes with a white girl only does so for special reasons.³⁶

This is so humiliating for a love like Daphne and Hari have. They are two young people who have different kinds of problems but one same need, which is, a companion who can understand them truly whom can be trusted. But these suspicions around both lovers don't stop. On the contrary, the murmurs around them increase and they begin to feel themselves uncomfortable. Especially Hari feels himself guilty and restrains himself. But that does not help both of them. Then they are more attracted each other. But they don't see each other but they cannot stop thinking the love they are resisting. The taboos and unwritten laws of the society make their situation even worse and they find themselves in the middle of a tragedy.

Daphne also can't bear the general assumptions or fixations about every object. One reason for her dislike about these solid images is these ideas are told and expressed too much among British population. She is bored with hearing the

³⁶ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 293

same things again and again. This is also a reason for why she wants to learn new things and meet new people. For instance, she wants to visit an Indian Temple and see how they worship or she wants to meet Hari's aunt. But at this point there is a need to mention about Daphne's comments about the visit to the temple. The idea comes to Daphne's mind in order to avoid anyone's witnessing her meeting with Hari. But she keeps commenting on the temple, priests and people praying in the temple. She comments on the temple from an Orientalist point of view. We can understand what she means after reading Edward Said's views about how the Orientalist point of view secularizes the subject, or 'the other':

In other words, modern Orientalism derives from secularizing elements in eighteenth-century European culture. One, the expansion of the Orient further east geographically and further back temporally loosened, even dissolved, the biblical framework considerably.³⁷

Nevertheless, it is clear that these new encounters make her relieved because she sees new aspects of public life in India. She says:

I hate the impression we get of things and places and people that make us say 'This is Indian. This is British.' When I first saw Bibighar I thought: How Indian! Not Indian I'd have thought of a place as Indian

³⁷ Edward Said. *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 2003. p.120

before I came out, but Indian as it struck me then. But when you say something like that, in circumstances like that, I think you are responding to the attraction of a place which you see as alien on the surface but underneath as proof of something general and universal.³⁸

Here, Daphne speaks about how people's mind catch an image, of a place or group of people belonging to a nation, race or religion, and what kind of a role that image plays later in that people's life. It is for sure that these images do not stay in our minds uselessly. The fact is forming essentialism leads to form another one whether about the same thing or alike. These illusions are created in the brain and then they are treated like they are realities. As Homi Bhabha states in case of colonial stereotypes, these essentialism can be seen as 'fetishisms'. This gives us an aspect to understand how colonial otherness is produced and how it is traced:

In this spirit, I argue for the reading of the stereotype in terms of fetishism. The myth of historical origination-racial purity, cultural priority- produced in relation to the colonial stereotype functions to 'normalize' the multiple beliefs and split subjects that constitute colonial discourse as a consequence of its process of disavowal.³⁹

³⁸ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 319

³⁹ Homi Bhabha. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006. p.106

Hari is not the only Indian that Daphne specifically talks about to her aunt in her letters. There is also the woman she stays with in Mayapore, Lady Chatterjee. Daphne likes this woman a lot and asks her if she can call her aunt Lili. Lady Chatterjee accepts this and in this way they break the ice.

Of course Lady Chatterjee is not an ordinary Indian. First of all, she lives in MacGregor house, which is a very famous and a well-known place in Mayapore. Its fame comes from one of the governors who lived there. Her husband died long ago and left her quite a lot of money. Her lifestyle is far from giving us hints of life of the ordinary Indians of the time. She has received a good education and her English is quite well. We understand that from the letters she writes to her friends and Lady Manners. She knows a great deal of rich people from cantonment and many respectable British people. Daphne meets Hari at a party in her house, which is also the house she lives. It is up to the reader to think whether she introduces Hari with Daphne intentionally by predicting a love affair between them or not. She knows Hari and his background before he meets Daphne. She also knows Hari's family and his aunt, Mrs. Gupta Sen. She tells his story to her friends. So it is clear that Lady Chatterjee knows nearly everything about Hari and she becomes aware of Daphne's tastes and pleasures. Therefore she may have done that with knowing that they would get along well.

Maybe because of her education, maybe she has lots of British friends or maybe she does it deliberately, she behaves and lives just like an English Lady. In a warfare environment or in such a chaos-considering the political conjecture-

the lifestyle she has can only be named as 'indifference'. With servants around her, with bridge games she attends together with her British friends, she is like living on an island on Indian Ocean. As Fanon states, in the decolonization period, the values of the colonizer is mocked or insulted by the colonized people.⁴⁰ But among the natives, sometimes there are ones who finds a kind of peace being among the rich and intellectuals of the colonizers:

This phenomenon is ordinarily masked because during the period of decolonization, certain colonized intellectuals have begun a dialogue with the bourgeoisie of the colonist country. During this phase, the indigenous population is discerned only as an instinct mass.⁴¹

Lady Chatterjee can be considered as an intellectual for that time because she speaks English very well. So it is possible to place her among the ones that Fanon describes. Daphne feels uneasy because of Lady Chatterjee's attitude towards events around her. She writes to her aunt Lady Manners about Lady Chatterjee's indifference to her country and its bad situation:

Aunt Lili hates anything grisly and sordid, doesn't she? She told me that once as a young girl, the first time she went to Bombay and saw the slums, she cried. I think well-off privileged Indians like Lili

⁴⁰ Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001. p. 33

⁴¹ Ibid, p. 34

have a sort of deep-rooted guilt that they bury under layers of what looks like indifference, because there is so little they can individually do to lessen the horror and poverty. They subscribe to charities and do voluntary work but must feel it's like trying to dam up a river with a handful of twigs. And with Lili I think there is also a horror of death.⁴²

It is true that there are a lot of things they can do as rich and privileged ones for Indians who live in poverty and misery. But Lady Chatterjee behaves like she is not one of them. She assumes herself someone who is not from that country or as if it is not her country that is exploited and suffering from a disastrous poverty. She stands as a different type of Indian. Maybe she doesn't have the general characteristics of ordinary Indians, for instance being messy or dirty, being late or any of these characteristics that follow 'typical Indian who always fails' but she is not a member of any group. She is like the ones who eagerly want to be like the British, or who wants to be like 'them' but cannot help being who really she is. That conflict can be seen by Daphne and she criticizes it cruelly:

There is that old, disreputable saying, isn't there? 'When rape is inevitable, lie back and enjoy it.' *Well, there has been more than one rape.* I can't say, Auntie that I lay back and enjoyed mine. But Lili was trying to lie back and enjoy what we have done to her country.⁴³

⁴² Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 314

⁴³ *Ibid*, p. 357

In the introduction of the book, the writer says that this is a story of a rape. Yes it is about rape and it is sure that there is more than one rape. In that sense, *The Jewel in the Crown* is a great book with its wonderful plot structure. We see two different rapes. One is the rape that Daphne suffered. In other words, the rape that she experienced at Bibighar Gardens when she thought she found the true love she longed for a long time is the first one. Anyone can understand how devastating it can be for a young girl in such an awkward situation. But in general the whole process of the British living and mastering Indians is the metaphorical rape. And unfortunately, the rape that all Indians suffer is even more devastating than Daphne's. It is also interesting for us to hear that from Daphne, whom we, as readers pity for her misery. Indians like Lady Chatterjee are enjoying it, of course not intentionally but without taking any action to hinder it. As far as Daphne's letters to her aunt are concerned Daphne is in a position that she blames these 'indifferent' Indians more than anyone. In fact, what Lady Chatterjee feels generally for the British can be defined as deep respect and trust. It can even be said that, she has met more civilized British people than that of native Indians in her life. But sometimes it can go beyond that. As for Ronald Merrick's deeds, she refused to believe Daphne's claims about taking the bicycle and planting it in the ditch near Hari's house. Daphne insists on her comment on Hari's arrest by Roland but Lady Chatterjee refuses to believe: "Lili was shocked because she knew it could be true, but she refused to

believe it. She couldn't accept that an English official would stoop to that."⁴⁴ It is clear that Lady Chatterjee trusts in any English official more than any Indian.

Before moving to the comments on Indians and their general characteristics from a formal point of view by the British people who work in India for English government, Daphne's ideas should be concluded. At one of her depressed moments after the rape and while she was pregnant, she writes Lady Chatterjee and asks about Hari and wants her to do something to help her and him. But Lady Chatterjee says nothing:

For them I suppose there *is* nothing to say. Nothing, that is, if they are intent on building instead of on destroying. Behind all the chatter and violence of India-what a deep, lingering silence. Siva dances in it, Vishnu sleeps in it. Even their music is silence. It is the only music I know that sounds conscious of *breaking* silence, of going back into it when it's finished, as if to prove that every man-made sound is an illusion. What an odd concept of the world that is! We shall never understand it.⁴⁵

By 'them', Daphne means Indians she knows generally. Daphne seems too eager to understand these people and she even pities them by considering their pain but after all the efforts she make, she cannot understand their attitude towards life

⁴⁴ Ibid, p. 347

⁴⁵ Ibid, p. 362

and its conceptions. In other words, she criticizes their perceiving life in itself and believes they do not comprehend anything correctly. This makes her pain even greater because at the end, there is no hope for these people, according to her. The silence is one of the most annoying things she sees in India. By silence, according to her conception of India, she means the hiding of many chatter and violence in its background. There are a lot of things going on everywhere that make people sorry but there is a cover of silence on all of them. It is like everybody sees everything going on but nobody says anything and do nothing to stop them.

Lady Manners' one last letter to Lady Chatterjee reveals one of the British insights, kept inside about Indians and being ruled out of India:

What terrifies me is the thought that gradually, when the splendors of civilized divorce and protestations of continuing good friends are worked out, the real animus will emerge, the one both our people just managed to keep in check when there was reason to suppose that it was wrong, because it could lead neither rulers nor ruled anywhere. I mean of course the dislike and fear that exists between black and white.⁴⁶

What Lady Manners says to Lady Chatterjee can be paraphrased like this: 'We, the British, have always had good intentions for you Indians but you never liked

⁴⁶ Ibid, p. 369

us and always feared us. But anyway, it is good for you and us both to depart.’

To some extent, this is very true for both sides because we see that not everything that the British do has harmed India.

The sixth part of the book is very useful for us in order to understand how Britain managed to govern India so many years and how the elites of the British population see Indians. The name of the part is “Civil and military.” By that, the writer aims to give the views of officials from military and civil authority. First we see the diaries of Brigadier Reid and later we come across with writings and conversations of the District Commissioner Robin White. Brigadier Reid is a soldier who defends status quo in India and he is a man of strong ideals. He believes that all humans have a tendency for cheating or ingratitude. He thinks that counting on Gandhi and his views means leaving India in chaos and that would be the worst thing to be done to it. He thinks that Gandhi and his views are very naïve and cannot be taken seriously. Brigadier Reid cannot comprehend how he, Gandhi, can assume everyone with such goodwill that he himself has. He is sure that the Quit India campaign that National Congress passes will take the country to a chaotic situation and a disaster at last.

He also doesn’t have any respect to Gandhi in the sense of a statesman or philosopher. He finds Gandhi too simple and vulgar:

In my opinion, final proof to the contrary, if any is needed, lies in the words of Mahatma to his followers at the time of his arrest, 'Do or Die.' Nothing, I feel, could be plainer than that.⁴⁷

Brigadier Reid is clearly an arrogant and immodest type of man. But he also symbolizes the mind of military officials of that time in India. From his views, it is easy to get a feeling that he has the mind of an ordinary Orientalist. He thinks that Indians can't do anything of their own and therefore they must be guided by them. He is the Orientalist that Edward Said describes very shortly. "The modern Orientalist was, in his view, a hero rescuing the Orient from the obscurity, alienation, and strangeness which he himself had properly distinguished."⁴⁸

We also have the opportunity to get some insights of British army of the time. Referring to an unfortunate and important event in the past, Brigadier Reid unveils his and his counterparts' ideas about how to control the crowds. The Amritsar Massacre also known as Jallianwallah Bagh Massacre, happened in 1919 and remained as a disgrace on the British rule over India afterwards. Hundreds of people gathered to celebrate a Sikh religious festival on April 13. Their only reason was to come together and do what their religion and traditions tell them to do. None of the people from the crowd was armed. Jallianwallah Bagh, or garden, is an enclosure where these celebrations usually were held. After some time, a great deal of security forces, i.e. soldiers, arrived with heavy

⁴⁷ Ibid, p. 342

⁴⁸ Edward Said. *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 2003.p. 121

arms and two armored cars. The security forces were led by Brigadier Reginald Dyer. Brigadier Dyer ordered to shoot on the crowd. The result of the shooting was a complete disaster. According to officials 379 people were dead but according to private sources there were thousands of people dead. No one could escape because the place was an enclosure. There is well in the garden and according to the reports, only from the well, there were 120 dead bodies removed. Although there was no response from the crowd the soldiers went on shooting. Brigadier Dyer soon told the event to a commission as *“I think it quite possible that I could have dispersed the crowd without firing but they would have come back again and laughed, and I would have made, what I consider, a fool of myself”*

The Amritsar incident was also approved by Governor of Punjab at first but then it was criticized by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons. But psychological effects of the incident remained alive in the un-conscious of British army afterwards. Brigadier Reid reveals it for us:

Learning that a crowd intended to forgather at a certain hour in a large but enclosed plot of ground called Jallianwallah Bagh, Dyer prohibited the meeting by written and verbal proclamation in accordance with the rules laid down. This proclamation was defied and his warnings ignored. His too personal command of the troops he sent to disperse it. His on-the-spot orders to disperse also having been defied; he then ordered the troops to fire. The Jallianwallah Bagh, from

a military point of view was a death-trap, and many civilians died, including women and children.

Ever since the Dyer affair, which was seized upon by ‘reformers’ as a stick to beat us with, the army had naturally become supersensitive to the issues involved, and we were now in the unhappy position of finding ourselves in what practically amounted to a strait-jacket.⁴⁹

The inferior complex the soldiers have been suffering after Amritsar affair is striking and it also helps to understand my second part of the thesis, which is about the British mind of stereotype from the Indian point of view. It is clear that there is a frustration and depression among the soldiers. It is a kind of culpability that can enable us to understand civil dominance on the governing of India by the British.

Here, the writer’s aim to emphasize on that incident is also important. There is a significant place for Amritsar incident in the history of independence of India. The trauma it caused both for the Indians and the British is lasting. The writer wants to show this by using the names that connote that particular event:

And the Chillianwallah Bagh, the cul-de-sac in Mayapore where Hari Kumar lives with his Aunt Shalini, echoes the name of the Jallianwallah Bagh in the Punjabi city of Amritsar, where in 1919

⁴⁹ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 229

General Reginald Dyer ordered his Gurkha soldiers to open fire on a peaceful demonstration. His troops had blocked the only exit.⁵⁰

Brigadier Reid is situated in Mayapore and his diaries are also includes his views about the incident happened in Bibighar Gardens, which is our subject matter. We learn that everything he knows about the incident is provided by Roland Merrick and District Commissioner Robin White. The murder of missionary teacher Miss Crane and the rape of Daphne Manners seem to panic him as these incidents panic all the British women in the city. But the incident remains like an embarrassment not only in the sense of failing to secure their citizens but also they cannot accept that an Indian man can dare something like that much temerity. He can't even bear thinking that this will be heard:

I was deeply shocked by this sorry tale and agreed with Merrick that the less said about her attachment to one of the suspected men the better, especially if things came to the head of a public trial.⁵¹

We know that 'one of the suspected men' is Hari Kumar and the officials cannot even think or understand how that can happen, a young British girl has some attachment to one Indian man. It is clear that they don't see Indians as ordinary people. It is even more infernal to see that he thinks that educating Indians does

⁵⁰Michael Edward Gorra, *Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997) 22, [Questia](http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=99314020), 16 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=99314020>>.

⁵¹ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 239

not make them civilized or mature but it makes them more sinister and dangerous. In one of their talk with Roland Merrick, they chat about the Indian youth who go and get a good education but turning out a more dangerous enemy for the British:

I confess that I was sickened to realize the extent to which some of these so-called educated Indians would go to defy and attack the people who had given them opportunity to make something of themselves..... I said as much to Merrick who then reminded me that, in his job, he had to deal almost every day with fellows of this kind. If he sometimes 'bent the rules' and paid them back in their own coin, he believed that the end justified the means.⁵²

It is clear that we see brutal cultural and humanist aspect of a colonial mind. It is brutal because it gives no reason for the colonized to survive in the same world that he himself lives. This snobbish attitude gives somehow a god-given authority for themselves by an unknown. The contempt or humiliation in the subconscious of Brigadier Reid is so apparent that it needs no further explanation.

Roland Merrick's comment on dealing with 'fellows of this kind' is also very interesting. Merrick says to Reid that there is a need to bend the rules. Of course there is no authority that the victim Indians can go and tell these. That's

⁵² Ibid, p. 244

also a pity for them because they live in their own country, the country that they inherited from their ancestors and they don't have the right to claim even their own rights, as Hari Kumar experienced. That's also because of the conceptions of people like Merrick and Brigadier Reid of India and its people, which they think would have no right without them. No right of education, no right of voting or no right of deciding their own fate.

As mentioned before, there are two views about India from two different sides that are authorities from military and civil administration. Brigadier Reid gave us the military officials' views. For a more humanistic and more modest comment of it, we will have to analyze the District Commissioner Robin White's views.

Robin White is a humane and tender person. He has the ability to think on issues more modestly than Brigadier Reid can do. His difference from Reid is obvious. It is also clear that Reid usually annoys him with his subjective ideas. The main difference between them is about being ready to face their true enemy, i.e. not the Indians but letting Indians down and furthermore watching them going down. In that sense, they are their own enemies.

Robin White is aware of the fact that their difference is partly because of their position, for one is from the military side and the other is from civil side. But there is more than that, which Robin White puts it very straight:

The drama Reid and I played out was that of the conflict between Englishmen who liked and admired Indians and believed them capable

of self-government, and Englishmen who disliked or feared or despised them, or, just as bad, were indifferent to them as individuals, thought them extraneous to the business of living and working over there, except as their capacity as servants or soldiers or dots on the landscape.⁵³

We are well-informed after that comment about the two kinds of British thinking about India. So it is not easy to define one way of British considering of Indians. There are two kinds: one takes Indians like ordinary people and believes in their capacity whereas the other sees them as ‘dots on the landscape.’ Regardless of his incapableness in political analysis, Brigadier Reid doesn’t care about any Indian because he is the second type of British.

Robin White does not hesitate to confess that Britain was in India because they want to exploit it. And there is no doubt that he is sure there are many British out there that ignore and forget that fact. Of course it is less painful when you do not know what you are doing such a bad deed.

We also learn some sociological notices from Robin White’s letters. For instance, according to him, the British has always seen Islam a greater danger than they see Hinduism because of the Holy War concept. But there is also some kind of inferiority complex, again according to White, in Christians when they compare themselves with the Muslims:

⁵³ Ibid, p. 260

..but then fundamentally we've always been a bit embarrassed by the 'weakness' of Christianity. We saw the same weakness in Hinduism, but a sort of Eastern version of muscular Christianity in the religion of Allah.⁵⁴

His openness and frankness is stunning after we read Reid's diaries. He continues to astonish the reader as he talks about Gandhi. He says he is shocked by Gandhi's ability to do always the right thing. He admires Gandhi for many reasons but mostly for his courage and wisdom to think loudly. As Robin White writes it as a response to a letter, he gives some examples from modern times. According to White, Gandhi, the most important Indian figure of modern times, is not a constant image but an unstable and inconsistent figure that can adjust itself to all times and conditions. That's because he is always capable of doing or thinking about the things that every one is afraid to do. He is not only an incredible intellectual mind but also a very bold and courageous man. His impact on his time can be summed as Robin White did: "But I think what he was actually doing was trying to bring into the open the element of doubt about the ideas and attitudes which we all undergo but prefer to keep quiet about."⁵⁵ It is clear that District Commissioner Robin White has a deep respect for Gandhi because Gandhi's actions and thoughts are beyond the consideration of any Western mind. His wisdom and courage cannot be imagined by any kind of

⁵⁴ Ibid, p. 262

⁵⁵ Ibid, p. 264

Europeans. The attitude of these imperial forces to Gandhi's personality and his policy comes from their notion of an ordinary independence struggle and process. To them, a non-violence independence act is out of question or a fantasy. Indeed, it is obvious now that the British always expected a violent act from the Indians to react in a more severely and to blame them for their mischievousness. This is a general concept, where there is an act of independence as Frantz Fanon's states in *The Wretched of The Earth*. He depicts the situation very clearly:

The existence of an armed struggle shows that the people are decided to trust to violent methods only. He, of whom *they* have never stopped saying that the only language he understands is that of force, decides to give utterance by force. In fact, as always, the settler has shown him the way he should take if he is to become free.⁵⁶

This is the way that the British wanted the Indians react. Mahatma Gandhi's genius and his policies fascinate many people from both sides because of his perception of justice and fundamental rights.

Robin White's comments on Amritsar Massacre are also important to understand the civil authority's way of thinking and attitudes. Though he came to India after that, he can recall his feelings and his reaction to the event:

⁵⁶ Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001. p.66

Well, you remember the result: riots, and then General Dyer at Amritsar and a return to distrust and fear and suspicion, and Gandhi emerging as the Mahatma, the one man who might provide an answer- but now it was going to be an Indian answer, not a British one. I'm sorry. I still get hot under the collar when I think about 1919. And I'm still ashamed, after all these years.⁵⁷

These lines show how the difference between Reid and White is so sharp. One is ashamed of the massacre; the other thinks General Dyer did what he had to do. Furthermore, there is a bigger and sharper difference which is between Indians and British. Again from the conversations of Robin White, we see that the main difference between them is that, Indians see the world as an illusion, as if everything happened around them, like the battle or torture – or rape according to Daphne Manners – is not actually happening. This also leads us to the result that the mobs or hooligans attack on armed British police or military knowing that they are going to die. Such a conception of life is inconsiderable for all Western countries and their people because life or right to live is the most important thing according to them. So many lives are wasted and so many lives are sacrificed in a society like India but Europeans always fail to understand why they do that.

⁵⁷ Paul Scott. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997. p. 266

The last excerpt that is going to be analyzed is from Robin White's last words from his conversations with an interviewer. He seems to be totally impartial and evaluated the situation in India from an objective point of view:

Being human, the longer the Indians were denied freedom the more they wanted to be free on their own terms the more we – also being human – insisted that they must initially acquire freedom on ours. The longer this conflict continued, the most abstruse the terms of likely agreement became on either side. It was then a question of the greater morality outlasting and outweighing the lesser. Which was why, of course, in the end the Indians won.⁵⁸

This is like a confession. It is a confession made by a high civil official saying that they didn't behave as fairly as Indians. White emphasizes on a kind of clash between Indian virtue and British greediness, where the British didn't pay attention for the rights of the Indians to govern themselves. They don't even respect that, for respect is not denied even if you have some kind of different benefits or interests. Usually one considers his/her rival as an equivalent and develops a strategy to beat it. As White puts it, in India case for Britain, it has been like a one way road, where the British writes the rules as well as the game itself and forces or even bullies its rival to do what it says. Of course, this long

⁵⁸ Ibid, p. 275

conflict would be won by the one which has the greater morality than the other one.

The outcome of the book is not to decide that one side is good and the other is bad. No one can reject the good things that the British have brought to India. Many Indians say that. But it is a question of being a decent partner or participant in terms of improving one land. Britain, for sure, has benefited from India more than India benefited from it. While doing that, India suffered a lot and wasted lots of things. But beyond that, there is one thing which is the most important of all, i.e. the British never consider the Indians as an ordinary human community. As a British writer, Paul Scott shows that even the most affectionate British character to the Indians, who is Daphne Manners, doesn't have the courage to accept that an Indian deserves to be loved and to love as a British. Hari Kumar wouldn't have experienced the tortures and disasters he faced and wouldn't waste his life if Daphne had told the truth about what actually happened in Bibighar Gardens. She makes him promise that he wasn't there that night. Of course it would be a shame for her to be known to have been raped while making love to her lover in a public place. It is obvious that for her, it came more shameful or disgraceful to be known to have loved and to have been loved by an Indian. What did Hari Kumar do to deserve this end? Nothing of course. The only answer to the question lies beneath the subconscious of British mentality which degrades or devalues all Indians and their human characteristics.

Considering the situation in India, it is not wrong to say that most of the British population, official or civil, looked down upon the Indian population in

India. The colonizer uses the colonized as an instrument of serving or production. Robin White said they see Indians as servants, soldiers or dots on the landscape. The relationship between British and Indians cannot be evaluated free from Victorian times' industrial revolution where capitalism was rooted. India's contribution to Britain's wealth is undeniable. Free labor force, free raw material supply and also a free market for themselves; all set for the British. But once they, the Indians, become aware of the fact by recognizing the world by being educated and learning the world, things get complicated and hard for the British. They, with bearing in mind that these people are of an inferior race; they claim all the rights for themselves to oppress them. While doing that they fabricated essentialisms that show the colonized evil or stupid. Indeed, this is an ordinary example of how colonial discourse functions for the colonizer. Indian independence process and turning points within this process cannot be understood without considering race relations in that period.

In relation to the twentieth century, there has been considerable work around the dynamic intersection of race and class, especially in Britain. A pioneering study pointed out that the class relations within which black working-class people exist as 'function as *race relations*. The two are inseparable. Race is the modality in which class is lived. It is also the medium in which class relations are experienced. This...has

consequences for the *whole class*, whose relation to their conditions of existence is now systemically transformed by race'.⁵⁹

From the point that Ania Loomba states it can be said that the function which is decided for Indians here is to work as inferiors and do all the menial jobs. The Indians cannot move across that line drawn around them. If they do, they must be suppressed and daunted. Because they are not ordinary human beings. Such a humiliation and contempt causes fear and lack of confidence in the colonized community. So it is not easy to change the status quo that has come along for hundreds of years, since it is a vicious circle. Because when the colonizer develops these ideas and turns them into essentialisms, then the colonized community does the same thing. The 'othering' process finds its way to go on.

⁵⁹ Ania Loomba. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, 2005. p. 114

PART 2

Looking closely at British Stereotypes in *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian*

Nirad C. Chaudhuri was born in 1897 and died at the age of 102 in 1999. *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian* was published as his first book in 1951. His writings and ideas are important because he is a witness to what happened in twentieth-century India. His book didn't receive a warm welcome when it first came out. He was fifty-three and independent India was only four years old and from the dedication page up to the end, there were ideas in favor of the British. As an example the dedication page is a good example:

To the memory of the British Empire in India, which conferred subjecthood on us but withheld citizenship; to which yet every one of us threw out the challenge: "Civis Britannicus sum" because all that was good and living within us was made, shaped, and quickened by the same British rule.⁶⁰

"Civis Britannicus sum" means "I am a British citizen." Even these words were enough to slander and condemn him in a nation that recently freed itself from the British rule. At that time he was working for the government, in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Things probably didn't go as he wished at the beginning but years later, there were lots of Indian people who understood him.

⁶⁰ Nirad C. Chaudhuri. *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian*. New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001. p.v

In an article about him and his life, his situation and never changing position is told as follows:

He became persona non grata, "a known un-Indian." In the end Chaudhuri's dedication, and the scandalous success of his Autobiography in England and America, cost him his pension at All India Radio, where for ten years he'd worked as a writer on foreign and military affairs; AIR let him go, after a year of internal intrigue, mere weeks before retirement benefits were to have kicked in. Simultaneously, India's Minister of Information and Broadcasting, acting on a tip from AIR, met privately with those Indian editors who'd welcomed Chaudhuri's articles and told them they could no longer do so. This media ban was not officially lifted until 1970, when India was twenty-three --the age, it seems, that one becomes old enough to appreciate aphorisms. It was then that the government invited Chaudhuri to write a propagandist tract on his native East Pakistan. "The Government of India may have lifted its ban on me" he told his friend the Sikh writer Khushwant Singh, "but I have not lifted my ban on the Government of India."⁶¹

Because of his admiration and sympathy for the British, it is clear that first he was ignored by Indian critics and intellectuals. But he didn't concede his views that he wrote in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* until he died, in

⁶¹ Christopher Carduff, "The Triumph of Nirad Chaudhuri," *New Criterion* Oct. 1999: 76, [Questia](http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001820114), 16 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001820114>>.

1999 in Oxford, England, where he moved in 1970 and lived to the rest of his life.

As far as the sum of his autobiography is concerned, Nirad C. Chaudhuri was a man of high ideals and moral stability. Apart from being very frank and sincere, the book is very easy to read with its expressive English and fluency. But most importantly, the book is like a collection of virtues and human values which enable a society to live in a just way.

It is clear that he didn't stint his words and wrote as much as he can, very detailed, about every aspect of his life. He divided the book into four parts: early environment, first twelve years, education and into the world. Each part has more than one hundred pages and, though written in his mid-life, which he wasn't aware of naturally at the time he started, consists of very interesting details with very ordinary ones, too.

The first part is about his birthplace, his village and England. As my study is about the British stereotypes in the book, there are none in the most pages of the first part. Only up to the end of the first part, we see that his notion of England or Britain usually corresponds with, in its geographical and logical sense, Europe. But it is obvious that all Indians have a Britain figure of their own, full of imaginations and fantasies. Of the important figures, Queen Victoria and other names that have 'Sir' or 'Lord' in it have a significant impact in his mind.

Queen Victoria we thought of as everybody else in England and India thought of her after the Diamond Jubilee, and about the prince

Consort our ideas are identical with those of the queen herself: he was the paragon of every virtue.⁶²

As a person whose family, as well as himself, pays great attention to education and reading, all British figures with these titles naturally have excellence and grace to him. But with that, it is difficult to infer that he admires them by heart. This seems as an associating by mind that happens unintentionally.

His interest in reading, apparently, made him engage to literature from his early life and his imaginations of Britain and the British derives from these books, classics specially. Homer, Milton, Shakespeare are the ones whose works he was acquainted at early ages. This intellectual inclination led him to read and love the life of generals and famous statesmen, like Wellington or Napoleon. His admiration for Napoleon is very evident but he still can't help thinking Wellington before as the best general. He explains this as giving supernatural traits to Napoleon whereas giving rational and human traits to Wellington.

The affinity to famous generals is interesting because he does not only like Europeans but he also admires Osman Pasha of the Plevna Defense. When his prejudice toward Muslims is concerned, it can be said that, throughout the book, Osman Pasha is the only Muslim figure he speaks in favor of.

Chaudhuri associates British terms and their meanings with his own background. For instance, he is a strict liberal and it is not wrong to say he hates

⁶² Nirad C. Chaudhuri. *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian*. New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001. p.106

conservatives in his country. But he realizes his mistake by misjudging the conservatives in England and essentializing them, who he thought once the same conservatives in his own country. His will to change his country and his people drives him to an obsession as to think “all conservatives are bad.” In fact, this is also an example of essentialism.

It is interesting to learn his first impressions about Englishmen he sees in his childhood. The anecdote he tells gives us hints to understand what and how the countrymen at his childhood think about the British:

The plain story is this. I and my brother had been sent to buy some bananas from the bazaar and were returning with a bunch when we saw an Englishman coming up the road from the opposite direction. I have no clear recollection who exactly he was, but he may have been Mr. Stapleton, the inspector of schools, whom I met with greater self-confidence some years later. As soon as we caught sight of him we hid ourselves in the ditch, because we had been told that Englishmen were as fond of bananas as any monkey could be and that they swooped on the fruit whenever and wherever they saw it.⁶³

The silly thing here is not the boy Nirad’s conception of Englishmen, of course. The fact that elderly people had told this to them shows us how the India’s people need a revolution in their minds and mentality. This is also the answer to

⁶³ Ibid, p. 123

what to change. This irrational and boundless attitude towards Englishmen is, most probably, out of hatred or ignorance. Englishmen is hated so much that these silly remarks are invented by the ignorant people. Frantz Fanon's description of native and settler relationship concerning producing myths and essentialisms helps us conceive this phenomenon:

Meanwhile, however, life goes on, and the native will strengthen the inhibitions which contains his aggressiveness by drawing on the terrifying myths which are so frequently found in underdeveloped communities. There are maleficent spirits which intervene every time a step is taken in the wrong direction, leopard men, serpent-men, six-legged dogs, zombies -a whole series of tiny animals or giants which create around the native a world of prohibitions, of barriers of inhibitions far more terrifying than the world of the settler.⁶⁴

There seems a difference between what Fanon says and what Chaudhuri's memory is all about. However, the main point is that, in underdeveloped communities, in colonized ones, the colonized people need to identify the settler with certain supernatural or unnatural concepts. This is because of his despair to fully understand the knowledge and the power of the settler. There is an unnatural and an unbalanced aspect of this encounter of Englishmen and Indian. The knowledge and rehearsal of life that the British and Indians have is out of comparison. Here, not only the ignorance of Indians is important to notice, but

⁶⁴ Frantz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001. p.43

also the snobbishness of the British, who hold back his teachings and give very little, is noteworthy.

To compete with the British in all walks of life, Chaudhuri is confident in believing the necessity of learning English. He even criticizes Mahatma Gandhi's one speech about the next presidents of India. Gandhi says that the next Indian presidents will not be required to know English. About learning English, Chaudhuri does not agree with Gandhi and he protests him. Chaudhuri, thanking his parents' discernment in teaching English, defends that this is nonsense and with that nothing can be gained in favor of the nation. He sees the welfare of the state in learning every thing that is possible.

In the same part of the book, we see that color issue is also an issue among the Indians themselves, as well as being a major issue between the British and Indians. Indians hate the British people's fair complexion because they regard it evil or malice. According to them, having a white skin means having a disease which should be avoided. There are many songs or poems which depict Englishwomen leprous or vicious. Apart from that, dark-skinned girls in India are not considered as eligible by young men. We are informed by Chaudhuri that many dark-skinned girls live miserably at their homes waiting for boys to marry. Even if they marry, they are abused or mistreated by their husbands or husbands' families. We are also told that the profound importance of color comes from historical books.

The first part of the book closes and second part is about his first twelve years and starts with his parents and birth. Here, he sometimes criticizes his

people and their habits. As an open-minded and intellectual person, he sees no offense in doing that. According to him, the basic problems of India are not too difficult to solve. Change in the habits of food, sleep and exercise will mean a lot to change the ill-fate of India.

As he tells us also about his parents in this chapter, their apt to aim their children to be free gives us a clue about the will and thirst for freedom in Indian people's minds. About his father he says: "To him freedom by itself was important as the ends for which it is supposed to be desirable."⁶⁵ We are also informed that once his mother said about freedom: "If you are able to win your independence from English by driving them out of the country, you will also be able to keep it."⁶⁶ These sympathetic words about freedom show us what the word means for them. This internalized attitude, most probably, was shaped after several incidents involving Englishmen with whom they have experiences of oppression. In one of them, while they travel by ship, one of the younger brothers of Chaudhuri has a trouble and starts to cry loudly. An Englishman on the ship, disturbed by the noise, protests the mother and the children. Chaudhuri's mother is so ashamed that she never travels by ship again. It is for sure that these incidents happened most of the times that Indians and Englishmen encounter on several occasions

⁶⁵ Nirad C. Chaudhuri. *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian*. New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001. p. 167

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, p. 255

Although he is an Anglican, a Christian, he points out that, the counter act to hinder Hinduism, and the reaction to it, have its roots in a sociological analysis:

Hinduism has an uncanny sense of what threatens it. No plausible assurances, no euphemism, no disguise can put its ever-alert instinct of self-preservation off its guard. No indirect approach can take it by surprise. Therefore during British rule, Hinduism fought tooth and nail even those measures of reform which a non-Hindu would consider as purely humanitarian, such as the abolition of infanticide and the burning of widows, the raising of the age of consent, the marriage of widows, and inter-caste marriages.⁶⁷

He names these interferences as attempts to reshape the society and its customs. We all know that even in our times, reshaping a society, which is called social engineering, starts with changing traditions or conventional rules. It goes on blaming these traditions to be the reasons of undeveloped ness. The main goal of the process is to make the people blame their own traditions. When that happens the goal is achieved, the process is done. It is clear that people, who tried to set these reforms, intended to change the basic rules of the Hindu community. These actions can also be named as using power as a means in order to ‘other’ the colonial subject.

⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 208

Chaudhuri comments on the reaction to these efforts with describing main Indian traits, from which we are well-informed about how the British see them, for the writer is very objective here because he knows the both sides very well:

This ethical extremism in Brahmoism and new Hinduism was not all narrowness or lack of intelligence. It was almost deliberate, and had its basis in a thorough insight into the Indian character and its workings. There is nothing an Indian understands less in his unvarnished Indianness than the Greek notion of *sophrosyne*, which, to quote Sir Richard Livingstone, stands for self-control, balance, sanity and reasonableness; avoidance of extremes of action, speech and thought; a rightness of mind which brings harmony into a personal life.⁶⁸

So we understand that to change Indians is so impossible that it takes too much effort and time. It is clear that such a person lives, loves or dies in accordance to his/her emotions. In the end, the moral teachers or important figures of the society decided on a puritan attitude to defend their customs and social habits, in place of developing a liberal viewpoint about the public's lifestyle. Of course, even if that resulted a fierce and significant fight between the elderly and the youth, the decision they made is quite considerable and

⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 227

acceptable because it was an irresistible reflex from a natural sect of defenders of morality, which I mean the elderly.

His interest in politics begins with Indian Nationalist movement. Thus, he reads and analyzes the revolutions around the world, like French Revolution, Chinese Revolution or even Young Turk Revolution in 1909. The nationalist movement appealed him because the society was being tried to divide into sects as Hindus and Muslims. From his point of view, the British were using the less powerful, the Muslims, to suppress the Indian nationalists which were mostly Hindus. The tension was controlled by the British because the Hindus couldn't react as they should yet the British were Muslims' powerful protectors. This also resulted the Muslim-Hindu distrust which would long for years to come, even still.

As we read the third part of the book we learn his reminisces about his education. The first important figure in his higher education was their superintendent in youth hostel Father Carlos Edward Prior, which he refers as Father Prior. Father prior is a very attractive man in the sense of his interests and abilities. Knowing and being eager to learn more of the Bengali language, it is evident that he is sympathetic to Chaudhuri. His attitude to relax the young Nirad and the way he communicates affects him very much. Among the other fathers Father Prior likes Chaudhuri more and without any doubt he covers his mistakes. This results in a very specific partial act by Chaudhuri and his brother, who were staying together. One day Father Prior makes an unfortunate remark which insults the whole Indian nation. Afterwards, all young men decide to protest him

by not speaking to him about anything, even a word. But their friends cannot persuade Chaudhuri and his brother. They keep themselves free from the protests and find this silly. For a short time, they were treated by their fellowmen as traitors. This shows us how their motives are activated.

The first time we come across his positive remarks of British soldiers is the part he tells about the British soldiers he saw after First World War. According to him, these soldiers seem younger and stronger after the First World War. It can be understood that this is partly because of his sympathy to soldiers and war. He likes soldiers. But more than that, he idealizes the posture of these British soldiers with feeling somehow envy. It is not true that he likes the soldiers but, though he doesn't mention it explicitly, he wishes to have such an attractive army. It is a clear admiration that he admits these young men die in order to prove their country's greatness.

Of his memories about his education, the most important point is his ambition in his academic studies and in being a scholar. He adores reading and loves academic studies. He wishes to crown his interest by being a successful scholar but he cannot decide what to do easily:

There was also a deeper urge. Although at times the idea of becoming an Orientalist allured me, I could never get over the feeling, wholly spontaneous in me but opposed to current opinion, that to confine myself solely to Indian studies at this stage would be a great mistake, that if I did so I should in the first instance be cut off from

world currents and become parochial and, next, make no progress beyond the second-rate in scholarly technique.⁶⁹

He is aware of the fact that without dealing with whole world affairs and issues, he could not be a well-known and revered scholar. He describes the life of ordinary Indians as decadence. It is interesting that he used the word 'decay' so many times while talking about his people's life. In that, he means not taking any initiatives to change the dull and bring life that they live. More than that, they do not bother how idle and lazy they have been even under so much pressure, and not independent. They do not teach that their children and they do not want them to do unexpected because they will be alone if they die or are arrested.

Of the quotation above, there is an interesting part. It is not certain if he means really to be one, when he says the idea of being an Orientalist attracts him. Whether or not, there must be certain factors that have him say that. As an intellectual Indian, knowing abroad and his domestic land, he might have been astonished seeing how these people known as Orientalists are respected. Or, he means to have had great interest in Indian studies from a Westernized point of view, which, then, can be inferred that he essentializes western scholars with Orientalists.

He grew up in Calcutta and he loves Calcutta. Here, we learn that Calcutta is a cosmopolitan city which has a wide range of different peoples and cultures. Interestingly, its inhabitants are so used to that they do not want to

⁶⁹ Ibid, p. 369

change it. They even resist to the attempts of revolution of any type. At those times, there were many reformation movements like nationalist movement or Indian Renaissance movement but people of Calcutta are the ones who resist them the most.

The most striking observations about the British are in the part he talks about the life in Calcutta, while he speaks about the British community in it. First he starts with implying the British cannot be considered Europeans and they are simply British:

I shall also say a few words about the other sect of Pharisees of Calcutta, the so-called European, but, correctly speaking, the British part of the urban community. They normally ignored the new culture of modern India, but when brought into accidental contact with it, showed even greater hostility than did the native Bengali.⁷⁰

He draws a thick line between being European and British. And indeed, he is very confident in not communicating with the English when he was in Calcutta. Their attitudes of ignoring Bengali culture and the hostility it showed to the traces of it irritated Chaudhuri so much. The days when racial privileges were being held high have significant places in his memory. Even after some privileges were given to Indians, they were not treated as ordinary people. Reminding his mother's attitude towards not going on a cruise after being

⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 384

reprimanded by a British on the ship, he says he never went to these places where rudeness and impoliteness were shown to Indians. He strictly condemns the people who went these places wearing British clothes. He calls going these privileged places in British disguise ‘freshening sense of injury and replenish self pity.’ He is also distanced to the British and never searched a way to become close to any of them. In doing so, he proves not only his confidence to have no British friends plays important role but also the snobbish attitude of the British of denying Indians around them and ignoring their presence as well as their rights, of which all ordinary humans should have in their own country.

We know that he loves Father Prior and many other well-known writers, politicians and generals. He apparently has a problem with the local British people in Calcutta:

As long as I lived in Calcutta I wore no article of English clothing and had none. In general, I disliked and despised the local English. To my mind, they alone justified the gibe that the English were a nation of shopkeepers.⁷¹

His comments on the British in Calcutta, of course, do not reflect his views about all British people. There is also the essentialism he uses as the terms ‘local English’ or ‘English clothing.’ The imperial or colonial presence

⁷¹ Ibid, p. 384

cannot be called 'English.' It would be more appropriate to call it 'British.' So, in Chaudhuri's eyes the British are essentialized as 'English.'

Keeping in our minds that his political views were shaped and aroused by the Nationalist Movement, his feelings about English goods are normal. But his comment about local English is very important, when discourse is concerned. Here, by saying 'shop' he means India and, not the owner but the shopkeeper is the British.

Referring to their leaving India, he refers to their incompetence and foolishness. According to him, leaving India and to be thrown out of it is completely the English side's fault:

If we Indians marked down the Englishman (as we saw him in rare mutual contacts), his own people ought to enter his name in their black books, for he has made a substantial contribution to the downfall of the British Empire in India. From his land and nation, the Englishman brought many fine qualities for his work and business in this country, but his residence among us seem to engender in him certain very offensive attributes which we as pronounced as the overpowering smell of our wild red dog (*cyon cyon dukhunensis*), and which did untold harm to Britain's relations with India.⁷²

⁷² Ibid, p. 385

Being aware of the fact that the British did not come to India with bare hands but brought many things in the name of civilization and humanity, he is sure that the way they treated Indians, the natural owners of the country, as useless people. Thus, in their leaving India, the biggest share of the problem or guilt belongs to the British and their mistakes, which Chaudhuri is reluctant to argue and leave to historians:

But I do not share the opinion of my countrymen regarding the Englishmen who have remained in India after the disappearance of the Indian Empire of Great Britain. Their conduct today fills me with vicarious shame, for they are showing themselves as the same men now by their self-interested and ingratiating niceness towards us as they showed themselves in the past by their arrogant and power-intoxicated snobbery.⁷³

Among the political actors in India, as the time the book was written, which is mid 20th century, there were some who defended British rule. Chaudhuri's views about these countrymen are stated strictly because of his avoidance of British population in India. He names them arrogant and snobbish; therefore this generalized expression leads us to another essentialism.

He finishes his regards about the British in Calcutta by referring to his religion, as well:

⁷³ Ibid, p. 385

The British Empire in India has perished without my ever coming into intimate personal contact with Englishmen, with the exception of less than half a dozen that I have known more or less well. I do not regret it, for with all the Anglicism of my spirit I should have felt a total stranger in the English society of Calcutta and would have been humiliated by the demonstration.⁷⁴

From these lines, it is understood that he, belonging to a nation which is despised by the British, despises the local British in his country. From that, we understand that, the English are totally responsible for their leaving India because their attitudes and behaviors resulted this.

About Calcutta, lastly, he tells about the Anglicized Bengali Element. In that, he emphasizes that as we saw it before, because of the unstableness of Calcutta, as everything changes in a very high speed, the Anglican attitudes also change. To describe that movement and change, he uses a wonderful analogy:

If a situation could be imagined in which Indians taught to read and write English of the received standard had wholly discarded that form of the language for basic English (which can be easily imagined today), that would furnish a parallel to the transition from the

⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 386

Anglicism of Bengali of the late nineteenth century to the Anglicism of Bengali today.⁷⁵

That move from another style of Anglicism is also a move from a primary stage of Westernization to the next stages. The older type of Anglicans was like Baboos, the ones who wanted to be like English gentlemen and speak and dress like them. But the new types are fully equipped in being so. Now they are not baboos, but Sahibs or Memsahibs, living in a more aristocratic style. These terms are produced and circulated as a means to degrade or discriminate a certain group or community. In order to understand the power of the stereotype, it is very important how these essentialisms are formed and why this process takes place.

Again, we learn from the writer that this new type of Anglicans were liked and disliked in India. They were snobbish so they were disliked by some people; they were liked because they were adherent to the principles and ideals that they had chosen for their life. This conscientious choice, eventually, brought them success as and esteem.

As he grows up, his political views also begin to change. His admiration and devotion to Gandhi and his principles leave their place to more modest and tolerant ideas. But he experienced some frustration on his way. And these experiences are about Indians and the English. These sentences are important about his disappointment:

⁷⁵ Ibid, p. 411

The first of these were caught by the immediate degeneration of passive resistance into mob violence. I had never thought that a method of which we have thought so highly and on which we had based our hopes would so easily drift towards murder, arson and looting. I read the news from Punjab and Gujarat with distress and anxiety. To my great disgust I saw bands of ragged streets urchins throwing mud and dust at the tram-cars. This was my first experience of a form of rebellion against British rule which was to become typical of the city.⁷⁶

It is mentioned above about his interest in wars or lives of generals and his curiosity in the revolutions that happened and have been going on in the world. He had always dreamed a revolution like the ones he learned. But passive resistance wasn't the kind of 'action' he longed for. The outcome of the passive resistance was disastrous at the beginning. His disappointment drove him to a desperate state of mind.

The second incident that led a big change in his politic views is one of the most drastic and tragic events of Indian History, the Amritsar Massacre, which has been referred above in the part which is about *The Jewel in the Crown*. Chaudhuri states the shock and dismay he had felt at the time:

⁷⁶ Ibid, p. 418

With my respect for discipline and love of order I saw nothing wrong in the resolute suppression of anarchy. But as information trickled out from the Punjab I, like the rest of countrymen, was horrified and infuriated by the disproportionate severity of the punishment and, which was more, by the gratuitous display of vindictiveness and racial arrogance that accompanied the restoration of order in the Punjab. It became a torture for us to think of Amritsar even before General Dyer described his action there with indiscreet bravado.⁷⁷

It is not difficult to imagine the whole nation's feelings after the massacre. But it is out of anyone's imagination how General Dyer could be so confident and haughty, as if he beat the biggest army in the world. As the writer implied, that offended the Indians more.

Chaudhuri's nationalist views also changed as he reads the other European writers and historians. The humiliation and insult for India strikes him and leave wounds in his heart that can't be injured. So, dissatisfied by the Gandhian nationalism, he traces back old nationalists and philosophers of his country. The historical records he conveys us about Alberuni's xenophobia, the days under the Muslim rule and Muslim invasion and after that the beginning of 'othering' the Muslims attracts us to our main point for a while:

⁷⁷ Ibid, p. 419

Almost instantaneously the hatred formerly felt for the Muslim was transferred to the English, as today with the disappearance of British rule the undying hatred has again fastened itself on the Muslim. Furthermore, after the downfall of the Muslim empire the hate not only continued but was aggravated. In the age which followed, that of British rule, the continuing stream of Hindu hatred was joined by the newly created stream of Muslim hatred, for the Muslim had in the meanwhile become fellow-slaves with their former subjects.⁷⁸

It is evident that the hatred that the Hindus felt for the Muslims or feud between them was even greater than that of before the British rule. Fairly enough once ruled but now the ruler or suppressor, the Hindus were feeling unfriendly toward the Muslims.

There is an important aspect of nationalism which drives the motives of ordinary people but not the people who deal with politics, which is called 'underground nationalism.' Underground nationalism is rooted in the prejudices and presumptions—simply stereotypes—of the undeveloped and uneducated sects of the society. The elements of this kind of, that is to say, primitive kind of nationalism are untrue stories, imaginary events or generalizations about the health of a specific group of people. These are like the mentioned monkey simile and from the point of their fair complexion the ill-heartedness of the English. As an enlightened man, Chaudhuri does not share these ideas and strictly criticizes

⁷⁸ Ibid, p. 431, 432

them by also blaming the elderly and education system that didn't hinder or even are not aware of how silly they had been in doing so. To understand it better he gives more examples of the situation:

To give only a few additional examples, the others were: defacing the pictures of the Mogul Emperors and English Governors-Generals in our textbooks and pummeling them; writing abusive epithets like "forger" or "thief" below the portraits of Clive and Warren Hastings; declaring that the English language was only a borrowing from Bengali; believing and telling others, as our teachers also did, that all that the history books taught were lies; writing of the Black Hole a tragedy and of the battle of Chillianwallah as a draw in examination papers, conceived all the while that the first was a myth and the second a defeat for the English; telling one another that there was not one chaste woman in the whole of the British Isles; slyly suggesting that the alleged ground of the resignation of Lord Curzon was only eyewash and the real ground was, not disagreement over the position of the Supply Member, but (repeated in a voice stiller and smaller than that of conscience) an affair between the bachelor Lord Kitchener and Lady Curzon. I give only a small selection, but even this will indicate the scope and the character of the whispering campaign. Its object was to take revenge for the English domination of India by representing the English people as corrupt, degenerate and decaying race whose

apparently supreme position in the world was due to their amazing talent in cunning, deceit and chicanery.⁷⁹

These are the elements of the discourse that involves discriminatory, prejudicial and wrong forms of interpretation. As Chaudhuri states these essentialisms originate from the hatred to the British, who underestimate and look down upon Indians, but it is sure that they do not function as the British's because eventually, it has no power and it has no basis that can be proved. Learning that the English are the greatest thieves, rascals and plunderers, the generations had grown a great deal of rage and fury in their minds which is ready to explode one day. The anti-propaganda was not done always secretly. Songs, tales or poems were so familiar that it is impossible to think that the British are unaware of them and consequently these incidents lead new kinds of essentialism and another again etc.

However, the Indian insight about the English is not always as mentioned above among the well-known and respected leaders of the society, especially religious figures. Chaudhuri speaks of two of them; one is a religious reformist Rammohun Roy. In brief, his views are important in the sense of dependence and independence. According to him, absolute independence without a proper order supplied by law is worse than an orderly dependent state to another authority of a more civilized country. The second esteemed person in Indian society with such views is Swami Vivekananda, who was a preacher of new Hinduism. His views

⁷⁹ Ibid, p. 434

are even more appealing to those who seek different interpretations of Indian nationalism, like Chaudhuri:

No one ever landed on English soil with more hatred in his heart for a race than I did for the English. On this platform are present friends who can bear witness to this fact; but the more I lived among them and saw how the machine was working –the English national life- and mixed with them, I found what the heart-beat of the nation was, and the more I loved them.⁸⁰

In another speech, Vivekananda names the problem between Indians and the English in greatest clarity. Chaudhuri quotes his words:

“As the philosophy, our national philosophy, of the Vedanta,” he observed, “has summarized all misfortune, all misery, as coming from one cause, ignorance, herein also we must understand that the difficulties that arise between us and the English people are mostly due to that ignorance: we do not know them, they do not know us.” He was perfectly right.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Ibid, p. 440

⁸¹ Ibid, p. 441

Believing that nothing is all bad or all good, Vivekananda is in the pursuit of true peace and wisdom. His attempt is to put his people's interest and benefit before anything else. When compared with the silly presumptions that the older generations told their children, these views prove that things changed a lot in a very short time, as the Indians see and observe native Englishmen in their own country. So, there is no doubt that the Indians do not have anything wrong with the British out of their country. According to Chaudhuri, the problems between Indians and the British are because of the acts and attitudes of the British who live in India.

The most painful process for those Indian intellectuals is to convince their people because the native people of India has the problem of discredit to the ones who have relations with the British. But once they are known outside of India, then they attract the public's attention. The writer puts it wonderfully:

The greatest paradox in this hostility of the general mass of Indians towards the things of the West is that nearly all of our great men of the nineteenth century were not able to gain any recognition from their countrymen nor exert any influence over them until they were recognized in the West.... It is this perversity which makes most great Indians feel like strangers in their land.⁸²

⁸² Ibid, p. 507, 508

What makes most 'great' Indians feel like strangers in their homeland is that conditioning in Indians' minds, which is, the Western world evaluates anything objectively. It is the confident attitude and the principles the Western intellectuals expose and what Indians-like other colonized societies-infer from this perspective is the objectivity and credibility in judging and preaching. This exposing of virtuous life style or view of life can be named as a way to dominate the minds of the colonized community, i.e. using it as a means of power.

It is evident that the Indian audience is sympathetic to the echoes from the West that is to say in order to succeed intellectually in his/her country; an Indian should be praised and awarded in a Western country. This is paradoxical because the Western country's people are not trusted in India but they are referred as the ones to approve that something is right/wrong or valid/invalid. Perhaps this may be interpreted by analyzing the internal dynamics of India and notwithstanding the negative associating to their minds. But still, Indian attitude towards the Europeans, and in particular towards the English, should be analyzed considering all impacts of the British which started in the 1600s.

CONCLUSION

Indian literature in English has been established after the institutionalization of English education and it plays an important role for the development of Postcolonial literature.⁸³ Since it can be said that that institutionalization of English language is still polemical in India, it is true that Indian writers who write in English have to face many critiques. But this process of writing in English has different functions for different writers. For example Nirad Chaudhuri's style and idiosyncratic or elaborate English has some hints about British rule in India whose impact on Indian people was challenging.⁸⁴ It wouldn't be odd to consider that the writer used highly academic and profound English to force the reader perceive the situation of Indian people under the British rule. But today there is no need for that because most writers in India see their primary audience in India itself because there is acceptable and vibrant English available to them.⁸⁵

On the other hand, "The imperial education system installs a 'standard' version of the metropolitan language as the norm, and marginalizes all 'variants'

⁸³ Jeannine Delombard, "Language, Identity, and Nation in Postcolonial Indian English Literature," *English Postcoloniality: Literatures from around the World*, ed. Radhika Mohanram and Gita Rajan (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996) 89, *Questia*, 14 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=22789068>>.

⁸⁴ Margery Sabin, *Dissenters and Mavericks: Writings about India in English, 1765-2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 122, *Questia*, 14 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104277305>>.

⁸⁵ Susan Bassnett, and Harish Trivedi, *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 1999) 56, *Questia*, 14 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102861963>>.

as impurities."⁸⁶ That is to say, language becomes a medium through which hierarchical power is imposed, in the name of 'truth' or 'reality' or 'order.' To understand this better, the standard British English and the English inherited from the British Empire should be distinguished. For this reason, the discussion of post-colonial writing which follows is largely a discussion of the process by which the language, with its power, and the writing, with its signification of authority, has been wrested from the dominant European culture. "⁸⁷

It is still very depressing to see how a nation of such ability and multitude of good will has faced so many troubles of which they are not responsible for most of them. On the other hand, it is also pathetic to see the efforts of the British to change these people ended in a disaster because of either their awkward ways indeed or the resistance which came from many sections of Indian society.

It is for sure that the stereotypes-or essentialisms- that the Indians developed were usually fantasies and lies derived out of inferiority complex. Since they serve the main purpose of doing that, which is to degrade and humiliate the British, it is not credible to say that they hurt them. On the contrary, the essentialisms that the British developed have still great effect on Indians, which means they achieved their goals.

Language has always been and will be used as a means of domination and manipulation of knowledge. The key position of stereotypes that are used in

⁸⁶ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 2002) 7, Questia, 14 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=107416403>>.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

that sense cannot be ignored, as it is assembled in *The Jewel in the Crown* and *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jason Howard Mezey, "Mourning the Death of the Raj? Melancholia as Historical Engagement in Paul Scott's Raj Quartet," *Studies in the Novel* 38.3 (2006), Questia, 14 Aug. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5018322392>>.

Scott, Paul. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Mandarin, 1997.

Haswell, Janis E. "Images of Rape and Buggery: Paul Scott's View of the Dual Evils of Empire," *Studies in the Novel* 33.2 (2001): 202, Questia, 15 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001024631>>.

Gorra, Michael Edward *Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997) 54, Questia, 15 Aug. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=99314052>>.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. England: Penguin, 2001

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2006

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. England: Penguin, 2003.

Chaudhuri, Nirad C. *The Autobiography of An Unknown Indian*. New York: The New York Review of Books, 2001.

Carduff, Christopher "The Triumph of Nirad Chaudhuri," *New Criterion* Oct. 1999: 76, Questia, 16 Aug. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001820114>>.

John C. Hawley, and Emmanuel S. Nelson, eds., *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Studies* / (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001) 365, Questia, 20 Aug. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102144441>>.

Childs, Peter and Patrick, R.J. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. Great Britain: T.J Press, 1997.

Ashcroft, Bill; Griffiths, Gareth and Tiffin, Helen. *Post-Colonial Studies The Key Concepts*. Great Britain: Routledge, 2005.

Jeannine Delombard, "Language, Identity, and Nation in Postcolonial Indian English Literature," *English Postcoloniality: Literatures from around the World*, ed. Radhika Mohanram and Gita Rajan (Westport, CT:

Greenwood Press, 1996) 89, Questia, 14 Sept. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=22789068>>.

Margery Sabin, *Dissenters and Mavericks: Writings about India in English, 1765-2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 122, Questia,
14 Sept. 2007 <<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104277305>>.

Susan Bassnett, and Harish Trivedi, *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 1999) 56, Questia, 14 Sept. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102861963>>.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London: Routledge, 2002) 7, Questia, 14 Sept. 2007
<<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=107416403>>.