

Shadows of the Raj: Anglo-Indian Visions of Empire, the
Raj Revival, and the Literary Crafting of National
Character

by

GENEVIEVE GAGNE-HAWES

B.A. Whitman College, 2003
M.A. New York University, 2007

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(English)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

November 2012

© Genevieve Gagne-Hawes, 2012

ABSTRACT

In my dissertation, I argue for a relationship of influence between the authors of what I define as the *Raj novel genre*, or works by British writers who lived in India between 1858 and 1947 and produced novels set in that country, and authors of the so-called “Raj Revival” in 1970s and 1980s Great Britain. The latter encompasses bestselling, award-winning novels (M.M. Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions*, Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet*; J.G. Farrell’s *The Siege of Krishnapur*, Ruth Praver Jhabvala’s *Heat and Dust*) and films (David Lean’s *A Passage to India*) that nostalgically revisit the Raj experience. Both movements claim ideal British character is manifested by Anglo-Indians, British persons living and working in India, who develop a series of exemplary character traits through the rigors of daily service in the subcontinent. In the Raj novel genre, this model of Anglo-Indian character—and the concurrent denigration of Indian character—is used as a strategy by which to elevate the nascent Anglo-Indian community. In the Raj Revival, the Raj novel genre’s ideals are deployed in support of the conservative shift that occurred during Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s tenure (1979-1990). Where the Raj novel genre’s image of Anglo-Indian ideality is prescriptive, the Raj Revival renders it nostalgic and comforting, a means of asserting lost national prominence through familiar markers of British imperial identity. The specificity and scope of the Raj texts’ influence necessitates, I argue, ongoing attention to the constitutive power of the Raj model of ideal British character in analyses of British literature and rhetoric in the wake of empire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Dedication	vii
I. Introduction: Why re-read the Raj? – Identity Construction, Anglo-India, and a Nation of Narration	1
English vs. British – A Vocabulary of Identity.....	13
Why Raj Novels Matter: Generating the Inquiry.....	17
II. New Rule(rs), New Character—Ideal Anglo-Indians in the Novels of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker	31
The British Raj in Practice and Ideology, 1858-1947.....	41
“Adventure and Prospects to the Right Sort”: The Self-Definition of Anglo-India	48
“She has come into an empire . . .”: Mutiny Literature and the Production of Anglo-Indian Exceptionalism in Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker	54
“God knows I never thought of <i>this!</i> ”: The Mutiny as Spectre in B.M. Croker’s <i>Mr. Jervis</i>	74
III. The Raj Novel Rampant: Rudyard Kipling, Sara Jeannette Duncan, and the Consolidation of the Raj Novel Genre	84
“The Bard of Empire”: Rudyard Kipling and the Envisioning of Anglo-Indian Ideality.....	97
“We are what we can conquer”: Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Ironic Visions of Anglo-India.....	119
IV. The Raj Ascendant – Construction and Breakdown of Genre Ideals in Alice Perrin, Maud Diver, and E.M. Forster	141
A Mannered Empire: Alice Perrin’s Legacy of Anglo-Indian Life	148
The Englishwoman in India: Maud Diver’s Fictional Campaign for Empire	168
“I really do know the truth about Indians. A most unsuitable position . . .”: E.M. Forster’s rejection of Raj novel genre tropes in <i>A Passage to India</i>	184
V. Raj Racism? – Depictions of India and “Indianness” in the Raj Novel Genre	198
Servants, Princes, Zealots: Visions of India in the Raj Novel Genre	202
Reading Indian-ness in Rudyard Kipling, E.M. Forster, Sara Jeannette Duncan.....	220
VI. Emotional Imperialism, Postcolonial Nostalgia – Reconfigurations of the Raj Novel Genre in the Age of Thatcher	242
“Britain has found a role”: Margaret Thatcher and the Rhetoric of the Falklands Crisis.....	251

“The jewel in the crown is made, these days, of paste”: Imperial Fiction for a Post-Imperial Age 270
Romance and Revival: The Inherited Ideal of British National Character 286

VII. Conclusion: “The Power with the Need” – Raj Fictions and the Post-Colonial World
..... **310**

Bibliography **317**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To complete this dissertation, I needed the help of people in three countries on two continents. It was a journey, literally, and I'm so grateful to everyone who helped along the way.

First, thank you to my supervisor: Professor Laura Moss. You read every word of every draft I wrote—every excessive lengthy one—and made it all so much smarter and better. Your insight, kindness, accessibility, and reminders that life went on outside the Ph.D. program were invaluable to me. Thank you also to my committee, Professor Miranda Burgess and Professor Miguel Mota. Your comments challenged me, encouraged me, and taught me more than I can say. Editing was a continual learning process, and I'm grateful for each moment of it.

Thank you to the University of British Columbia English Department, particularly graduate secretary Louise Soga, who put out fires while I was in Africa and was never less than gracious about standing in line for hours on my behalf; Professor Patsy Badir, for her support in the final stages of my project, Professor Deanna Kreisel, for serving on my comprehensive exam committee, and Professor Sherrill Grace, a phenomenal resource during my time in Vancouver.

I was blessed, while I lived in Vancouver, to have the most astounding, inspiring group of friends and colleagues. Thank you to Dr. Katie Calloway Sueda (I can see our morning runs on each of these pages), Sarah Crover and Paisley Mann (my last-minute printing saviors), Asad Kiyani, Liz Buskell, Dr. Tyson Stolte, Megan Bell, Carrie-Jane Williams, Simon Charles, Matt Dixon, Stephania Schwartz, Fred Vermote, Gemma McClintock, Crystal Sikma, Anna Cohen, Brianna Brash-Nyberg, Lindsay and Nathaniel Funk, Joel and Lisa Nikkel, Arun Ramamurthy, Emily Blamire, Laura Estrada, Mono Brown, Erin Somerville, Tiffany Johnstone, Kim Duff, Dr. Wendy Strangman Bassett, Lisa Harris, Eve Preus, and everyone at St. John's College. And a special thank you to Ms. Crover, Mike Borkent and Dr. Mark Diotte. TA Cohort forever, guys. I miss our Fridays at Mahoney's. Thanks for all the laughter and love.

Thank you to Abigail Scott, who during her life taught me so much about faith, intelligence, and the will to explore the world. I miss you, Abigail.

Throughout my Ph.D., I was supported by my colleagues at Writers House Literary Agency, particularly Amy Berkower, Dan Lazar, Maja Nikolic, Jodi Reamer, Robin Rue, and Simon Lipskar. Thank you for always giving me that extra day to get manuscripts read, and for encouraging me in the final stages of my own revisions. Thanks also to my New York support network of writers, including Ridley Pearson, Linda Lee, Cecily Wong, and Saira Rao. I feel as though you guys wrote this with me. Thanks for the encouragement, and for being there.

I was sustained hugely in the years of study by my family and friends in Alaska. Thanks to my amazing mothers, LouAnn Gagne, who brought me up to love literature so passionately, and Theresa Lauterbach, my wonderful father, David Hawes, my beautiful sister, Anna, and brother, Alex, my grandmothers, Jane Gagne and Doris Hawes, and my late grandfather, Gene Gagne.

And thanks to my dear, dear friends Lael Harrison, Katherine Rue Bollinger, Dr. Bryan Bollinger, Michelle Schwartz, Alexandra Penfold, Hilary Dorsch Wong, and Dr. Christina Capacci-Daniels. No more e-mails about the dissertation, guys. Can you believe it?

Between the third and fourth years of my Ph.D., I moved to Cape Town, South Africa. I would never have finished the doctorate if I hadn't, and I'm grateful every day to this country of my heart, and to all the friends I've made here. To Tim, Shona, and Patrick Smith: there aren't words to say how much I love and value you guys. Thank you to Regine le Roux and Mark Ingle, without whom Chapter II (and Chapter III; and Chapter IV . . .) wouldn't have happened. Thank you to Professor Coilin Parsons, at the University of Cape Town, for allowing me access to UCT's facilities during my semester of intensive writing; your help was invaluable. And thank you to Gailyn Scarpa, Karen Lilje, David Stein (my first friend!), Carmen Schaefer, Megan Ferguson, Julie Cameron, Lissa Fenner, Donnelly McClelland, Sally Shepherd, Rachel Fenner, Carolina Massa, Cecily Roos, and everyone at Shoreline Church, especially my Home Group leaders Geoff and Natalie Thomson, and Derek and Debi Nunley, who reminded me to keep my eyes on the real point of things.

Which brings me to God, and His ongoing work and presence in my life. Everything I learned for the dissertation taught me that, in actuality, I know very little. Wherever I go in the world, I will constantly be amazed by the wonder of His works, and the grace He has given me in my family, friends, loves, life, and opportunities. There were so many moments where I truly didn't think I could finish this dissertation. I was too tired, too sad, or too alone. In each of those moments, He picked me up and carried me forward, or gave me a person to say the words I needed to hear. Thank you.

Genevieve Gagne-Hawes
25 July 2012

Dedication

To Tim, Shona, and Patrick Smith. Thank you.

I. Introduction: Why re-read the Raj? – Identity Construction, Anglo-India, and a Nation of Narration

When I was 16, I read M.M. Kaye's Raj Revival novels, *The Far Pavilions* (1979) and *Shadow of the Moon* (1957; 1979). I remember being struck by the strong sense of duty and honor displayed by the latter's British hero, Capt. Alex Randall. At one point—the scenario is amusing in retrospect—Alex does not speak to the heroine, whom he loves passionately, for months because his duty to the Raj is so important. As a teen, this struck me as the height of romantic devotion. Alongside Alex's ethic of duty, I absorbed Kaye's images of India as deadly, beautiful, and sensual, succumbing unwittingly to the Orientalist fantasia whose perpetuation, I argue now, was a main achievement of the Raj Revival. Eager for more Raj tales, I searched for Kaye on the internet and found interviews in which she discussed her love of Rudyard Kipling. “*The Jungle Books* were the first stories Daddy ever read to me,” Kaye told the *Wall Street Journal* in 1978. “The only reason I'm living in Sussex now is because of *Puck of Pook's Hill*. It's right in the middle of Kipling country. Whenever I feel homesick for India, which is about once a year, I fly to *Kim* and read it again.”¹ On this recommendation, I read *Kim* (1901) and noted the similarities between this book and *The Far Pavilions*. Each features a British hero who grows up believing he is Indian, and is then drawn into the edifice of British imperial rule. These similarities became, in my senior undergraduate year, the basis for a presentation on the Raj Revival. That presentation grounded itself on a discussion of especially awful clips from HBO's television adaptation of *The Far Pavilions* (1984), but despite the lack of academic rigor with which I pursued my comparison at that time, it was in that seminar that I first read postcolonial theory (Homi Bhabha's “Signs Taken for Wonders”; Salman Rushdie's *Imaginary Homelands*) and began to consider the pitfalls of representations I had previously enjoyed without question.

¹ “Interview,” *Wall Street Journal*, 13 Oct. 1978, Web. 31 March 2012.

What intrigued me then, and continues to intrigue me in this dissertation, is the eagerness with which Raj Revivalists such as Kaye and Scott model their work on Raj novels such as *Kim* and E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924). Harold Bloom's *The Anxiety of Influence* (1973), published near the outset of the markedly un-anxious Raj Revival, presents a now-familiar image of poets entangled in perpetually fraught relations with their literary forebears. Bloom's poetic history, made by "strong poets . . . misreading one another, so as to clear imaginative space for themselves," is a "variety of melancholy or an anxiety-principle."² In contrast, Stephen Guy-Bray's *Loving in Verse: Poetic Influence as Erotic* (2006) argues that (homoerotic) desire offers a broader, more flexible terminology for reading literary exchange (86-87). In-depth analysis of the Raj Revival texts' relationship to the Victorian works I term *the Raj novel genre* reveals a level of novelistic influence akin to Guy-Bray's poetry analyses, though without the particularity of personal desire Guy-Bray highlights amongst famous poets such as Dante, Virgil, and Statius. What were the texts that produced this spirited emulation? The Raj novel genre is composed of novels by British authors who lived and wrote in India between the establishment of the Raj in 1858 (after the Sepoy Rebellion/Indian Mutiny),³ and Indian independence in 1947. These works champion Anglo-Indian character as an ideal form of British imperial identity, a generic message which I argue recurs, in nearly identical form, in the 1970s and 1980s Raj Revival, a literary movement which takes place during Margaret Thatcher's tenure as Prime Minister (1979-1990).

The intersection of the Raj novel genre and the Raj Revival texts, I argue, shows that melancholy and anxiety can be assuaged, rather than manifested, at the site of literary influence.

² Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd ed, (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997). 5, 7.

³ The name of the 1857 uprising, in which Indian sepoy and civilians mutinied against the British, is now hotly debated, with some scholars and politicians calling for it to be referred to as the First War of Indian Independence. To maintain consistency with the fictional works I analyze, however, I follow the terminology used by the Raj novelists and the Raj Revivalists, and refer to the uprising as the Mutiny. This is the same approach taken in texts such as Jenny Sharpe's *Allegories of Empire* (1993), which reads the Mutiny novel genre in detail.

Sigmund Freud's "On Mourning and Melancholia" (1917) defines melancholia as an exacerbation of behaviors that characterize mourning, marked particularly by deep dejection and self-hatred so intense it culminates in "a delusional expectation of punishment."⁴ The difference between mourning and melancholia, Freud writes, may stem from melancholia's unconscious aspect—the inability to fully grasp or articulate the nature of a loss. In Chapter V, I explore the possibility of diagnosing melancholia on a national scale in post-imperial Great Britain; the Raj Revivalists' eager re-circulation of Raj narratives serves as a means of repressing or denying the melancholic nation's tendency toward self-castigation, and of ignoring or sublimating the "loss" of empire.⁵ Further echoes of the Raj novel genre in the political rhetoric of Margaret Thatcher, also analyzed in Chapter V, shifts the discussion of influence from the psychoanalytic specificity of Bloom and Guy-Bray's studies. Rather than evincing neurotic entanglement, authors and politicians of 1970s/1980s Britain who rework Raj novel genre tropes and themes augment the veneration of imperial Britain taking place under Thatcher's Conservative government. By focusing on the role of literary interchange in this process, I argue that a return to Raj narratives, which see British imperial identity as fixed and unchangeable, casts literary influence as a refuge from, rather than a manifestation of, Britain's post-imperial definitional angst.

To study the Raj novel genre, and to articulate the relationship of nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj texts to late twentieth-century ones, I combine several theoretical approaches. Studies of genre, character, and the development of the novel form in concert with new modes of reader subjectivity in the late 1700s and early 1800s are laid out in detail in Chapters II and III. I also refer throughout my dissertation to postcolonial arguments that the British Empire was essential to Britain's national identity formation in the Victorian Era, as both

⁴ Sigmund Freud, "Mourning and Melancholia," *On Freud's 'Mourning and Melancholia'*, ed. Leticia Glocer Fiorini, Thierry Bokanowski, Sergio Lewkowicz (London: Karnac, 2009). 19-34. 20.

⁵ I draw here and in Chapter V upon Paul Gilroy's *Postcolonial Melancholia* (2005), which posits a similar scenario.

a concrete entity and a space of imaginative projection. My conceptual reference here is Jean-François Lyotard's "metanarrative," described in *The Postmodern Condition* (1979). A metanarrative yokes the structuring fiction of a society with the dissemination of ideological power in discourse. Lyotard imagines a discourse that seeks knowledge which validates its preset claims; this information is referenced whenever the discourse needs material with which to authorize its purported truths. A metanarrative, moreover, dictates the legislation of groups by appealing to a common humanity and suggesting all are subsumed in the shared narrative. Laws and asserted truths thus claim a universal, non-prejudicial relevance that eschews the discursive power differentials actually shaping their construction (*The Postmodern Condition* 35-37).

Deconstructive and postmodern criticism such as Lyotard's own (Lyotard suggests that incredulity towards metanarratives is the core of postmodern thinking) troubles the stability of such meta-discursive constructs. However, I argue that to the British of the Victorian age, including the Anglo-Indian authors whose works I analyze in my first four chapters, the metanarrative of British imperial identity was deeply influential and determinative. Moreover, it was something to which the Raj novel genre contributed by producing a specific kind of knowledge about Anglo-Indian daily life. Lyotard notes the political efficacy of particular metanarratives, writing that "the insertion of the narrative of race and work into that of the spirit as a way of legitimating knowledge and its institutions is doubly unfortunate: theoretically inconsistent, it was compelling enough to find disastrous echoes in the realm of politics."⁶ In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and, I argue, in late twentieth-century Thatcherite Britain, the components of the British metanarrative of imperial identity, which depends upon hierarchies

⁶ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984). 37.

of race, gender, and colonial power, continued to echo in the political realm, influencing the form of Thatcher's political discourse.

To ground my argument, I discuss in this introduction the theoretical background for my presentation of Great Britain as an imperial nation, or a nation with a metanarrative of identity that depends upon the experience of colonial rule. Foundationally I ask: What is the relation of Anglo-Indians, or British persons whose service in the Indian subcontinent as civil or military authorities gave them a distinct communal identity, to larger conceptions of Britishness? While Chapter I addresses this question, in exploring discursive nation construction it is important to observe the sense of exile felt by many Anglo-Indians as they attempted to forge a sense of national allegiance with Britain. Despite choosing the careers that took them around the globe as administrators, soldiers, educators, and missionaries, Anglo-Indian narrative reflects a profound awareness of actual (physical) separation and cultural, sometimes emotional, distance. This is made apparent by the common reference to the British Isles as "Home" in the Raj novel genre; the mythos of Anglo-India as a world apart is also perpetuated in collections of reminiscences by real-life Anglo-Indians, which echo this nostalgic tenor. "We thought England was the greatest place on earth," Ed "Jungle" Davies, who served for twelve years in Meerut, Lanicotal, and on India's North-West Frontier, recalls. "We were always talking about home."⁷ I preserve the symbolic, wistful capitalization and punctuation assigned to "Home" in the Raj novel genre for its ability to evoke Anglo-India's sensibility of being a world apart. The feeling of separation and the fear of surveillance or judgment from "Home" Britons produces, in the Raj novel genre, repeated, defensive claims that Anglo-Indians had "true(r)" knowledge of India by virtue of residence in the country. Following the genre's dismissal of British persons (and British fictions) that lack practical experience of India, the Victorian and early twentieth-century authors who

⁷ Qtd. in Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983).

comprise my study all lived under the Raj. They are Flora Annie Steel (1847-1929), Bithia Mary (B.M.) Croker (1849-1920), Sara Jeannette Duncan (1861-1922), Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), Alice Perrin (1867-1934), Maud Diver (1867-1945), and E.M. Forster (1879-1970).⁸ While Forster and Kipling spent less time in India than the female authors, all experienced first-hand the exigencies of Anglo-Indian life and Raj rule, and conveyed those experiences in fiction.

That fiction is bound up with the history of the Raj as imperial Britain's "jewel in the crown". Thomas Richards writes in *The Imperial Archive* (1993) that "[a]n empire is partly a fiction" (1). My goal, then, is to elaborate the ways in which literal fictions (the Raj novels) produced a larger national fiction of Britishness and Anglo-Indian ideality. In the Raj novel genre, Anglo-Indian authors rewrite empire, drawing inspiration from daily life in India. Control and dissemination of information, which Richards argues was "the administrative core" (4) of the British Empire, is essential to this effort: the Anglo-Indian authors produce knowledge about the subcontinent and champion its authenticity. But Anglo-India's ties to Britain's imperial mythos are also emotive. Etienne Balibar writes in "The Nation Form: History and Ideology" that "[e]very social community reproduced by the functioning of institutions is imaginary: that is to say, it is based on the projection of individual existence into the weft of a collective narrative" (93). Articulating how the Raj novelists project Anglo-Indians' "individual existences" into the "collective narrative," or metanarrative, of British imperial identity reveals the depth of the Raj authors' investment in the race, gender, and class hierarchies the Raj fictions consolidate. These fictions allow profound and affecting self-valorization. David Symington, a prominent Raj

⁸ Benita Parry's seminal *Delusions and Discoveries* (1972; 1998) also analyzes the female authors Fanny Emily (F.E.) Penny (1847-1939) and Ida Alexa Ross (I.A.R.) Wylie (1885-1959), whom she groups with Perrin, Croker, and Diver in her list of "Romancers". Residence in India is part of my definition of the Raj novel genre, which as I discuss in Chapters II and III, expands Parry's formulation. Thus I do not include Wylie, who never lived in or visited India. To avoid excessive duplication with the Raj novels of Diver and Perrin—set here as representative—I also exclude Penny. However, I agree with Parry that Penny's depiction of Anglo-India and India in novels such as *The Rajah* (1911) and *The Outcaste* (1912) carries out what I term in Chapter II the "exigence" of the Raj novel genre texts.

administrator whose Anglo-Indian family traced its lineage back to the East India Company, describes Anglo-Indian attitudes toward the British colonial subject illuminatingly:

We realized that we were members of a very successful race. We belonged to a country that, in the world league, had done exceedingly well for a small island. And we also realized that we were working in a country which was as pre-eminently unsuccessful as we were successful. And I suppose that that produced a frame of mind in which we tacitly . . . felt ourselves to be rather superior people.⁹

In the Raj novel genre a feeling of superiority derived from “racial” belonging to the British nation which Symington articulates finds fictional affirmation. Strong, duty-bound, humble, and deeply honorable, the male and female protagonists of the Raj (and Raj Revival) novels rule in a fair, informed manner that “tacitly” evinces their superiority. They thus perpetuate an idea of virtuous British behavior codified by nineteenth-century political thinkers such as Thomas Carlyle and Charles Dilke. Carlyle and Dilke led Victorian attempts to explicate the formation of the “successful race” Symington references, galvanizing images of Anglo-Saxon *noblesse oblige* in service of the imperial mission,¹⁰ or what Dilke calls “the grandeur of our race already girdling the earth, which it is destined, perhaps, eventually to overspread.”¹¹ Critic Zohreh Sullivan notes that “[h]istorians debate the relative claims” of Carlyle and Dilke “to be known as the father of British imperialism,”¹² and Dilke draws on Carlyle in his valorization of inherent “Saxon” qualities such as strength, vigor, and stoicism—character traits which mirror those the Raj writers attribute to Anglo-Indians serving the Raj. The use of Anglo-Saxon history to pit

⁹ Qtd. in Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 218. Symington served as Secretary to the Governor of Bombay from 1943 until Indian Independence in 1947.

¹⁰ I reference here Carlyle’s *Heroes and Hero-Worship* (1869), which imagines “a Saxon-dom covering great spaces of the Globe” (133), and his epic twenty-one-book biography *History of Friedrich II of Prussia* (1858). For Dilke, I refer to *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English Speaking Countries During 1866 and 1867* (1869).

¹¹ Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, *Greater Britain*, 2nd ed (London: Macmillan, 1869). vii.

¹² Zohreh Sullivan, “Race, Gender, and Imperial Ideology in the Nineteenth Century,” *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 13:1 (1989). 23.

Saxons against Celts and internally colonize the spaces of Great Britain thereby¹³ finds international application in Anglo-Indian narratives of colonial undertaking. Hierarchies of racialized power, which trade upon this mythos to valorize the white colonizer, are deployed to manage colonial crisis or insurgency in India as in contested territories within the British Isles.

This practical fact of imperial Britain's power maneuvers troubles Balibar's more theoretical assertion that "under certain conditions, *only* imaginary communities are real" (93). To the Indians who lived under British colonial control for more than 250 years, and under direct Raj rule for almost a century, the British Empire was in no way imaginary. It was a dominating structure by which colonial subjectivities were legitimized and policed, and the ideological strategies by which the Raj novelists justify economic exploitation and racial discrimination in India follow widespread methods of discursive control in the Victorian Era. Robert Young argues that under European colonialism "seemingly impartial, objective academic disciplines . . . colluded with, and [were] indeed instrumental in, the production of actual forms of colonial subjugation and administration" (151). Indeed, the explosion of new scientific and industrial production techniques in nineteenth-century Great Britain drew on minute analysis of the natural world to organize categories of knowledge and control the subjects those categories produced.¹⁴

¹³ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 92. The process of internal colonization via contrast of valorized Anglo-Saxons and denigrated "Celts" is described by Michael Hechter in *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development* (1975); it is also discussed in Hugh Kearney's *Ireland: Contested Ideas of Nationalism and History* (2009; see especially 75-76; 125-26; 192-202).

¹⁴ To name but a few examples: the works of Charles Darwin (1809-1882), such as *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871), put forth the theory of evolution. Darwin urged meticulous analysis of the natural world, including detailed observation of variance in genetic characteristics, as a mode of understanding how environments and species changed with time. Nearly simultaneously, Gregor Mendel (1822-1884) performed minute observations of variance in pea plants which helped subsequent generations of scientists develop the theory of genetics. Outside the field of science, the development of new manufacturing techniques in the late eighteenth century gave rise to the Industrial Revolution, which spanned the 1790s to the mid-1860s. The introduction of new power technologies (steam, coal) and mechanization and the institution of partially-automated factory production lines vastly altered Britain's economy and the nation's perception of goods and consumption. As Raymond Williams argues in *The Country and the City* (1973), even the spatial organization of

Postcolonial theorists observe this link between “authoritative” knowledge of the colonial subject and the exertion of colonial power, as in Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, which argues that constructions of the “East” by the West are used to justify imperialism:

The object of such knowledge is inherently vulnerable to scrutiny; this object is a “fact” which, if it develops, changes, or otherwise transforms itself in the way that civilizations frequently do, nevertheless is fundamentally, even ontologically stable. To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for “us” to deny autonomy to “it”—the Oriental country—since we know it and it exists, in a sense, *as* we know it. (32)

Construction of Indian subjectivity in the Raj novel genre follows this model and continues—albeit in cloaked form—in the Raj Revival. What my dissertation adds to discussions of identity construction via British imperial discourse is the idea that the Raj writers also treat Anglo-Indian identity as something producible in their fictions, what Said calls a “fact” subject to scrutiny and imitation. By treating incidents of Anglo-Indian valor as sites at which British virtue is honed and toughened, and through an insistent focus on the difference between Britishness performed at “Home” versus that lived out in India, the Raj authors articulate a discrete mode of national character. Anglo-Indian participation in the imperial casting of British selfhood through systems of knowledge accrual, the Raj novel genre implies, is essential to “proper” rule.

In this schema, the idea of being British justifies imperial domination and expansion in and of itself. Peter Mandler writes that national character is “one of the most intensely focused forms of national consciousness because it implies specificity . . . about the people in question (and all of them, not only some).”¹⁵ Such specificity must be constructed, particularly in an empire as vast as Britain’s. An address given by Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary of Great Britain, to a Royal Colonial Institute dinner in 1897 exemplifies the ways in which Britain

Britain and the relationship of British citizens to the agrarian landscape shifted at this time, with many people moving to the ever-larger urban centers.

¹⁵ Peter Mandler, *The English National Character* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2006). 8

used the rhetoric of imperial duty to consolidate a feeling of unity across the vast geographical spaces separating metropole and colony at the turn of the twentieth century:

It is a gigantic task that we have undertaken when we have determined to wield the sceptre of empire . . . Great is the task, great is the responsibility, but great is the honour, and I am convinced that the conscience and the spirit of the country will rise to the height of its obligations, and that we shall have the strength to fulfill the mission which our history and our national character have imposed upon us.¹⁶

In his use of the phrase “our national character” to justify the British imperial enterprise, Chamberlain signals the insistence on an idealized British “selfhood” whose manifest virtues necessitate imperial rule. The articulation of this selfhood, I argue, is the project of the Raj novel genre. The Raj texts develop narratives of character which make Anglo-Indian service an exemplar of the “great” task—and resultant honor—to which Chamberlain argues Britain is called. Chamberlain’s speech thus evokes the ways in which the Raj novels situate Anglo-India’s grinding daily routine as the arbiter of what it meant to be British in an era that made “imperial” synonymous with “British” for Britain’s citizens. While I distinguish momentarily between the overarching concepts of “British” and “English,” the linkage of both with imperial rule explains in part how political impetus can be grafted onto a nebulous quality such as “national character”.

What is it for a nation to possess a character? Balibar writes that “[t]he history of nations . . . is always already presented to us in the form of a narrative which attributes to these entities the continuity of a subject.”¹⁷ Analyzing components of *The English National Character* (2006), Mandler argues that “the idea of a national character seeks to yoke real national differences based on a wide variety of experiences to a few key psychological traits to which those national characteristics may have no connection” (2). Such disconnect between reality and politics or, to speak in literary terms, between fact and fiction, facilitates my argument that the Raj novel genre

¹⁶ Joseph Chamberlain, *Mr. Chamberlain’s Speeches*, ed. Charles Boyd (London: Constable & Co., 1914). 5.

¹⁷ Etienne Balibar, “The Nation Form: History and Ideology,” in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (New York: Verso, 1992). 86.

and the Raj Revival construct a well-ruled British empire by describing the character traits of the persons who rule it well. To show the cohesion of Anglo-Indian community, the accuracy of Anglo-Indian knowledge about India, and the “love” with which Indian servants view their Anglo-Indian rulers, is to advocate for a vision of British imperial identity unique to the Raj. That identity relies heavily upon Mandler’s “key psychological traits”: devotion to duty and to Britain; abnegation of self in favor of nation and community; physical, mental, and emotional strength; verbal and emotional reticence; and affection for India, tempered by awareness of what is presented as the necessary separation of British and Indian. Taken together and tested by the difficulties of life on the subcontinent—the Raj novels eagerly depict skirmishes with hostile Indians, monsoon floods, blistering heat, deadly cholera outbreaks, and painful familial separations—Anglo-Indians in the Raj novel genre embody ideal qualities in dire circumstances, and thus emerge as key to Britain’s identity as a successful imperial nation.

In *The Imperial Archive*, Richards observes the ways in which symbolic displacement allows control of territories outside a nation’s physical borders: “The symbolism of the British Empire was built on an extended foundation of national symbols . . . seeing it that way, through the distorting lens of the nation, lent the Empire the sense of symbolic unity it so often lacked in practice.”¹⁸ Imagined unity encourages the perpetuation of practical unity for individual colonial actors and the wider nation. Further, it leads Britain to depend on the symbolic markers produced in its empire to confirm, as with Lyotard’s concept of the self-supporting metanarrative, its idea of itself as essentially imperial. Hannah Arendt writes that “the most dangerous concept of nationalism, the idea of ‘national mission,’ was especially strong in England”¹⁹ at this time because, as historian and cultural critic Tom Nairn notes, “Great Britain was quite unusually and

¹⁸ Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive* (London: Verso, 1993). 3.

¹⁹ Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harvest, 1973). 182.

structurally dependent upon external relations tied up with its empire.”²⁰ In my analysis, I follow this critical consensus that Britain’s national identity is inextricable from a historical sensibility of Britain as an imperial ruler. Again, Arendt notes in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) that Great Britain had to construct a coherent national character because

. . . the British Isles were completely separated from the surrounding world by natural frontiers and England as a nation had to devise a theory of unity among people who lived in far-flung colonies beyond the seas, separated from the mother-country by thousands of miles. (181)

Inventing a compelling vision of national identity was essential if the British Empire’s political and commercial aims were to proceed. During what Nairn calls “a pseudo-revolutionary chain of events” in 1970s Britain—events which continued into the 1980s and which coincided with the literary productions of the Raj Revival—such coherency was similarly desirable. Britain’s lost empire meant lost international prominence, with the United States and the then-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics taking Britain’s place as global superpowers. In response, Thatcherite Britain “stressed” an “uncompromisingly British Union . . . as never before.”²¹ In Chapter V, I explore how the Raj Revivalists promote this union with images drawn from the Raj novel genre. This move has been noted in studies of how the “heritage industry,” which sprang up in Thatcherite Britain during the 1980s, venerated Britain’s cultural history (architectural; archeological; artistic) even as it placed historical objects under governmental control and policed access to them.²² As with Thatcher’s Falkland Islands rhetoric, analyzed in detail in Chapter V, the Raj Revival fictions join the heritage movement in scripting British identity and glorifying aspects of the nation’s character and history that support an image of ongoing imperial might. Analyzing

²⁰ Tom Nairn, *The Break-Up of Britain*, 2nd ed. (Altona: Common Ground, 2003). 3.

²¹ Tom Nairn, “Introduction: 21st-Century Hindsight,” in *The Break-Up of Britain*, 2nd ed. (Altona: Common Ground, 2003). xiv.

²² I reference Patrick Wright’s *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain* (1985) and Robert Hewison’s *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline* (1987) in this description.

the Raj novel genre, explicating the relationship of the Raj novels to the Raj Revival texts and films, and exploring the ties between the Raj Revival and Thatcherite politics shows how the politically motivated fashioning of national identity is repeatedly carried out through the deployment of Raj novel tropes and themes—even after the practical end of empire.

English vs. British: A Vocabulary of Identity

Before delving further into the theoretical genesis of my project, it is necessary to pause and comment on my choice of the descriptor “British,” rather than “English,” in my discussion of British national identity in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. The two signifiers have a contentious legacy, as the terms “England” and/or “English” historically were used to represent the entirety of what is today referred to as Great Britain (England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland). In part through the colonial project, however, the idea of an overarching “Britishness” came to serve as a means of ameliorating potential discord and masking power differentials among Great Britain’s member countries. Krishan Kumar argues in *The Making of English National Identity* (2003) that at the heights of imperialism in the mid to late nineteenth century, “[a]ll British peoples, whether at home or ‘abroad’” saw themselves “as members of a single imperial nation. The flow of influence was two-way, even though the English nation was the inspiring and guiding spirit” (36). Kumar traces the formation of a “Britishness” meant to “override, or at least accompany, Englishness” from the 1707 Act of Union with Scotland forward to the heights of Victorian Empire.²³ Many major colonial policy texts, such as J.R. Seeley’s lecture series, *The Expansion of England* (1883), thus advocate for the use of terms such as “Greater Britain” to define the British imperial entity (11-12; 85-89). Peter Mandler links such attempts to debates in the late 1820s over the 1801 union with Ireland, which “only riveted

²³ Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). 36. Chapter VI of Kumar’s work, “The making of British identity” (121-74), traces this historical progression in detail.

individual liberty and diversity more centrally onto the self-definition of the English in order to make their traits a more plausible core for a plural multi-national Britishness.”²⁴ The use of “British” to subsume territories into Great Britain’s internal and overseas imperial holdings was countered by the continued prioritization of English economic, political, and cultural interests, to the detriment of the United Kingdom’s other constituent members. This antipathy, which continues today, was felt strongly in the 1970s/1980s under Thatcher, whose unpopularity in Scotland and Wales led her Conservative government to test potentially unpopular policies such as the poll tax there.²⁵ Hugh Kearney writes in *Ireland: Contested Ideas of Nationalism and History* (2007) that:

A government . . . which aims at preserving the United Kingdom needs to think long and hard about the nature of “British identity.” That there is confusion in high places emerged in Mrs. Thatcher’s speeches when she happily intermingled “British” and “English” history. There was also uncertainty in the setting up of a national history curriculum, which turned out to be not “national” in the sense of “British” but more narrowly national in the sense of Welsh, English, and “Northern Ireland.” Scotland was not even included. (152)

Kearney highlights the ongoing importance of distinguishing between “English” and “British,” and the need to acknowledge that even in the contemporary moment, as the so-called “national” history curriculum he describes shows, the terms are not equivalent. Jenny Sharpe adds that “English” and “England” historically “designate a national culture that brings the ‘Celtic fringe’ of Scotland, Wales, and Cornwall under its hegemony.”²⁶ Again, it is this sense of England exerting power over the other members of the United Kingdom that the more politically sensitive current usage of “British” works to reduce. By eliminating specific reference to one part of the British Isles as reductive shorthand for the others, “British” is an ostensibly more open referent.

²⁴ Peter Mandler, *The English National Character* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2006). 33.

²⁵ Earl Reitan’s *The Thatcher Revolution* (2003) discusses the poll tax (87-93) and deals with the havoc wreaked on Scotland by Thatcher’s policies on 151-53.

²⁶ Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993). 167n.

Holding in mind the contested, politicized nature of the terms “English” and “British,” then, complicates my readings of the Raj texts. The Anglo-Indian writers I examine often use “English” to describe what is today termed “British”; or, like Thatcher’s speeches, the Raj novels “happily intermingle” the terms, referring to all characters from the British Isles as English regardless of other identity markers (Scottish or Irish names; back stories which incorporate origin in Scotland, Ireland, or Wales). To the Raj novelists, “English” can mean a white man or woman from any part of Great Britain, molded by inherited traditions such as the monarchy, the Protestant ethos, and a rigid hierarchical class structure. Colonial disputes with Irish nationalists and the repeated insinuation by the English that Scottish and Welsh persons were lesser players in British history—issues embedded in the movement between “English” and “British”—are thus raised, but not addressed, by the Raj novels. Slippage between the terms also occurs in real-life Anglo-Indian descriptions, as when Lady Frances Smythe shifts from “British” to “English” when discussing the life of a *memsahib*: ““British women in India were like British women anywhere else,”” but in cities wives ““lived a life far more English than the English.””²⁷ Even critical literature on the Raj incorporates this back-and-forth in terminology. Summarizing arguments about Kipling’s *Kim* by critic John McClure, Parama Roy writes in *Indian Traffic*: “It has been said . . . that the project of this novel is to naturalize the Englishman in India, or at least to naturalize British control of India” (85). In *Ideologies of the Raj*, Thomas Metcalfe writes of the Indian Civil Service that Indians “had to succeed in an examination framed to suit the British . . . educational system. ‘Many of the Native Civilians thus selected,’ Hunter concluded rather extravagantly, ‘are more English in thought and feeling than Englishmen themselves’” (207).

²⁷ Qtd. in Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 213. Lady Smyth was born in India (Quetta) in 1908 and spent her childhood there; she returned to India in 1925 and wed two Indian army officers before leaving in 1942. She was stationed variously in Bangalore, Poona, Allahabad, Bakloh, Amritsar, Lahore, and Rawalpindi (*Plain Tales* 271).

Here, Metcalfe uses “British” while the quoted material supplies “English”; this pattern of critical (and Anglo-Indian) usage is replicated in my argument, which uses “British” rather than “English” in all applicable instances but direct quotes.

My choice of “British” is not meant to invalidate the resistance that universalizing descriptors with an inherently prejudicial history (as “English”) properly provoke; but as with the terms “Mutiny” versus “Sepoy Rebellion,” this study attempts to capture and analyze trajectories of thought present in the Raj novel genre and Raj Revival works. The Raj writers use the term “English” as synonymous and interchangeable with “British”. This may be due to the ongoing Victorian attempts, described by Kumar, to interpose British as the preferred descriptor; as Kearney writes, a “prime minister appealing to ‘the British people’ is appealing to a sense of national identity which may have been stronger in the heyday of the British empire than it is today.”²⁸ In line with this mode of thinking, I read the identity model the Raj writers construct as one of “British national character”. The terminology shifts eclipsed by this choice evoke Ernest Renan’s claim in “What Is a Nation?” (1882) that “[f]orgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation” (13). To understand how the Raj Revivalists, writing in the self-defined British 1970s/1980s, found the material to recreate their nation in the model of the Raj authors requires “forgetting,” as the Revivalists did, the contested movement away from “English” as a blanket descriptor for persons from the British Isles. However, such references on my part are not meant to be less than reflexive about the complexity of the terminological shift, nor about its ideological ramifications.

²⁸ Hugh Kearney, *Ireland* (New York: New York UP, 2007). 152.

Why Raj Novels Matter: Generating the Inquiry

In his introduction to *Nation and Narration* (1990), Homi Bhabha argues that the inherent instabilities of the modern nation are qualities best explored through links to the unstable process of narrative construction. Bhabha queries the consequences when contestable narratives are situated as essential to national belonging:

If the ambivalent figure of the nation is a problem of its transitional history, its conceptual indeterminacy, its wavering between vocabularies, then what effect does this have on narratives and discourses that signify a sense of “nationness”: the *heimlich* pleasures of the hearth, the *unheimlich* terror of the space or race of the Other; the comfort of social belonging, the hidden injuries of class; the customs of taste, the powers of political affiliation; the sense of social order . . . the *langue* of the law and the *parole* of the people. (*Nation and Narration* 2)

Bhabha’s queries weave together a series of intersections between individual and nation, between discrete fictions and metanarratives, and between colonizer and colonial “other,” whose specific manifestations I articulate in my analysis of the Raj novel genre and the Raj Revival. In referencing “*langue*” and “*parole*,” Bhabha invokes post-structural critiques of unstable narrative utterance. These terms, taken from the language theory of Ferdinand de Saussure, juxtapose the specific individual utterance (*parole*) with the overwhelming linguistic system into which that utterance inserts itself (*langue*). As with the Raj fictions providing one specific component of the British metanarrative of imperial identity, Bhabha’s concept of discursive nation construction as fitting discrete speech act into linguistic law bespeaks the ideological power I attribute to the Raj novel genre’s fictions of Anglo-Indian character. Bhabha’s reference to an “*unheimlich*” terror of the “Other” in the colonial space is similarly useful for its invocation of Sigmund Freud’s “The Uncanny,” which diagnoses *unheimlich* as a sense of profound unsettling spurred by the vision of one’s double or doppelganger.²⁹ The Raj novel genre fictions, and later, the Raj Revival texts, confront in the space of the colonial encounter persons who threaten to upset the discourse of

²⁹ Sigmund Freud, *The Uncanny* (New York: Penguin, 2003).

British “race” superiority I have been describing. The Raj novelists’ attempts to discursively contain this unsettledness with dominating fictional visions of Anglo-Indian ideality trampling across the “space or race of the Other” again shows the ways in which fiction conveys an ideological message of containment or control when put in service of a nation-building agenda.

It is my argument that the ability of the Raj and Raj Revival authors to contain the pitfalls of *unheimlich* sensation endows even seemingly simple love stories with theoretical heft. Set apart geographically from the British Isles, the “narratives and discourses” of the Raj “signify a sense of ‘nationness’” in which Anglo-India is not only constitutive but potentially directive, modeling a form of character that supersedes Britishness formed outside India. This theorization builds upon the work of Benedict Anderson, whose seminal *Imagined Communities* (1983) attributes the rise of national consciousness to the birth of print culture. Anderson writes that “[n]ationalism has to be understood, by aligning it not with self-consciously held political ideologies, but with large cultural systems that preceded it, out of which - as well as against which - it came into being.”³⁰ The Raj authors illuminate a subset within the (here, British) cultural systems Anderson describes, in part because these artists do not necessarily or consistently articulate “self-consciously held political ideologies”. Part of the interest of the Raj novels lies in their frivolity, in what can be read as a solipsistic focus on banal aspects of Anglo-Indian experience. Sara Jeannette Duncan’s *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib* (1893) devotes nearly twenty pages to the purchase of furniture in 1800s Calcutta; Maud Diver’s novels about the heroic Desmond family diverge frequently into rhapsodic asides about the glories of the Himalayas. But in the minute examination of daily Anglo-Indian reality and environment, and in the explicit situating of that reality against Britishness at “Home,” the Raj authors (and the Raj Revivalists, in imitation) encapsulate a discrete idea of what British national character might

³⁰ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 3rd ed. (London: Verso, 2006). 12.

– or should – be. The Raj novel and the Raj Revival works thus demand consideration amongst ongoing efforts to understand the formation of contemporary British nationhood, and to grasp the ramifications of imperialism’s constitutive role in Britain’s national mythologies.

Other intellectual antecedents to my study include works such as Deirdre David’s *Rule Britannia* (1995), which explores how “the textual labor of empire” meant major cultural moments in 1950s/1960s Britain were “partially created, along with innumerable other cultural moments in the history of Britannia’s ruling of the waves, by the textual construction of empire to be found in Victorian writing.”³¹ David’s study focuses on the period of East India Company rule and concludes before the establishment of the Raj, but she anticipates the connections I draw between colonial and postcolonial British literature and society, and between Victorian literature of empire and the constitution of British national consciousness.³² Similarly, Patrick Brantlinger argues in *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914* (1990) that literature of empire and empire are conjoined: “Adventure and domesticity, romance and realism, are the seemingly opposite poles of a single system of discourse, the literary equivalents of imperialism abroad and liberal reform at home.”³³ Even in the 1950s and 1960s, David writes, “a vastly diminished empire continued to define metropolitan existence.”³⁴ Enabled by Brantlinger’s “single system of discourse,” I describe a feedback loop between Raj novel narratives of ideal British character formed through interaction with Homi Bhabha’s “*unheimlich*” Other in India, and British reading audiences at “Home”. The following analysis of how Raj novels written

³¹ Deirdre David, *Rule Britannia* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995). 4; xiii.

³² However, as the subtitle of David’s work (“Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing”) indicates, her focus is on literature by women and the impact of these fictions on the constitution of Victorian and postcolonial female selfhood. While I analyze the images of female identity promoted by Victorian and early twentieth-century authors, my work is equally invested in what is seen as constituting British masculinity and in examining how hierarchies of gender are used in relation to hierarchies of race to police the Anglo-Indian and Indian communities.

³³ Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988). 12.

³⁴ Deirdre David, *Rule Britannia* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995). 3.

subsequent to those studied by David participate in this process augments a rich body of critical work describing how British character in its contemporary manifestation evolved—and how that construct continues to be politically mobilized and developed today.

With regards to audience, David writes: “The wealth derived from empire served to create a curious and mainly middle-class reading public” that eagerly consumed Victorian novels which “created that nation-defining construction on which the sun was never to set: the British empire” (*Rule Britannia* 4). In Chapters II and III, I delve more deeply into the creation of a middle-class British reading public to make the claim that, in reading about Empire, British audiences imbibed ideological messages about how to live out ideal Britishness on the Anglo-Indian model, even without practical experience living and working under the Raj. This already-present separation between “Home” audiences and the Raj authors creates a space from which the 1970s/1980s Raj Revivalists reached back into Britain’s past, nostalgically recreating an empire which was, by the time they wrote, finished. Scholarly work on how early “national tales” facilitated the Irish independence movement is also relevant to my discussion. Katie Trumpener’s *Bardic Nationalism* (1997) explores how literature produced specific notions of what it meant to be Irish (or Indian; or Anglo-Indian), and details how such nascent national categories were negotiated in relation to the overarching identity of the colonizer (Britain). “On one level empires function by fixing a hierarchy of place and by instituting laws that keep colonized subjects in their respective places,” Trumpener argues. “[O]n another level they function only by perpetual motion” (244). Such motion includes the export of national tales to the colonies, where they offer the colonized subject a mode of discursive resistance against the colonial power.³⁵ In dealing with Anglo-India, I explore the complexity suggested when national tales are written by authors who situate themselves in service of the colonial power instead of in

³⁵ Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1997). 249-59.

opposition to it. That is, the Raj novel genre crafts national tales of Anglo-India to help consolidate an idea of Britishness that supports, rather than resists, imperial rule.

Again, the issue of audience is crucial: the avid consumption by readers of works as varied as Irish national tales and Raj love stories enabled the rapid spread of specific myths of national identity during a period in which, due to the presence of Britain's imperial territories, those identities were hotly contested. A specific discourse emerges from the contact zone existence of the Raj writers; this discourse, in its circulation amongst the reading publics of Britain and Anglo-India, justifies the continuation of the political experiences that give it birth. Many Raj novelists demonstrate a canny awareness of this exchange. Duncan's *Set in Authority* (1906), for example, makes the fashioning and emulation of national character through fiction a topic of humor. Anglo-Indian memsahib Mrs. Biscuit consumes novels about Anglo-India but is disappointed by real life there, reaching the "conclusion that either Pilaghur was far from being a 'typical' Indian station, or the novelists were simply not to be trusted" (87). Or in Alice Perrin's *The Woman in the Bazaar* (1914), wise memsahib Mrs. Greaves mourns the misapprehensions spread when foolish young women bring tales of Anglo-Indian life back to audiences at "Home":

"She is a typical example of the kind of girl who deteriorates rapidly in India; and then people at home, who won't try to understand, think India is to blame. She would have been just the same in England, or anywhere else . . . [but] she will probably go home and talk about her servants and her carriage and her men friends, and help to spread the false impression that out here all English women live like princesses and are nothing but brainless butterflies. It is such a mistake!" (79)

In moments such as these, Raj novel genre texts reflect a savvy understanding of the reciprocity between fictional productions, the Anglo-Indian character and national identity celebrated in their novels, the negative stereotypes their works reject, and the response such imagery generates in the British Isles. The Raj novels thus help to set and center the jewel in Britain's crown.

This ability to compel contemporary audiences has been well attested by prior scholars of the Raj novel genre, but as many authors in my study remain largely unknown, career highlights should be noted. As an eminent modernist, Forster is famous more widely than the other Raj writers I analyze, and with the exception of *A Passage to India*, his novels do not depict the Anglo-Indian experience. Kipling, then, was arguably the most famous Raj writer, in that the novels and short stories for which he achieved and maintained his fame center almost entirely on the British Raj and on Anglo-Indian experiences. Kipling was also the first English author to be awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature (1907). His books were bestsellers, particularly his children's fictions *The Jungle Book* (1894), *Kim* (1901), and *Just-So Stories* (1902), which remain popular in book and film form to this day. His poetry, particularly imperial odes such as "Recessional" (1897), is quoted repeatedly in descriptions of the British Empire.

Flora Annie Steel's immensely popular Mutiny novel, *On the Face of the Waters* (1896), was similarly influential, achieving circulation of half a million copies in less than two decades.³⁶ Moreover, newspaper and magazine notices selected by publishers for inclusion in Steel's flap copy introduce a recurrent theme in Raj novel promotion and marketing. The selected reviews repeatedly cite famous Raj novel genre writers as authorizing influences. In the case of Steel, such references are to Kipling; for later Raj writers, Steel herself is a touchstone. The validation of Raj novel works by reference to previous Anglo-Indian authors, and the further emphasis on accurate knowledge in reviews selected by publishers, situates the Raj authors as themselves characteristic of the knowledgeable Anglo-Indians celebrated in the fictions that comprise the

³⁶ "Noted Writer is Held Up as 'Senile,'" *The New York Times*, 14 March 1914. Steel was a prominent figure in the women's suffrage movement; this article describes a late-life stopover at New York City *en route* to Jamaica, during which authorities attempted to block Steel's entry at Ellis Island, claiming she was senile. Political involvement was characteristic of Steel. As Violet Powell's biography, *Flora Annie Steel: Novelist of Empire* (1981) notes, portions of Steel's 22 years in Anglo-India were spent working on educational reform, particularly education for women. Steel served as a school inspector and helped settle disputes in the Punjab, where her husband worked for the ICS.

genre. Like their characters, the Raj novelists are seen as “of” India, organized into a specialized group distinguished by long residence in the subcontinent. A feedback loop is thus established, in which the Raj authors’ lives are seen as bearing out the imagery promulgated in their novels.

For example, the *Chicago Times* wrote that Steel “knows the life of which she writes to its veriest details . . . she has a flow of language and sympathy,” while *The Spectator* excerpt notes that “[w]e have read Mrs. Steel’s book with ever-increasing surprise and admiration . . . We know that none who lived through the Mutiny will lay it down without a gasp of admiration, and believe that the same emotion will be felt by thousands to whom the scenes are depicted.”³⁷ Kipling comparisons are numerous: reviewing Steel’s short story, “Lal” (1894), a critic wrote that “[t]his story is either by Kipling or Diabolus,”³⁸ and *The Daily Chronicle*’s laudatory review of *On the Face of the Waters* called the novel a “picture, glowing with color, of the most momentous and dramatic event in all our Empire’s later history. Mrs. Steel has challenged comparison with Mr. Rudyard Kipling and she need not fear the result.” In general, critics agreed, Steel “knew far more about [India] than was considered necessary for a woman.”³⁹ Steel’s authority is thus cast so absolutely that it can, as in reviews for *On the Face of the Waters*, compel even those who experienced the historical events to accept Steel’s version.

The other female Raj authors did not enjoy Steel’s enormous volume of sales, but their novels were popular and generated enthusiastic reviews over decades of production; these reviews, again, are culled by publishers to emphasize themes of Anglo-Indian authority and

³⁷ Reviews qtd in *Voices in the Night: A Chromatic Fantasia* 433.

³⁸ Qtd in Violet Powell, *Flora Annie Steel: Novelist of India* (London: Heinemann, 1981). 71. Publicity materials for Steel’s subsequent novel of India, *The Hosts of the Lord* (1900), claim “Mrs. Steel, after Mr. Rudyard Kipling, is the greatest novelist of India . . . No writer has shown more vividly the contrast between the civilized life of the Anglo-Indian and the strange native world of ancient fears and famine around him” (qtd. in *The Hosts of the Lord* 387).

³⁹ Margaret MacMillan, *Women of the Raj* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1988). 206.

community. Early Raj novelist Bithia Mary (B.M.) Croker was compared to Kipling and Steel⁴⁰ (“Mrs. Croker has achieved a secure foothold in that temple of Anglo-Indian fiction whereof Rudyard Kipling is the high priest,” declared *The Athenaeum*). The *Morning Post* called her stories “among the best of their kind. The author knows equally well how to write of Anglo-India or purely native life.” *The Scotsman* said Croker wrote “from a peculiar knowledge of the life [her stories] describe.” Later Raj novelist Alice Perrin is described similarly.⁴¹ Her 1934 obituary in *The Times* states: “Mrs. Perrin was a realist, and all her work bears the stamp of sincerity and love of truth which characterized her as an individual . . . the reader feels keenly the heat, the dust . . . and all the sights and sounds and smells of the unchanging East.”⁴² *The Guardian* called Perrin’s Anglo-Indian novel *The Waters of Destruction* (1905) “unforced and natural . . . the characters, English and native, are described with humor and sympathy, and without exaggeration; while the whole is grouped into a homogenous, truthful picture.” The emphasis in publisher-selected notices on Croker and Perrin’s accuracy (and the reiteration of the stereotypes about India their novels perpetuate in items such as the *Times*’ obituary), along with the contemporary popularity of their works, speaks to a sense that the Raj novels gave a reliable accounting of Anglo-Indian life—a sense yet more pronounced in the promotion of Maud Diver.

⁴⁰ *The Times*, discussing Croker’s short stories, also compared her to Steel: “Her ‘Village Tales’ are so good that they bracket her, in our judgment, with Mrs. F.A. Steel in comprehension of native Indian life and character.” Benita Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries* usefully examines claims of authoritative knowledge in nineteenth and early twentieth-century analyses of Steel’s works; all reviews of Croker are quoted in her later story collection, *Jungle Tales* (London: Holden & Hardingham, 1913). np.

⁴¹ Perrin was also compared to Kipling, both in the financial and creative arenas. Her contemporary and friend, author Arnold Bennett, wrote that Perrin’s early Indian story collection, *East of Suez*, “sold well, & brought her into prominence. With Kipling, Barrie . . . Doyle, Jacobs, & sundry others she is an example of a reputation built on short stories” (*Letters of Arnold Bennett* 105-6). The success to which Bennett refers led to Perrin being granted a then-hefty advance of £150 for her novel of India, *A Free Solitude* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1907). Reviewers linked *East of Suez* with Kipling’s oeuvre; *Punch* wrote that “for graphic description, sharp, incisive sketches of character, and effective dramatic situation” the collection was “second only to the ‘Plain Tales’ of Rudyard Kipling; while two or three of them run even the best of Kipling’s uncommonly close” (qtd. in *A Free Solitude* n. pag).

⁴² “Mrs. Alice Perrin,” *The Times*, 15 Feb. 1934. 9.

Diver, a latter-day champion of Anglo-India and the Raj, campaigned passionately against the end of empire in fiction and nonfiction works alike; her writing has a particular afterlife among the 1970s/1980s Raj Revivalists. In reviews drawn from “Home” and Anglo-Indian sources alike, her publishers promoted her as espousing the truth of a “better” imperial self. *The Athenaeum* wrote that “Mrs. Diver excels in representing the better side of Anglo-Indian life, in bringing vividly before us its strenuousness, self-sacrifice and loyalty”; Anglo-Indian newspaper *The Pall-Mall Gazette* (at which Kipling worked during his “seven years hard”⁴³ in India) wrote that Diver “presents, unostentatiously, the most inspiring aspect of Empire-building . . . [She] has few equals among contemporary writers.”⁴⁴ As a literary author, Sara Jeannette Duncan received similar praise. In part because of her origins in British North America (named the Dominion of Canada five years after Duncan was born in Brantford, Ontario; her novel, *The Imperialist* [1904] is set in Canada), she has enjoyed a livelier critical afterlife than many Raj authors. Two biographies (Thomas Tausky’s *Sara Jeannette Duncan: Novelist of Empire* [1980] and *A Different Point of View: Sara Jeannette Duncan* [1991] by Misao Dean) and numerous articles by literary critics have been published analyzing her work. Of her Anglo-Indian works, contemporary reviewers praised Duncan as “always entertaining when she writes about India . . . her accounts of Anglo-Indian official society are extremely interesting and instructive.”⁴⁵ *The Athenaeum* called Duncan’s *Set in Authority* (1906) a story “about India and the possibility of carrying our beloved doctrines of liberalism into practice in that strange land . . . In with the politics is wound a story of men and women, of love and loss

⁴³ Drawn from a chapter heading in Kipling’s posthumously-published autobiography, *Something of Myself* (Edinburgh: R & R Clark, 1935).

⁴⁴ Reviews qtd. in *Candles in the Wind* 393, 394. The reviews discuss, respectively, *Captain Desmond, V.C.* (1907) and *The Great Amulet* (1908), from Diver’s “Frontier Trilogy” about heroic Anglo-Indian dynasty, the Desmonds.

⁴⁵ “Review of *Set in Authority*,” *The Spectator* 96, 28 June 1906. 989.

and hopes and fears.”⁴⁶ Here again, a virtue of the Raj novels is their ability to compel audiences to a political viewpoint through the use of accessible genres (the domestic novel, humor, the short story). The praise Duncan wins for exporting “doctrines of liberalism” in tales of “love and loss and hopes and fears” exemplifies this mode of sympathetic and popular appeal.

En masse, analysis of the Raj novel genre and the unique images of Anglo-Indian life and ideal British character, as well as the stereotypes of Indians and “Indianness” which these works produce and perpetuate, comprise Chapters I, II, III, and IV. Chapter I extends the theoretical groundwork for my project, giving a history of the British Raj and exploring the relationship of the Anglo-Indian community to the British nation more largely. I then provide a separate, in-depth history of the 1857 Mutiny and the outpouring of “Mutiny novel” literature that followed this event. Having established these contextual frames, I argue in my analysis of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker (with Rudyard Kipling, the earliest Raj novelists surveyed) that Steel and Croker present a less complicated vision of British imperial authority than the Raj writers that follow them. In so doing, their portrayal of British character draws heavily on the tradition of the Mutiny novel, and achieves its straightforward casting of Anglo-Indian ideality by deploying tropes of Mutiny narrative, such as assertions about the widespread assault of British women by Indian men and the supposedly inherent brutality of India and Indians.⁴⁷

Chapter II argues for the development of the Raj novel genre as a distinct body of work with a unique instigating generic exigence. In making this claim, I provide a definition of genre

⁴⁶ “Review of *Set in Authority*,” *The Atheneum* 1:791, 30 June 1906.

⁴⁷ These assertions, scholars and historians agree, had little basis in reality. Much Mutiny-related violence involved retributive actions carried out by the British; in one particularly brutal example, captured mutineers were tied to the front of cannons, which were then fired (see Sharpe’s *Allegories of Empire* 76-78). One of Sharpe’s main arguments in *Allegories of Empire* is that images of violated white female bodies were constructed specifically to justify this violence on the part of the British (77). Astrid Erll argues similarly in “Re-writing as Re-Visioning: Modes of Representing the ‘Indian Mutiny’ in British Novels, 1857-2000” (2006); Erll adds that the constructedness of rape and murder imagery was noted in Britain as early as 1859, a year after the Mutiny ended (164).

that incorporates a brief history of the novel's development in the early nineteenth century, and explores changes in reader perceptions of their relationships to fiction and fictional characters at this time. As I attribute the formulation of the Raj novel genre's tropes, themes, and ideologies to Kipling, his short stories and novel *Kim* (1901) are read in detail here. I then explore how Sara Jeannette Duncan's later Raj novels present a complex expansion of the Anglo-Indian character Kipling describes, and how Duncan thematizes the difficulty of conveying images of Anglo-Indian ideality to uncomprehending British audiences at "Home".

In Chapter III, I explore the consolidation of the Raj novel genre through the works of Alice Perrin and Maud Diver, and the critique of sedimented Raj novel genre themes, plots, and character descriptions as carried out by E.M. Forster in *A Passage to India*. Perrin and Diver's novels, which I argue are representative of the bulk of Raj novel genre output, meld domestic scenes and political elements with genre conventions I argue are established in Kipling. Changes in Diver and Perrin's depiction of Anglo-Indian character reveal a political situation in flux: as Indian independence became a reality, the methods by which Raj novelists idealized Anglo-Indians shifted, casting the community as ever more knowledgeable about and sympathetic to India's "needs". Having discussed these shifts, I read Forster's *A Passage to India* as a critique of elements specific to the Raj novel, and argue that the inclusion of Raj novel elements in this text shows the power of the genre's assumptions amongst British reading audiences.

Chapter IV turns from an examination of how Britishness is depicted in the Raj novel genre to a consideration of how Indian character and the Indian environment are treated in these texts. I argue that specific, recurrent racist stereotypes allow the Raj novelists to further elevate their ideal of Anglo-Indian personal character, and to define themselves as a nascent national community apart from the Indians whom they ostensibly serve. This is the most studied aspect of

the nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj novels, and this chapter offers in part a review of scholarship in this area, citing the work of scholars such as Benita Parry, Nancy Paxton, and Jenny Sharpe. My conclusions focus on the connection between racism in the Raj novel genre and the perpetuation of Anglo-India as an ideal for British readers at “Home”; my central question in this chapter is: “How does the denigration of Indianness allow a greater or more extensive celebration of Anglo-India’s ‘Britishness’?” Through close reading, I posit the techniques by which this subtle uplifting of Anglo-India’s community takes place.

Having catalogued the traits that comprise ideal British character in the nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj novel genre, and having analyzed how racist depictions of Indians allow the upholding of that character as an ideal, Chapter V moves forward in time to the 1970s and 1980s. Here I examine the political milieu of Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government, with a focus on the 1982 Falkland Islands War, and a rhetorical analysis of statements by Thatcher during the conflict. Thatcher’s mode of argument, and her particular reliance on the poetry of Kipling to evoke a grand age of British imperial achievement, shows a continuation of the model of national character developed in my first four chapters. Chapter V then turns to an analysis of the Raj Revival, and closely reads notable texts from this period. I use historical documentation to demonstrate how Thatcher’s Falklands rhetoric and the books, films, and TV series of the Raj Revival participate in consensus building around a Conservative agenda of retrograde British imperial identity. Examination of Raj Revival texts shows the ways in which these works are specifically indebted to the Raj novels for their conception of the character traits that elevate Anglo-Indian identity; those traits, along with the Raj novel genre’s racist attitudes, are recalled in an effort to reassert Britain’s ongoing imperial greatness in the face of the Empire’s actual dissolution. The theoretical frame for this chapter is what Paul Gilroy calls

Postcolonial Melancholia (2005)—a national feeling of nostalgia for a lost period of British ascendance. My conclusion summarizes these ideas, and suggests avenues for future research.

In sum, then, my dissertation argues that the Raj novel genre sees heroic Anglo-Indians perfecting traits of British character in circumstances impossible for British persons at “Home” to emulate. In the absence of empire, the Raj Revivalists take up this ideal, developing more complex justifications for British imperial rule and more elaborate apologies for its loss to the British national imaginary. Throughout, I return to the idea of Britain as a national community that conceptualizes its global identity through a metanarrative of imperial adventure and rule. Alex Inkeles and Daniel Levinson’s *National Character: A Psycho-Social Perspective* (1997), which gives a history of academic discourses on national character, posits the term as determined by “modal” or recurrent characteristics across a national body. National character’s components “are *relatively enduring personality characteristics . . .* character traits, modes of dealing with impulses and affects, conceptions of self,”⁴⁸ Inkeles and Levinson conclude. In the Raj Revival, the personality traits catalogued in the Raj novel genre achieve the cultural and political currency for which nineteenth and early twentieth-century Anglo-Indian authors agitate. Now inextricable from Britain’s conception of itself as an imperial actor on the world stage, Anglo-Indian character traits venerated in the Raj novel genre offer Britain succor in the post-imperial era.

When, in my senior year of undergraduate studies, I began to read M.M. Kaye’s novels through a postcolonial lens, my first response was the somewhat kneejerk: “I can’t believe I enjoyed these books; they’re so racist.” Now, many years later, by tracing the origin of Kaye’s imagery to the Raj novel genre and exploring the historical and cultural exigence that led the Raj novelists to doggedly promote an ideal of Anglo-Indian character, I attempt to delve into both

⁴⁸ Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, *National Character* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1997). 13. Emphasis in original.

parts of my response: enjoyment as well as repulsion. The Raj novel and Raj Revival fictions succeed because the imagery they perpetuate is, on one level, deeply appealing. The idea that Britain wanted to do well by its imperial subjects, that it sought not personal or economic gain but uplift for the Indians it ruled, has nostalgic allure. However, even a cursory examination of the aftereffects of this mythology—in ongoing racism, anti-immigrant violence, and battles over what Britishness is, was, and will be in future—undermines such sentimental impulses. Better understanding how the Raj was formative to Britishness will productively inform future readings of literary or political rhetoric that mines the history of Britain and India’s imperial relationship, particularly those works that use tropes and themes specific to the Raj novel genre.

II. New Rule(rs), New Character—Ideal Anglo-Indians in the Novels of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker

In May 1857, Indian sepoy and civilians rose up against the East India Company in a series of violent insurgencies which consumed the subcontinent for almost a year and led to the establishment of the British Raj, under whose auspices Britain's government ruled India directly. At midnight on August 15, 1947, the British Raj ended, giving way to an independent India and Pakistan. And in April 1982, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher took Great Britain to war against Argentina in a battle for control of the Falkland Islands, colonized by Britain in 1833. In this dissertation, I describe how connections between these disparate historical events can be found in the discursive productions of what I call the Raj novel genre, novels written by Anglo-Indian authors between 1858 and 1947, and the Raj Revival, novels and films produced in 1970s/1980s Britain. These texts are part of what I, following Jean-François Lyotard's definition of the term in *The Postmodern Condition* (1979), call the "metanarrative" of British imperial identity. This metanarrative claims that British national and cultural identity is determined by Britain's history as an imperial ruler, and by the stories and subjectivities created via Britain's experiences colonizing and living abroad in the colonies. A "metanarrative implying a philosophy of history is used to legitimate knowledge," Lyotard writes; in this legitimation, the dominant institutions governing the social bond are reified.⁴⁹ The British Empire is supported by narratives of imperial adventure whose plots, imagery, and ideology depend on the hegemonic institutions of power that direct and organize colonizing and colonized bodies in the imperial space.

In *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire* (1979), Martin Green writes "[t]he adventure tales that formed the light reading of Englishmen for two hundred years . . . [were] the energizing myth of English imperialism. They were, collectively, the story England told itself as it went to

⁴⁹ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984). xxiv.

sleep at night; and, in the form of its dreams, they charged England's will with the energy to go out into the world and explore, conquer, rule."⁵⁰ The following theorization of the Raj novel genre, with the definition I produce of Anglo-Indian personal character, community, and the relation of Anglo-Indian interests to the larger concept of British national character, explores how Green's "light reading" and "adventure tales" make ideological assertions about race and gender that charge an imperial nation's "will with the energy to go out into the world" and rule. Raj novel genre and Raj Revival fictions are, to use Lyotard's terms, "incorporated into the metanarrative of a subject that guarantees their legitimacy". Speaking generally, Lyotard adds that this subject is made representative of "humanity" largely; it is this expansion from individual narrative to a sense of greater homogenizing belonging that I emphasize in applying Lyotard's theory to the Raj novel genre. I read the subject as the British nation made synonymous with "humanity," in an attempt to lend ideological justification to the practical realities of excess and exploitation that comprise the colonial project. As subject, the British nation disseminates small-scale narratives (such as the Raj novels or Green's adventure tales) by which its founding mythologies are first constituted and then sustained. These narratives validate Britain's exertion of power in political conflicts ranging from the Mutiny to Indian independence to the Falklands.

The theory of a nation narrating its national self into being with which I deal draws upon postcolonial and postmodern theories of discursive subjectivity. In *Nation and Narration* (1990), Homi Bhabha writes that "[t]o encounter the nation *as it is written* displays a temporality of culture and social consciousness more in tune with the partial, overdetermined process by which textual meaning is produced through the articulation of difference in language" (2; emphasis Bhabha's). Language and nation each try to put inherently changeable entities in concrete form. As with the lack of fixity he assigns textual meaning production, Bhabha argues that real nations

⁵⁰ Martin Green, *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire* (New York: Basic Books, 1979). 3.

are impossibilities. Uncertain “temporality,” like the variability of language, exposes the constructed character of “nation” as deconstructive criticism undercuts an utterance’s claim to truth. We tell a story; we tell a nation. The similarity in these processes leads to slippage, and instances of narration emerge as compelling ideological utterances that encourage adherence to the nation they help create, confirm, and maintain. “Project and destiny,” Etienne Balibar writes, “are the two symmetrical figures of the illusion of national identity.”⁵¹ While such claims must be read in concert with the political realities defining Britain’s colonization of India, the figuring of national identity as predestined illusion which Balibar references allows Britain to rewrite economic exploitation as national mission. My analysis, in this respect, accords with that of scholars who argue national goals (project), and the sense of fated-ness (destiny) that accrues to those goals, garner power from narrative. Overtly constructed national identities derive strength from the illusive, yet still compelling, fictional form; this in turn allows the nation, seen as actor, to carry out actions which it inscribes as particular or constituent to its projected destiny.

To provide a justificatory rationale for its actions, moral or ethical sensibilities are often woven into national fables of preordained purpose. In *The Theory of the Novel* (1920), Georg Lukacs notes an overt ethical component in novelistic renderings: “ethic—the ethical intention—is visible in the creation of every detail and hence is, in its most concrete content, an effective structural element of the work.”⁵² I argue that this perception of ethical responsibility, constitutive of the novel broadly, motivates the nationalistic mission I ascribe in Chapter II to the Raj novel genre. Lukacs views the novel as a form that arises when the uncertain modern world springs up around the text; like Bhabha’s nations, novels fracture in the acknowledgement of their final inability to be commensurate with the reality they represent. But this instability does

⁵¹ Etienne Balibar, “The Nation Form: History and Ideology,” in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (New York: Verso, 1992). 86.

⁵² Georg Lukacs, *The Theory of the Novel*, trans. Anna Bostock (Boston: MIT P, 1974). 72.

not strip them of ideological power. Lennard Davis also links novels and ideological agendas, arguing that “novels are pre-organized systems of experience in which characters, actions, and objects have to mean something in relation to the culture in which the novel is written, and in relation to the readers who are in that culture.”⁵³ In my analysis of how the Raj and Raj Revival novels play a role in the construction of Britain’s national character, I integrate Lukacs’ theory of ethical intention as structural component of the novel with Davis’ argument that novels are understood in spaces of cultural interrelation. By constructing Anglo-Indians as ethical actors, the Raj novel genre writers produce a new cultural framework within which Britain may grasp and embrace its imperial enterprise. This embrace continues, more fervently, in the Raj Revival. With the end of the Raj comes further fictional construal of the importance of empire to Britain’s global identity, and the celebration of Anglo-Indian goodness as intrinsic to that identity.

Critical theories of how novels take a prescriptive role in British historical development and ideological change thus guide my close readings in Chapters I, II, and III. Here, I analyze Raj texts whose energizing role in the British imperial mission has not been considered in detail, or which have been read with regard to race or gender issues rather than to theories of Anglo-Indian identity construction. While certain Raj novels were overwhelmingly popular in their day, it is their afterlife, and specifically the afterlife of their image of British national character, upon which I focus my study. My linkage between the Raj and Raj Revival novels takes a diachronic understanding of literature’s impact on history, arguing that books and politics form relationships of influence over time. Further, in analyzing this linkage I develop the idea of a collective national unconscious to which the works of the Raj novelists and Raj Revivalists each contribute. Speaking of the individual psyche, Sigmund Freud writes: “What is forgotten is not extinguished but only ‘repressed’; its memory-traces are present in all their freshness, but they are isolated by

⁵³ Lennard Davis, *Resisting Novels* (New York: Methuen, 1987). 24.

‘counter-cathexes.’”⁵⁴ The unconscious mind, in Freud, continually represses the emotional charge carried by sentimental bonds; thwarted from overt resurgence, these powerful emotions, or “memory-traces,” reappear in subtle linguistic slips or fantasies—resurgences which I argue occur, on a broad level, in the fictions read here. As in studies like Paul Gilroy’s *Postcolonial Melancholia* (2005), I argue that Freudian processes of repression and reemergence take place on a national level. Peter Mandler, tracing the evolution of *The English National Character* (2006), argues that the titular concept “seeks to yoke real national differences based on a wide variety of experiences to a few key psychological traits to which those national characteristics may have no connection” (2). Integral to its coherence, the nation is conceived of as being or thinking like a human. Throughout my analysis, I query how an inchoate entity such as the nation, taken as the unstable, constructed object Bhabha describes, can be said to react in psychologically meaningful ways to phenomena such as loss.

To ground these larger arguments, in this chapter I establish a historical context for the terms and references used in this dissertation. An overview of the Raj, from its establishment in 1858 after the cessation of hostilities surrounding the Mutiny, to Indian independence in 1947, demarcates this period from the preceding centuries of British control. During the 1700s and 1800s, the East India Company oversaw British interests in India along primarily commercial lines. The Raj and the Company employed different modes of rule with different degrees of oversight from the British government; the ideological resonances of this difference alter the tone and content of the fictional works each era produced. The Raj also saw a more careful definition of the term “Anglo-Indian,” and I analyze here how this descriptor acquired greater political significance as the Anglo-Indian community grew. Finally, I give a separate, in-depth

⁵⁴ Sigmund Freud, *Moses and Monotheism*, trans. Katherine Jones (New York: Vintage, 1955). 121. In Freud, a cathexis is the investment of psychic or emotional energy in an object, person, or concept; a “counter-cathexis” is the prevention of such investment from developing, or the cessation of previously formed development.

history of the Indian Mutiny and an outline of the Mutiny novel form, which reached its peak of popularity in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This detail about the Mutiny and Mutiny literature frames my close reading of Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* (1896), *Voices in the Night – A Chromatic Fantasia* (1900), and *The Hosts of the Lord* (1900), and B.M. Croker's *Mr. Jervis* (1894). Steel was one of the most commercially successful Mutiny novelists; Croker, her contemporary, wrote many novels and short stories about Anglo-India while contributing, with *Mr. Jervis*, to the Mutiny novel oeuvre. I spotlight Steel and Croker because they are among the earliest Raj novelists to be both popular and well-reviewed, and because their novels exemplify the earliest incarnation of Raj novel character idealization through Mutiny novel tropes.

With respect to the development of Anglo-India as a nation within a nation, the analysis of nation-building as a discrete phenomenon formalized by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities* (1983) and Ernest Gellner in *Nations and Nationalism* (1983) directs my argument. This project explores the crafting of a national identity which attempts to dissociate itself from the practical fact of Britain's exploitative relationship with her colonies (David Cannadine notes a similar disconnect between "the British Empire as a social structure and hierarchical vision" and "the "realities of imperial power politics"⁵⁵ in *Ornamentalism* [2001]). I thus encounter the possibility of replicating the occlusion of race and gender difference for which postcolonial critics rightfully impugn the Raj writers. Gellner argues that

Generally speaking, nationalist ideology suffers from pervasive false consciousness. Its myths invert reality: it claims to defend folk culture while in fact it is forging a high culture; it claims to protect an old folk society while in fact helping to build up an anonymous mass society . . . Nationalism tends to treat itself as a manifest and self-evident principle, accessible as such to all men . . . when in fact it owes its plausibility and compelling nature only to a very special set of circumstances.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism* (London: Allen Lane, 2001). 144.

⁵⁶ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 2nd ed (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006). 119-20.

Understanding how the Raj novelists portray Anglo-India as a “national” community discrete from Britain and how Raj fictions merge idealization of Anglo-India with the metanarrative of British imperial identity requires a careful parsing of how they construct a particular form of “pervasive self-consciousness”. To make this connection, I build upon the work of critic David Carroll, who situates M.M. Bakhtin’s concept of monologic discourse, a series of utterances which do not admit the validity of the listener, as a form of Lyotard’s metanarrative. Carroll’s formulation is useful because Bakhtin sees monologic utterances always bounded by a constrictive field of national consciousness. Imperial Britain’s perception of Indian inferiority and unspeakability, augmented by the Raj novel genre and the Raj Revival, forms a monologic discursive field. At times “the language collective is regarded as a kind of collective personality, ‘the spirit of the people,’”⁵⁷ Bakhtin writes. Yet, geographic separation from Britain and the cultural inferiority assigned them by British persons from “Home” places Anglo-Indians outside participation in the “spirit” or personality defined by Britain’s imperial adventures. Anglo-India must articulate its collective identity, constantly negotiating its inclusion in the metanarrative of British imperial selfhood, with the Anglo-Indian subject valorized increasingly as counter to potential rejection by Britons at “Home”. “A metanarrative demands,” Carroll writes, “that all alternative narrative possibilities be repressed or subsumed into it; it is terroristic or totalitarian in the sense that it assigns every narrator, listener, and actor *a* place and makes each responsible for the place assigned to him.”⁵⁸ In the Raj novel genre, nineteenth and twentieth-century Raj writers dispute that place of assignment, presenting an alternate narrative that can be subsumed into the metanarrative only after its constituent power in Britain’s larger story is acknowledged.

⁵⁷ M.M. Bakhtin, “The Problem of Speech Genres,” in *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 2nd ed. (Austin: U of Texas P, 2004). 68.

⁵⁸ David Carroll, “Narrative, Heterogeneity, and the Question of the Political: Bakhtin and Lyotard,” in *The Aims of Representation*, ed. Murray Krieger. (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1987). 77. Emphasis Carroll’s.

To make this argument, I describe how the Raj novel genre and Raj Revival develop their own monologic discourse which excludes the colonized subject so as to venerate specific Anglo-Indian male and female personal character traits developed through duty performed on the subcontinent, my conception of character and its function being expanded in Chapter II.

Such a description risks replicating the mechanisms of exclusion by which the Raj novels police the imagined borders of their nation. However, detailed close reading is required because the ideological work of the Raj novels is implicit rather than explicit: that is, Raj novel models of British identity are presented in the course of seemingly straightforward romantic adventure tales. Benita Parry writes in *Delusions and Discoveries* (1972; 1998) that “[w]hen British rule over India in the late nineteenth century took on the ideology of an Anglo-Saxon mission to the dark peoples of the globe, the British-Indian encounter became a battle expressed as a political struggle and experienced as a psychic crisis” (30). This description clarifies the tri-partite task of analyzing how the Raj novels set ideal Anglo-Indian character as constituent to British national identity: “the ideology of an Anglo-Saxon mission”; political struggle; and psychic crisis are all implicated. Yet the three aspects are not easily isolated and do not appear discretely in each Raj novel. For instance, Flora Annie Steel emphasizes the ideology of Anglo-Saxon mission and political struggle at the expense of psychic crisis. What the Raj novels concur on is the idea that Anglo-Indian identity was distinct and describable, defined by specific, recurrent personality traits which made it superior to other forms of Britishness. For example, Parama Roy writes in *Indian Traffic* (1998) that Rudyard Kipling’s Anglo-Indians “may be said to ‘choose’ India in a manner not available to the native” (86). The selflessness and empowerment the Raj writers see in this choice is one of the elevating characteristics their texts assign the Anglo-Indian.

The following analyses attempt to categorize this and other traits assigned to the Anglo-Indian actor, while bearing in mind the theoretical pitfalls of setting up Anglo-India as an unquestioned 'national' ideal. Cautioning against hasty equation of the titular subjects in *Nation and Narration*, Simon During, in "Literature – Nationalism's other? The case for revision," urges critics to distinguish between "culturalism" and "nationalism" because the imperial project inflected the terms differently at different historical moments. During sees nationalism as the set of discursive practices which define and celebrate a nation-state or an individual's membership within that nation-state. Nationalism, he specifies, is a product of modernity.⁵⁹ Culturalism, while also a set of signifying behaviors that unites a group, pre-dates the nationalist concept. This distinction allows the Raj novel writers to dismiss the Indian desire for independence; these writers portray India as mired in a "primitive" culturalism that does not admit the modernity of nations. In a simultaneous move—one whose contradictory heft is not noted in the genre—the culturalism/nationalism divide allows the Raj writers to cast the imperial duties carried out by Anglo-Indians as inextricable from the development of British culture.

That is, the Raj novels backdate empire so that it figures in the pre-history of the British nation as an essential British cultural practice. "Imperialist thought," During writes, "possesses itself of culturalism because cultures are even more worth fighting for than nations; hierarchies of cultures seeming to fix identities, whereas hierarchies of nations merely [seem] to belong to history and politics" (139). The identity fixing During describes is, in large part, the Raj novel project. I thus establish a bridge between the nineteenth-century Raj texts, the selfhoods that emerge from them, and the recurrence of those images of selfhood in the late twentieth-century Raj Revival. Overlapping, yet separate, the spheres of culture and nation, and the moments at

⁵⁹ During does not specifically date his use of the term "modernity," but locates the concept roughly in the "early-nineteenth-century," a period in which he observes "a scene of individual cultures chasing after nationhood" (139).

which the two meet or diverge, are the point at which politically salient images of Britishness that yoke culture and nation appear. In *The Oxford History of the British Empire* (1999), Andrew Porter notes that in addition to its economic, diplomatic, and political impacts, “the possession and expansion of an Empire also markedly influenced Britain’s ‘cultural’ – that is, social, institutional, religious, and intellectual – development” (1). Being thus mindful of the linkage between culture and nation in the imperial context, my close readings tie character traits and Anglo-Indian cultural norms promoted by the Raj novelists (along rigid gender binaries, the theoretical implications of which are also discussed) to a vision of British national belonging.

It must be admitted that, while their subtext is intellectually productive, the Raj novels are by and large not artful literature, and the authors’ portrayals of race and gender are often distasteful to contemporary sensibilities.⁶⁰ Dismissing the claims of all but a few Raj works to literary excellence, Benita Parry dubs Anglo-Indian writing “a literature of bombastic self-advertisement and cloying self-pity in which [Anglo-Indians] featured as supermen, as marvels of efficiency and endurance, probity and moral excellence.”⁶¹ Yet, the close of Parry’s condemnation points to the space within which my project works, and to the necessity of close reading the Raj novels’ portrait of ideal British character as developed in Anglo-India. The Raj novelists’ influence comes in their ability to conjure up a slate of desirable personal qualities (such as those listed by Parry) and to “sell” those qualities so compellingly that artists working a century after revisit the Raj novel catalogue of character traits in detail. This exchange recalls Peter Mandler’s claim that national character develops when differences—presented in the Raj

⁶⁰ A concern examined in detail in Chapter IV of this work, which explores portrayals of Indians, and particularly portrayals of interracial romance, in the Raj novel genre. Chapter V briefly addresses the perpetuation of stereotypes particular to the Raj novel genre in the Raj Revival.

⁶¹ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries* (London: Allen Lane, 1972). 40. In Chapter II, I argue that Raj novels and short stories written by Rudyard Kipling and Sara Jeannette Duncan display a greater level of artistic craftsmanship; in Chapter III, I add E.M. Forster to this list.

novels between Anglo-Indians and Indians, though these writers are also compelled by differences between Anglo-Indians and Britons at “Home”—are yoked to key psychological traits. The majority of the Raj novels, while popular in their contemporary moment, have not found lasting fame in the literary canon. But they have had an ongoing impact on British culture nonetheless—many of the Raj Revival texts received the Booker Prize,⁶² today one of Great Britain’s highest literary honors. It is the work of this chapter to argue how works from a less fêted genre, written less than well, use the assignation of psychological traits to produce a national identity and make a demonstrable impact that ties the exercise of the literary imagination to processes of historical and political change.

The British Raj in Practice and Ideology, 1858-1947

The British Raj was established in 1858 and controlled an expanding area of territory on the subcontinent until the formal granting of Indian Independence on August 15, 1947. British colonialists⁶³ exerted control over India through the auspices of the East India Company (or “John Company”) from the mid-eighteenth century onward, and had informal influence in the century prior. Company rule was decentralized, however, and until the mid-1800s, informal and mainly focused on monetary gain. Angus Wilson describes the distinguishing attitude of this period as ““make your lakhs of rupees and come home.””⁶⁴ The Company was also male-dominated: the steamship voyage around the Cape of Good Hope prior to the 1869 opening of the Suez Canal discouraged transport of British women to India, the passage being considered

⁶² I refer to J.G. Farrell’s *The Siege of Krishnapur*, which won the Booker in 1973; Ruth Praver Jhabvala’s *Heat and Dust*, which won in 1975; and Paul Scott’s *Staying On*, which won the Booker in 1977.

⁶³ In distinguishing between “colonialism” and “imperialism,” I follow Robert Young’s delineation of the terms in *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (2001). Young argues that colonialism involves an empire, or a group of states and territories, used for settlement or commercial purposes. Imperialism, in contrast, is a state operation which works from the center outward and has an ideological aspect. Colonialism, in a sense, is practical where imperialism is more conceptual. In India, ‘Company’ rule would be called colonialist where the Raj is imperial.

⁶⁴ Angus Wilson, *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979). 22. “Lakh” is the Hindi word for “thousand.”

too difficult. In contrast, the Raj was a family affair. Increasing numbers of British women and children lived in India in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century; sons followed fathers into the Indian Army or the Indian Civil Service, the latter an elite administrative apparatus formed in 1858 after the Mutiny. These sons raised families in India, and over the next 50 to 60 years an Anglo-Indian community with discrete social spaces, such as the cantonment, club, and maidan, developed.⁶⁵ The introduction of new educational techniques, new technologies, and a new legal system were points of emphasis under the Raj. While many “improvements” of this type (such as the Great Indian Peninsular Railway and the East Indian Railway; trunk roads between major cities in India; universities in Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras) began in the last twenty years of Company rule, they were then viewed by Liberal politicians as developing India along an English model: “The government of India had set out to give its subjects, so far as might be, an English mind.”⁶⁶ From 1858 on, a paternal, corrective attitude replaced this Liberal rhetoric. Benita Parry cites “the belief that it rested with the British to supervise the functioning of Indian society and to guide India’s future.”⁶⁷ India was now seen as difficult and intractable, a country and people in need of ongoing supervision. This view is visible in Raj novels such as Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim* (1901), in which British surveillance of India forms the main plot, and Alice Perrin’s *The Anglo-Indians* (1912) and *Idolatry* (1909), whose heroes are educators correcting recalcitrant Indians.

This ideological change was partly a response to the Mutiny, an uprising in 1857-1858 by Indian soldiers (sepoys) and Indian civilians. The causes for the Mutiny are complex; I provide a

⁶⁵ *Hobson-Jobson: The Dictionary of Anglo-India*, writes of “cantonment” that “[t]his English word has become almost appropriated as Anglo-Indian, being so constantly used in India, and so little used elsewhere. It is applied to military stations in India, built usually on a plan which is originally that of a standing camp” (158). The meaning of “club” follows standard usage (a building for a select social group—here, the British—where various leisure activities are pursued). “Maidan” was essentially a large athletic field upon which the British gathered for sport.

⁶⁶ Sir Adolphus William Ward, *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1930). 336.

⁶⁷ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 29.

detailed summary of instigating events, and of the violence that consumed the subcontinent for almost a year, in framing my close analysis of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker. Viewed in the broader context of Indo-British relations, Thomas Metcalfe notes in *Ideologies of the Raj* (1997) that “the liberal presumption that all men were inherently rational and educable fell to the ground [after the Mutiny], and with it the expectation that India could be transformed on an English model” (47). This rejection of the uplift strategy was rooted in racist presumptions of Indians as brutal, ungrateful, and impossible to educate; Raj attitudes came to embody what Metcalfe calls a British sense of “difference from, and superiority to, their Indian subjects” (48). This view ensured that during the near-century of Raj rule there was little real social contact between British and Indian. “British racism,” Jenny Sharpe writes in *Allegories of Empire* (1993), “comes into its own during the high era of British imperialism” (4).⁶⁸ If and when British and Indian characters interact in the Raj novels, such dealings are almost always pedagogical (Briton as teacher or missionary), hostile (Indian as enemy), or servile (Indians serving the British as *ayahs* [nannies] or soldiers). Simon Gikandi’s *Maps of Englishness* describes the “constant reminders of the ways in which British and colonial identities are staged as radically different and yet inherently similar” (2) and something of this constitutive ambiguity appears in the ideological productions of the Raj. Indians in Raj novels are enough like the British to be ruled with methods exported wholesale from Britain, but it is assumed this guidance will not take because of some fundamental Indian inferiority.

Concurrent to the ideological shift between Company and Raj, the geographic space of British India was formally defined in 1876 when the Royal Titles Bill, conceived by Benjamin Disraeli, made Queen Victoria Empress of India. The bill was part of Disraeli’s “new Tory

⁶⁸ The ideological shift Metcalfe and Sharpe describe is well-documented in analyses of British India and its rhetoric. Pamela Lothspeich (2007) and Bart Moore-Gilbert (1996) also provide useful histories.

strategy,” Metcalfe writes: “[E]mpire was to be set alongside the ‘maintenance of the institutions of the country,’ which for Disraeli included, above all, the monarchy, the established church, and the House of Lords.”⁶⁹ True to Disraeli’s aims, India and empire came to preoccupy the British popular imagination in this period. Gikandi, aligning himself with Edward Said’s thesis on this point in Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), writes that “colonized peoples and imperial spaces were crucial ingredients in the generation and consolidation of a European identity and its master narratives . . . the imperial map of the world was to thread its way into the cultural products of the West.”⁷⁰ The second half of the nineteenth century is the high imperial period Sharpe mentions, and Gikandi’s observation about the consolidation of “master narratives” of European identity at this time mirrors my argument about the consolidation of a British metanarrative of imperial identity, and the focus in the Raj novels on ensuring Anglo-Indian voices were numbered among the “cultural products of the West” Gikandi cites.

However, despite British confidence in the economic, cultural, and psychological benefits of empire, resistance to imperial rule was stirring in India. In 1878, Viceroy Lord Lytton signed the Vernacular Press Act, restricting the activities of papers in indigenous Indian languages; in 1883 Viceroy Lord Ripon partly reversed the Ilbert Bill, which would have given Indian judges authority equal to British judges.⁷¹ This controversial move and the growing influence of India’s powerful middle class helped lead to the formation of the Indian National Congress in 1885. Congress became the main organizing entity for India’s independence movement, with Mahatma Gandhi helping direct its operations from 1917 onward. Contentious issues in the late 1800s included the deployment of Indian soldiers in imperial campaigns and the ongoing use of India

⁶⁹ Thomas Metcalfe, *The New Cambridge History of India, Vol. III* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). 59

⁷⁰ Simon Gikandi, *Maps of Englishness* (New York: Columbia UP, 1996). 5. Gikandi refers to Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994).

⁷¹ Edwin Hirschmann, “*White Mutiny*”: *The Ilbert Bill Crisis in India and Genesis of the Indian National Congress* (New Delhi: Heritage, 1980).

as a market for British-produced goods at the expense of local industry. Further, during the Raj, territories under direct British rule were interspersed with independent “princely states”. After the Mutiny, rulers who remained loyal to the British were granted special titles and privileges. However, from 1858 to 1947, many states were absorbed into British India through semi-legal manipulations of law and inheritance clauses, a process begun under the East India Company which met with much resistance.⁷²

In counterpoint to these rumblings, the Viceroyalty of Lord Curzon (1899-1905) and the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria (1897), during which Rudyard Kipling wrote his famous imperial ode “Recessional,” were high points for the Raj. Curzon’s speeches embody the British enthusiasm for imperialism and rule over India in this period: “It is only when you get to see and realize what India really is – that she is the strength and greatness of England – it is only then that you feel that every nerve a man may strain, every energy he may put forward cannot be devoted to a nobler purpose than keeping tight the cords that hold India to ourselves.”⁷³ In *Rule of Darkness*, Patrick Brantlinger calls this a time of “easy confidence about British world domination” (x). During Curzon’s tenure, Anglo-India’s administrative and financial apparatuses were streamlined, the North-West Frontier Province was created, and Bengal was controversially partitioned in 1905 to form the new Muslim province of East Bengal and Assam. Resistance from the area’s Hindu population, many of whom lost land revenue in the split, took the form of *Swadeshi*, an organized boycott of British goods. (*Swadeshi* is a component of Gandhi’s *Swaraj* [self-rule] strategy, articulated in his 1909 essay, “*Hind Swaraj*”). In response to agitation by Hindus, the All-India Muslim League formed in 1906. Bengal’s partition was rescinded in 1911,

⁷² During Lord Dalhousie’s tenure as Governor-General (1848-1856), the Company instituted policies such as the Doctrine of Lapse, which allowed the British to take over any land belonging to a feudal ruler if said ruler did not leave a legitimate male heir to inherit upon his death.

⁷³ Qtd. in Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 243.

coincident with the Delhi Durbar at which King George was crowned Emperor of India, and it was announced that the capital would move from Calcutta to a redesigned site in “New” Delhi.

The beginning of World War I (1914-1918) marked a clear break in Britain’s conception of its imperial identity as incumbent on continued possession of India. To secure the support of the Indian people, particularly Congress, for the war effort, the British government began serious discussions of independence during WWI. Legislation in this direction, dubbed the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms after then-Secretary of State Edwin Montague and Viceroy Lord Chelmsford, was drafted from 1916 to 1921.⁷⁴ Raj novels written after World War I thus reflect a growing sense of empire’s inevitable end. Where early books, such as Steel and Croker’s, reject amoral Company rule and celebrate the Raj’s positive aims and effects, Raj novels written after 1918 tend to manifest great anxiety about the future of empire. Such anxiety was warranted. In 1919 the British forced passage of the controversial Rowlatt Act, allowing the government to imprison for up to two years, without trial, any person suspected of terrorism. Widespread protests from the Indian populace ensued, and martial law was declared around the country, including the city of Amritsar, where on April 13, 1919, General Dyer ordered his soldiers to fire into Jallianwala Bagh, a public park with only one exit where unarmed Indians were peacefully demonstrating. More than 1,000 Indians were wounded; 379 were killed.⁷⁵ The “Amritsar Massacre,” as it came to be known, formed a rallying point for independence activists. When Dyer became a hero for many British persons at “Home,” tension increased further.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Edwin Montagu, Secretary of State for India, told Parliament in August 1917 in a speech written by Curzon that British policy in India was moving toward “increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire” (Moore 719). In 1916, two Home Rule parties were founded in the Congress, one by Bal Gangadhar Tilak and one by the Englishwoman Annie Besant.

⁷⁵ The Government of India’s statistics; estimates of casualties varied widely.

⁷⁶ Nigel Collett’s *The Butcher of Amritsar* (2005) details Dyer’s popularity at “Home” (320-40).

In December 1919, the Government of India Act established a diarchy that divided administrative authority between elected Indian legislators and elected British authorities. The measure was considered excessive by proponents of British rule and insufficient by advocates of independence. Massive civil disturbances, including strikes, marches, and protests, unsettled the last three decades of the Raj, with Gandhi launching a movement of resistance through noncooperation in 1920. Many Congress members, including Gandhi and Congress President Jawaharlal Nehru, were imprisoned by the British during this period. In 1935, the Government of India Act ended diarchic rule and laid the groundwork for Independence by instituting independent legislatures in all provinces, forming a central government that incorporated the princely states with areas of British control, and laying out protection for the Muslim minority. India's Constitution was based in part on this act. World War II began in 1939; with its end in 1945, independence for India was virtually assured.

The "Partition" of the subcontinent on August 15, 1947 into separate Muslim (Pakistan and East Pakistan, now Bangladesh) and Hindu (India) states led to a horrific wave of ethnic violence that consumed both countries for weeks and left an estimated 600,000 people dead. Responses from Britain were condemnatory and self-castigating in equal measure. Leonard Mosley's *The Last Days of the British Raj* (1961), a history of 1946-1947 whose visible pro-Britain bias makes it an early piece of Raj Revivalism, claims that "when one considers how much goodwill there was behind Britain's wish to give India her freedom, what a stinking bog of unpreparedness, blunders, and appalling lack of planning separated the wish from the achievement" (246). Maud Diver's Raj novel, *Far to Seek* (1921), places similar sentiments in the mouth of an Indian character, who claims of the Independence Movement: "It was British policy in the first place . . . that stirred up this superficial ferment; and now it grows alarming"

(255). This dissertation explores how Mosley's "history" came, in its specific emphases, to mirror Raj novel genre celebrations of Anglo-Indian influence, and how the cultural history of Great Britain in the 1980s was haunted and shaped by the Raj's cultural and political history.

“Adventure and Prospects to the Right Sort”: The Self-Definition of Anglo-India

From 1858 to 1947, then, life for British civilians, administrators, soldiers, and officers in India changed greatly. With those changes came an increasing preoccupation with the particulars of Anglo-Indian community. What was Anglo-India, and how, as a group, should Anglo-Indians define themselves, particularly in relation to “British” national and imperial identity? Attempts to address this question recur in the Raj novels. From the work of Rudyard Kipling forward—and even in the earlier, Mutiny-centered works by Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker which I read here—“Anglo-Indian” is treated as an identity with a specific history, literature, and legacy:⁷⁷ Anglo-Indians were British persons who lived, worked, and in some cases, were born and/or died in India. Jenny Sharpe writes in *Allegories of Empire* that “Anglo-Indians did not comprise a white settler colony so much as a community in exile” (165; n4). Concurring with this view, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (1930), Sir Adolphus William Ward unintentionally reveals the stakes of Anglo-India's investment in defining their community, codifying the quality of their character, and establishing a distinct literary school for their artistic productions. Working from a markedly “Home” perspective, Ward writes:

Anglo-Indian literature, as regards the greater part of it, is the literature of a comparatively small body of Englishmen who, during the working part of their lives, became resident in a country so different in every respect from their own that they seldom take root in its soil. On the contrary, they strive to remain English in thought and aspiration . . . throughout the period of their life in India, they are subject to the

⁷⁷ This nineteenth and early twentieth-century definition is distinct from the current meaning of the term. Today “Anglo-Indian” refers to persons of mixed British and Indian ancestry, persons referred to in the Raj novels as “Eurasians”. As with the term, “Mutiny,” I use the definition contemporary to the Raj novels in my analysis.

influence of two civilizations, but they never lose their bias towards that of England, which, in most cases, ultimately reabsorbs them. Anglo-Indian literature, therefore, is, for the most part, merely English literature strongly marked by Indian local color . . . the Anglo-Indian writer must, as a rule, make his appeal mainly to the public in England and only secondarily to the English community in India. (331)

Alongside Ward's general tone of dismissal, the essential characteristics of his description are the claim that Anglo-Indian literature is little more than English literature "marked by Indian local color," and that, Anglo-Indian audiences being insufficient, Anglo-India's literary output was primarily intended for consumption in Britain. These points form a subtext in the Raj novels, with the Raj authors perceiving that their books, light as the plots may be, are textual emissaries for Anglo-India's larger community. That community was never large—Nancy Paxton notes in *Writing Under the Raj* (1999) that in 1901 approximately 170,000 Anglo-Indians dwelt amongst an Indian population of 294,000,000, with a Eurasian population of 89,000 (198). Despite its small size, however, Anglo-India felt itself possessed of a distinct identity. Introducing Parry's *Delusions and Discoveries* (1998), Michael Sprinker writes:

. . . much British writing on India was intended to speak, not to Indians themselves, but to two distinct publics: the one resident in the imperial metropole and for the most part ignorant of Indian realities; the other that community of Anglo-Indians that lived and worked in the sub-continent and posed as the rightful, natural rulers of its indigenous inhabitants. Maintenance of the Raj required not only relative quiescence among the ruled, it equally demanded that the rulers believe in the justice and necessity of their mission, affirming its high-minded purpose and its status as a noble human calling. For hegemony is not just something those who dominate imposed on the dominated, it must at the same time be promulgated among the *Herrenvolk*, who have continually to be reminded that their rule is sanctioned by right. (x)

Sprinker's argument, and Parry's analyses, mark the first major examination of reciprocity between the Raj novels, audiences in Anglo-India, and readers at "Home" in Britain. By conceiving of the Raj novels as part of the process by which British power was naturalized in colonial India and the British metropole as noble and necessary, Sprinker evokes the ways in which specific fictions assisted the larger hegemonic understanding of British identity formed via

the experience of imperial rule. My analysis intervenes at this juncture, arguing that the project of the Raj novels goes beyond the general promulgation of hegemonic British imperial power to which Sprinker refers. The Raj texts work to make the figure (or, as I describe in Chapter II, the character) of the Anglo-Indian a justification of the imperial enterprise in and of itself. In the ensuing interchange, the Raj texts enact fictional imperial scenarios, to which the response of idealized Anglo-Indian men and women “sanction[s] by right” the imperial mission.

Here again, I argue, the Raj novel genre intervenes in Britain’s monologic metanarrative of imperial identity by drawing comparisons between Britain and Anglo-India—and, as Parry notes, between Anglo-Indians and their Indian subjects. These comparisons are implicit (valorization of specific aspects of Anglo-Indian character developed by Raj service) and explicit, as in this line from Alice Perrin’s *The Anglo-Indians*: “None of those difficulties existed in India that made life so complicated in England for those who had not the advantage of recognized family claims, or an assured monetary position. In India no English official people were wealthy, and the same recreations, the same meeting-places were open to one and all” (170). Perrin’s Raj novel sets the British subject as interchangeable with humanity via the phrase “one and all”; Perrin does not comment on the irony of India’s subjugation being necessary to achieve that equality, but casts her gaze outward, arguing that Anglo-India is an egalitarian counterpart for the English subject to rigid Great Britain—the constrictions of which recall David Carroll’s understanding of metanarrative as “totalitarian” in its restriction of identity. Comparison is also made between Britain and India through the figure of the “globe-trotter,” a person out from “Home” to inspect and criticize Anglo-India. The globe-trotter’s presence demonstrates that, in fiction as in reality, Anglo-India perceived itself to be under constant surveillance by British audiences. Michael Sprinker speaks of “promulgating hegemony”; the term is drawn from Marxist philosopher

Antonio Gramsci, who argued that the dominant class does not impose power unilaterally, but gains adherence to its ideological program through cultural leadership. The subordinated classes “choose” to participate in the power structures of the class which oppresses them.

To return to Lyotard, then, those without the cultural capital to construct and disseminate a metanarrative may choose to participate in the extant metanarrative, believing they gain cultural power by so doing. They thus become part of the hegemonic construct by which the dominant class maintains power. In the practical context of the Raj novels, this abstract formulation is realized as follows: the Raj writers take up the hegemonic construct of British imperial identity, accede to its descriptions of British character by using its terms and ideas, but attempt to gain power within its metanarrative by inscribing an idealized Anglo-Indian identity within the set space demarcated by the idea that British national character is fundamentally imbricated with the imperial mission. “[D]ominance is created through a complex cultural interplay that involves consent and willingness to move within the culture,”⁷⁸ Lennard Davis writes in *Resisting Novels*. From the Raj texts springs imperial dominance (as Sprinker states and Parry incisively analyzes). But, I argue, from these novels comes also a strict policing of the contours of Britishness. In the Raj texts, the Anglo-Indians dominate themselves, consenting to the rigid construct of imperial identity as the first step in attempting to make a space for themselves within that construct.

Indeed, I argue that as the Raj novel evolved, Anglo-Indians increasingly came to take pride in the community’s difference from British persons at “Home”. Introducing *Plain Tales from the Raj* (1975), a collection of BBC radio interviews with “survivors of the British Raj” (9) recently reissued under the title *Plain Tales from the British Empire* (2008), Philip Mason writes, “[t]he life of the British in India, even in 1939, was still Victorian. Clothes had changed, some customs a little, but the framework of life had been settled in the last years of the old Queen. And since it

⁷⁸ Lennard Davis, *Resisting Novels* (New York: Metheun, 1987). 39.

was a country ruled by an official hierarchy, it was socially conservative” (15-16). In shedding the image of “John Company” irresponsibility, Anglo-Indians portray themselves as morally superior to the British at “Home”. Thus, as Chapters I, II, and III argue, the sense of “Home” readers as a primary audience noted by Ward in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, and Sprinker and Parry in *Delusions and Discoveries*, became a tool by which the Raj writers promote Anglo-Indian ideality and justify the practical necessity of their rule. Physical displacement from the British Isles provides a channel by which fictions celebrating Anglo-Indian preeminence travel back to “Home” readers; distance also lends motive to the product of crafting Anglo-India as a national community. Literally separate from the British, Anglo-Indian authors construct themselves as a micro-nation within the British whole.

While Anglo-Indians described themselves as exiles, the community was also proud of the ways in which its members survived and surmounted the obstacles of life in India. Clive Dewey writes in *Anglo-Indian Attitudes: The Mind of the Indian Civil Service* (1993):

[The Indian Civil Service] constituted a ruling class, a class apart. They were hard-working in a debilitating climate, incorruptible in a society riddled by bribery, celibate until middle age in a subcontinent which married at puberty. Above all, they were intellectuals. Yet they pretended to be men of action, to escape the stigma attached to cleverness by the late Victorian middle class. No one, in Anglo-India, wanted to be labeled an impractical theorist, an effeminate aesthete or an immoral atheist. “Character” was what counted, not brains. Civilians living up to a manly ideal prided themselves on enduring isolation and illness and overwork. They quelled riots with a glare, silenced subordinates with a word. (5-6)

This self-promoting streak, and Dewey’s emphasis on character and the ways in which India’s “debilitating climate” and morally-questionable society honed that character, backgrounds the argument made in the following chapters about Anglo-Indian self-actualization and idealization in the Raj novels. To Dewey’s qualities (hard-working, celibate, intellectual, incorruptible), the

Raj writers add the actuality of “men of action”. Most Raj novel heroes are dashing soldier types, allowing in fiction the embodiment of a “manly ideal” reality may have denied.

As Chapter II discusses in detail, the career of Rudyard Kipling set the stage for the emergence of Anglo-Indian fiction as a distinct genre in which promoting Anglo-Indian identity was a specific generic aim. When the first 500-copy edition of his *Departmental Ditties* (1886) sold out immediately, Kipling made what biographer David Gilmour calls the “semi-accurate observation that Anglo-Indians liked reading about themselves.”⁷⁹ Indeed, an Anglo-Indian audience, fed by Kipling’s engaging images, was now present and consuming fiction. Upon visiting Simla, Mary Wood, wife of Indian Army Capt. George Wood, “found it so like Kipling as not to be quite true . . . It was what you expected Simla to be.”⁸⁰ Anglo-India came to believe itself the community described in Kipling’s works. Preceding authors had registered concern about Anglo-India’s ability to self-describe. ICS legend and poet Sir Alfred Lyall (1835-1911), writing in the mid 1800s, believed that “Anglo-India could produce neither a writer nor an audience”; his own best poems spoke “to the homesickness of the exiles abroad.”⁸¹ In Kipling, however, Anglo-Indian fiction developed a series of touchstones to which readers and reviewers alike could refer, imagining a realized universe whose inhabitants were not exiled but identifiably settled. While writers struggled for self-definition outside Kipling’s shadow—as my Introduction notes, Kipling comparisons are ubiquitous in nineteenth-century Raj novel reviews—works published between 1880 and the late 1930s were, as Alison Sainsbury writes,

⁷⁹ David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2002). 36.

⁸⁰ Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 154. Wood married Capt. George Wood in 1928 and was stationed with him in Dacca, Delhi, and Simla before leaving India in 1935 (275).

⁸¹ David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2002). 33.

“popular novels, in both senses of the word.”⁸² Such popularity was true of the Mutiny novels, and particularly true of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker, to whom my investigation now turns.

“She has come into an empire . . .”: Mutiny Literature and the Production of Anglo-Indian Exceptionalism in Flora Annie Steel

In September 1857, as the Mutiny raged through India, the *Economist* asked its readers to consider “whether in future India is to be governed *as a Colony or as a Conquest*; whether we are to rule our Asiatic subjects with strict and generous justice, wisely and beneficently, as their natural and indefeasible superiors, by virtue of our higher civilization, our purer religion, our sterner energies.”⁸³ As a group, novels, poems, and dramas about the Indian Mutiny produced in the next fifty years struggled to answer these questions. In her influential *Allegories of Empire*, Jenny Sharpe argues that Mutiny texts also ameliorate criticism of British imperial practices and stem Indian resistance by the invocation of Indian alterity and barbarity. Images of Indian sexual violence against white women were potent tools of ideological coercion; Sharpe writes that their deployment in Mutiny novels gave them particular power: “During the course of the nineteenth century, Anglo-Indian fiction gave coherence to the Mutiny narratives by lending a literary imagination to what was ‘unspeakable’ in the first-hand reports.”⁸⁴ In the hands of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker, the Mutiny emerges as a site at which idealized forms of male and female Anglo-Indian identity developed through life under the Raj are catalogued and celebrated. For Steel and Croker, the Mutiny is the dramatic incident in which the specific aspects of the new Anglo-Indian “nation” described in the Raj novels is tested and proved true.

⁸² Alison Sainsbury, “Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel,” *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 163.

⁸³ *The Economist*, Vol. 15, 26 Sept. 1857. 1062. Emphasis in original.

⁸⁴ Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993). 2.

While the Mutiny formally began in Meerut on May 10, 1857, dissatisfaction among the sepoys in the British army, and amongst India's civilians, had been growing for years. In the army, factors contributing to the uprising included the 1856 annexation of Oudh⁸⁵ by the Company, which deprived high caste sepoys of land revenues and titles; the deployment of sepoys to territories as far away as Burma, where they were forced to defend Company interests without added financial compensation; a fear of increased missionary activity and growing pressure to convert to Christianity; and particularly, the introduction of cartridges for the 1853 Enfield rifle which were purportedly greased with tallow made of cow and/or pig fat. Biting off the ends of the cartridges, a necessary step in loading the rifle, was thought to defile both Hindus, whose religion forbids consumption of beef, and Muslims, who may not consume pork.⁸⁶

More generally, the Company had grown increasingly aggressive in its land annexation policy. The seizure of large stretches of territory sparked discontent among India's indigenous rulers, a discontent exacerbated by the Company's increasing lack of regard for the remnants of India's Moghul aristocracy, which in 1857 still resided in the Red Fort in Delhi. (The taking of Delhi was ostensibly driven by the mutineers' desire to reinstate the Moghul Empire). A series of legal changes championed by missionaries, such as the abolition of *suttee*,⁸⁷ or widow burning, also stoked discontent. Ironically, such dissatisfaction was shared by many in Britain, who felt the Company had descended into amoral indulgence. Images of obscenely wealthy indigo

⁸⁵ Today called "Awadh," this province is located in contemporary Uttar Pradesh, along India's northeast boundary with Nepal.

⁸⁶ Kim Wagner, *The Great Fear of 1857* (Oxfordshire: Peter Lang, 2010).

⁸⁷ "*Suttee*" is more properly spelled *sati*, as Gayatri Spivak notes in her famous essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988). However, as with the terms "Mutiny" and "Anglo-Indian," I follow Raj novel style in selecting this spelling for usage in my dissertation; my goal is to preserve a consistency of approach in referencing the Raj novel texts. Discussions of the discourse of *suttee* and its abolition under the Raj include Margery Sabin's "The Suttee Romance" (1991) and the collection *Sati: Historical and Phenomenological Essays* (1988); Sabin's article is particularly useful for its location of *suttee* within a larger Anglo-Indian discourse of British moral uplift.

planters mingling with “natives” and keeping Indian mistresses (a recurrent image in Raj and Raj Revival texts) emblemized the moral decay believed to hold sway in India circa 1857.

This sense of an imminent need to overhaul the Company may explain in part why the Mutiny did not deeply trouble British certainty about its imperial future in the subcontinent. Thomas Metcalfe writes that “[u]nlike the divisive debates over the future of South Africa that accompanied the Boer War a half-century later, at the time of the Indian Mutiny no one in Britain, or even among the British in India, ever considered leaving India . . . the 1857 revolt evoked a cleansing sense of heroism and self-assertion.”⁸⁸ This difference is racially charged—Britain’s opponents in the Boer War were white Afrikaaners of Dutch descent. Yet, in the decades to follow the Mutiny, Parama Roy writes, the “Mutiny offered to colonial officials . . . the classic paradigm of Indian ingratitude and brutality; it served as an ur-text of insurgency and miscegenation that threatened to repeat itself endlessly in colonial history.”⁸⁹ The archetypal nature of the Mutiny led to many detailed histories in a variety of styles: nonfiction accounts, biographies, plays, poems, and novels. As a group, these works deploy representations of the Mutiny and what were portrayed as its constituent events (particularly the rape and murder of British women and the murder of British children) in an increasingly programmatic defense and celebration of British imperial identity. Sharpe argues that rhetorical use of the Mutiny to shore up imperial control then reoccurred whenever Raj administrators needed to reassert their moral authority in India: “in 1883 and 1919, a British implication in torture and massacre produced a crisis in colonial authority. And, in both instances, the Anglo-Indian community organized itself around the racial memory of the Mutiny” (*Allegories of Empire* 2). To Sharpe’s argument, my analysis adds the claim that Mutiny novels such as Steel’s *On the Face of the Waters* and

⁸⁸ Thomas Metcalfe, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). 44.

⁸⁹ Parama Roy, *Indian Traffic* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1998). 80.

Croker's *Mr. Jervis* use specific tropes of the Mutiny experience to augment the idealized model of Anglo-Indian identity developed in the Raj novel genre more broadly.

In accordance with Sharpe's claim that the embarrassments of the Ilbert Bill and Amritsar led to increased uncertainty about Anglo-India's moral and practical authority, I also argue that Steel's and Croker's Mutiny novels offer sites at which the memory of the Mutiny becomes an opportunity to catalogue and reassert Anglo-Indian virtues. Sharpe writes that

Although the assumption of European superiority and native inferiority was present from the start of modern colonialism, it was so taken for granted that it did not require representation. In the post-Mutiny era, the British began to represent their sovereignty in a set of discursive practices that they reenacted for themselves as much as for their Indian subjects.⁹⁰

As regards British rule in India, the Mutiny novels offer a subset among the discursive practices cited. Patrick Brantlinger notes that at least fifty Mutiny novels were published before 1900, and at least thirty more between 1900 and 1939.⁹¹ Despite the fact that much of the violence, particularly in 1858, was retributive brutality by the British, these novels almost uniformly portray the British as innocent victims caught up in illogical, unpredictable bloodshed. The genre thus allowed Britain's patriotic feelings to come to the fore with particular efficacy. Nancy Paxton suggests in *Writing Under the Raj* that "'romances' and 'boys' adventures' about the mutiny were the preferred form, since in these genres the moral uprightness of the hero is an uncontested given" (268). In *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, Hilda Gregg wrote in 1897 that "[o]f all the great events of this century, as they are reflected in fiction, the Indian Mutiny has taken the firmest hold on the popular imagination" (218). Noted authors dabbled in the genre: Sir Alfred Tennyson wrote "The Defense of Lucknow"⁹² (1879), a poem praising British fortitude;

⁹⁰ Roy 4.

⁹¹ Patrick Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988). 199

⁹² The Siege of Lucknow, which lasted from June to November 1857, particularly captured the British popular and literary imagination, both because of its duration and the continued "heroic" resistance of the besieged British.

and Charles Dickens and Wilkie Collins penned a short novel called “The Perils of Certain English Prisoners” (1857), cited by Gautam Chakravarty as the first prose fiction work on the Mutiny.⁹³ A swarm of novels such as *The Story of Cawnpore* (1859) and *Love Besieged: A Romance of the Defense of Lucknow* (1911) followed. With long descriptions of battle, gruesome death, and rape, most Mutiny novels incorporate love affairs between their British protagonists, yoking emotional affect to descriptions of historical events so detailed that footnotes are often used. Describing the impact of the Mutiny novel on the literary scene, Chakravarty writes that

The overlap between genres and the criterion of verifiability was the means by which an incredible expansion was configured as at once a history that appeared to possess the character of romance, and a romance that was the speculum of a verifiable material history. [The] traditional romance gave way to the novel of adventure reliant on journalism, travel writing, and historiography . . . (75)

The Mutiny novel gestured, as Chakravarty notes, to an increasingly vigorous Anglo-Indian literary scene producing works that yoked “historiography” and sentimental love story to better venerate Anglo-Indian character and experience. In *Blackwood’s*, Gregg says that she has tried her hand at “no less than three completed works of fiction” about the Mutiny; her motive being that “the events . . . seemed to provide every element of romance that could be desired in a story. Valour and heroism, cruelty and treachery, sharp agony and long endurance, satiated vengeance and bloodthirsty hatred were all present” (219). Often, as Chakravarty and Sharpe note, Mutiny novels claimed to go beyond official reports to an ostensive truth—a tactic used by Flora Annie Steel. Though it appeared thirty years after the event itself, Steel’s 600-page novel, *On the Face of the Waters* (1896), was one of the best-selling, most popular Mutiny novels.⁹⁴ Postcolonial critics such as Sharpe and Benita Parry have lent Steel’s depiction of British and Indian relations,

⁹³ Gautam Chakravarty, *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005). 107, 108.

⁹⁴ The destruction of publishing house records during World War II (in the Blitz bombing of England) prevents citation of precise sales records for Steel. However, the extreme popularity of her novel is indicated by surviving correspondence. In a letter dated Feb. 3, 1897, agent Sydney Pauling, employed by Steel’s publisher Heinemann, informs Steel that he is increasing her share of the profits based on runaway sales of the novel.

and her relatively sympathetic portrayal of Indian characters, guarded praise.⁹⁵ Contemporary critics were also enamored of her novel, albeit for different reasons: the *Daily Chronicle* feted Steel for producing “[a] picture, glowing with color, of the most momentous and dramatic event in all our Empire’s later history.”⁹⁶ In addition to its massive popularity, Steel’s thematic depiction of the Mutiny as a necessary cleansing of corrupt Company rule showcases how the Raj novelists used the cultural memory of 1857-1858 to codify a new model of Anglo-Indian character. Steel, a devout Christian like many female Raj writers, develops in her novel a typological scenario that explains how the Mutiny enables the rise of an “improved” imperial order. By so doing, she casts what was historically (and logically) a challenge to British authority as a virtual divine re-assignment of said authority in a new and better context.

On the Face of the Waters’ hero is Jim Douglas. His pseudonym, “Greyman,” marks him as a liminal figure between black and white—the implicitly inscribed race line between Britain and India—which Douglas has previously crossed by taking an Indian mistress. Douglas can pass as an Afghan, a skill he shares with many subsequent Raj novel genre and Raj Revival male characters.⁹⁷ Also anticipating the perceptive hero seen in Raj Revival texts such as M.M. Kaye’s *Shadow of the Moon* (1957; 1979) and J. G. Farrell’s *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973), Douglas grasps the tension brewing in India long before knowledge dawns on the Company’s tired old-guard rulers. Kate Erlton, the heroine, is married to Major Erlton, who is having an affair with the married Alice Gissing. *On the Face of the Waters* also casts real “hero” John Nicholson

⁹⁵ In general, *On the Face of the Waters* has received more serious scholarly attention than many of the Raj novels. For example, David Wayne Thomas’ article, “Liberal Legitimation and Communicative Action in British India: Reading Flora Annie Steel’s *On the Face of the Waters*” (2009), argues that Steel is representative of avowedly imperialist texts that nonetheless trouble the question of how effectively British political policy was communicated in India. Or, in “Unspeakable Outrages and Unbearable Defilements: Rape Narratives in the Literature of Colonial India” (2007), Pamela Lothspeich compares the use of rape plots in Steel to the deployment of rape narratives in literature by Indian authors working contemporaneously in the late nineteenth century.

⁹⁶ Qted. in Flora Annie Steel, *Voices in the Night: A Chromatic Fantasia* (Macmillan: London, 1900). 418.

⁹⁷ Kipling’s Police Inspector Strickland, introduced in *Plain Tales from the Hills*, is one example. Ashton Pelham-Martyn, the hero of M.M. Kaye’s Raj Revival novel, *The Far Pavilions* (1979), also passes as an Afghan.

(1822-1857) as a character. A dashing soldier who captured the British popular imagination in the mid 1800s, Nicholson died helping retake Delhi from the mutineers. This range of dramatic personae allows Steel to show how the Mutiny offered a multiplicity of challenges for Anglo-Indians, tests which the community uses to reconstitute Britishness in a more ideal form.

The novel begins⁹⁸ with Kate begging Douglas to forgive Major Erlton's racing debts out of a sense of Christian charity. British administrators hire Douglas to investigate rumors of a possible mutiny; and his mistress Zora dies, thrusting Douglas back into the Anglo-Indian social world. *Chupattis*, carrying word of revolt, move across India; so too do stories of the greased cartridges. Minor uprisings multiply, and the Mutiny begins after a taunt from a bazaar harlot. The British cantonment in Delhi is not warned, despite the best efforts of Douglas, whose horse breaks a leg as he rides to deliver a warning. Alice sacrifices herself to save an angelic British child named Sonny from mutineers, and Alice's Indian *ayah*,⁹⁹ Mai, flees with the boy. Douglas and Kate are trapped in Delhi. During what Steel portrays as a dreamlike stretch of time prior to the relief of the city by the British in September, Kate hides on a rooftop, disguised as Douglas' Afghan wife. She reunites with Sonny, but the boy falls ill and must be spirited out of the city. Nicholson arrives, and in Book V, "There Arose A Man," *On the Face of the Waters* becomes virtual hagiography, with Nicholson inspiring and ennobling the British troops. Kate flees the roof with the help of Indian princess Farkhoonda, who sacrifices her lover for Kate's life; Kate is

⁹⁸ The following plot summary does not describe the Indian characters in Steel's text. Much of the novel is spent detailing figures such as the Rajput *suttee*-widow Tara Devi, her soldier brother Soma Chund, and life in what Steel calls the "sham court" in New Delhi (xxvii), a shadow of the former Moghul Empire whose power the mutineers claimed they would restore. This omission here is driven by the need to focus on Steel's portrayal of ideal Anglo-Indian and British character; an analysis of her portrayal of Indians and Indianness occurs in Chapter IV.

⁹⁹ *Hobson-Jobson* defines an "ayah" as a "native lady's-maid or nurse-maid" (42). In the Raj novel genre, these figures model "good" Indian qualities of loyalty and devoted service to the British. "Chupattis" are small round pieces of unleavened bread. Like the greased cartridges, popular Mutiny mythology claims that mutineers circulated chupattis around India to spread word of the coming revolution.

disguised anew as a *suttee* widow before rejoining the British. Major Erlton dies in battle, and Nicholson is fatally wounded retaking Delhi. In the years that follow, Douglas and Kate marry.

Steel's essential themes in *On the Face of the Waters* are the transition between Company and Raj rule, and the codification of new ideals of British masculinity and femininity created through the Mutiny experience. In each instance, Steel's novel works to establish strict binary definitions: her parsing of difference between the Company and Raj eras is as careful as her fixing of static, distinct male and female gender roles. Judith Butler writes in *Gender Trouble* (1990) that "[t]he institution of a compulsory and naturalized heterosexuality requires and regulates gender as a binary relation in which the masculine term is differentiated from a feminine term, and this differentiation is accomplished through the practices of heterosexual desire" (30). Following this model, *On the Face of the Waters*' interest in policing rigid gender categories and the insertion of romantic narratives into the historical tableaux Steel creates is explicable. The love story, as Raj novel critics Sharpe, Paxton, and Alison Sainsbury argue, can offer a mode through which forms of control and social discipline are made palatable to readers. In demarcating gender as a set binary relation, Steel operates within popular Victorian modes of representation, which cast gender divisions—along with other divisions such as class and race—as absolute. Zohreh Sullivan discusses such codification through imperialism in her essay "Race, Gender, and Imperial Ideology in the Nineteenth Century":

[T]he politics of Imperialism and education [were] dominantly masculine. The discourse of Imperialism, gendered by hierarchy and trope, mapped domestic ideology to social paternalism, repeated familiar antinomies and confirmed Victorian myths of manhood and of Empire as paternalistic enterprise that in turn informed the myths of manliness so constructed as to oppose the ordered, disciplined, rational and masculine to the chaotic, childlike, irrational and feminine. (24)

Following Butler's observation about the ways in which narratives of heterosexual desire help construct categories of masculinity and femininity as fixed entities, it is evident that Steel's text,

like the other Raj novels, works in a literary and political milieu (what Sullivan calls “the discourse of Imperialism”) that codifies binary gender roles to help solidify discourses of control.

Further, developing Sullivan’s claims, the Raj novels distinguish British manifestations of these categories (“ordered, disciplined, rational, and masculine”) from qualities assigned to the colonial subject: chaotic, childlike, irrational, and feminine. British femininity is thus a new, third category in colonial texts such as the Raj novels, a category which relies on Victorian belief in inherent differences between men and women, but also institutes essential racial difference between British femininity and the femininity assigned to the colonial “other”. Edward Said famously observes this process in *Orientalism* (1978), writing that “a new median category emerges, a category that allows one to see new things, things seen for the first time, as versions of a previously known thing . . . such a category is not so much a way of receiving new information as it is a method of controlling what seems to be a threat to some established view of things.”¹⁰⁰ The colonial encounter, as fictionalized in the Raj novels, takes particular urgency from the Mutiny as the threat Said describes actualizes into physical violence by Indians against the British. As a rhetorical defense, the differences between British and Indian noted by the Raj writers, and differences between Anglo-Indians and British at “Home,” are politically mobilized through the instructive “new median category” of Anglo-Indian masculinity and femininity. In particular, the Raj novels’ definition of these terms allows the rejection of what the Raj writers portray as less desirable aspects of femininity—physical weakness; indecisiveness; hysterical emotional response; sexual promiscuity—from model British character. The Raj writers use these aspects to define the newly-encountered Indian subject (“things seen for the first time”). Sainsbury writes that Anglo-Indian domestic novels

¹⁰⁰ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon, 1978). 58-59.

. . . engaged in an ideological struggle over the national enterprise of imperialism, contesting the notion of empire-building as a masculine enterprise that requires a passive and private femininity. In Anglo-Indian fiction, and in colonial discourse in general, we find two contesting visions of imperial citizenship: will the nation be defined by “doing a man’s work in the world” out on the frontier . . . or by women who are engaged in demonstrating and extending “civilization”? (181)

My analysis argues that the Raj novels make space for both visions in their composition of ideal Anglo-Indian character. The ideological struggle over imperialism discussed by Sainsbury is resolved through categorical redefinition in works by authors such as Steel and Croker. Mutiny rhetoric which mobilizes particular images of violated British femininity is indispensable to this process, providing a pedagogical channel through which female British characters can be shown incorporating their work “extending ‘civilization’” into the larger project of maintaining Anglo-Indian rule—and thereby, British imperial identity.

On the Face of the Waters begins with a ruling British establishment that has fallen away from British ideals of duty, decisiveness, and control. The Mutiny allows the reassertion of these values, and Steel thus situates the event as a lucky “chance” for Anglo-India to reconstruct itself along a more streamlined, admirable model of national character. “God gives men a chance sometimes,” Kate cries. “He gives the whole world a chance sometimes of atoning for many sins. A Spirit moves on the Waters of life bringing something to cleanse and heal” (25). The ideals of behavior revealed in the Mutiny’s violent cleansing are established in part by Steel’s situation of historical events, such as the detonation of the Delhi Magazine by its British guards, within overtly ideological frames. Steel portrays the officers serving the Magazine as ideals of Anglo-Indian character; they embody stoicism, gentility, duty, and willingness to sacrifice self for nation. The pedagogical heft of this depiction is clear: the Magazine is “a place where men may learn what men can do” (273). The officers’ leader is “very courteous” and the men speak “cheerfully” (283) in the face of death. After the explosion, “a great cloud of rose-red dust” rises

“majestically . . . a corona glittering in the slant sunbeams . . . To those who know the story it seems to hang there still—a bloody pall for the many; for the Nine, a crown indeed” (285).

Biblical emphasis, seen also in Kate’s evocation of the titular spirit moving on the waters,¹⁰¹ is a common stylistic feature in Steel. The reference to “a crown” evokes Jesus’ death on the cross and sets “the Nine” as martyrs, following what Steel sets as the ultimate selfless role model. One of the essential aspects of the Raj novelists’ Anglo-Indian character, thrown into stark relief by the upheaval of the Mutiny, is the abnegation of personal interest in favor of the greater interests of the Anglo-Indian community. The martyrdom enacted by the Nine is carried out in favor of a greater ideal; Anglo-India’s community is seen to selflessly serve the British metanarrative of imperial responsibility even to its insurgent colonial subjects.

Here, Steel’s plotting recalls Thomas Metcalfe’s observation in *Ideologies of the Raj* that “a cleansing sense of heroism and self-assertion” (44) accompanied British responses to the events of 1857-1858; Said cites similar sentiments of “righteous vindication.”¹⁰² The Mutiny gave Anglo-India, in Kate’s words, “a chance” to establish new modes of dominance in India and make a compelling case for citizens at “Home” as to why such dominance was necessary.¹⁰³ What Steel adds to the general repositioning of British attitudes in the aftermath of the uprising is the certainty that, in exerting control, the Anglo-Indians who survive the Mutiny demonstrate a model of British character surpassing that at “Home.” Many direct comparisons between Anglo-India and Britain appear in *On the Face of the Waters*: Douglas thinks that he might “find his

¹⁰¹ Kate references the description in Genesis 1:2 of God’s formation of the Earth: “And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (KJV). This Biblical symbolism implies, as I argue here, that Steel views the Mutiny as a chance for the British to begin their imperial experience in India anew; the Raj offers a sort of British “new world” in the subcontinent.

¹⁰² Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). 147.

¹⁰³ Sharpe argues that a parallel impulse characterizes the multitudinous depictions of Indian barbarity in the Mutiny novels, and the portrayal more generally of colonial subjects as violent and malicious in novels centered on various slave risings, etc. (*Allegories of Empire* 4-8).

chance in it also; a better chance, maybe, than he would have had in England” (54); Steel writes that “it seemed as if the whole plan had been evolved for them by a kindly fate” (325); at the end of the novel, Kate reflects on her future: “Was she to go home to safe, snug [smug]¹⁰⁴ England, live in a suburb, and forget? . . . The Spirit which had moved on the Face of the Waters, bringing their chance of Healing and Atonement to so many, had left hers in the shadow. She had learned her lesson. Ah! yes; she had learned it” (529). The Mutiny is an explicitly pedagogical scenario by which the fittest of Steel’s characters—Alice and Erlton’s deaths lend “fit” a moral aspect—learn to reinvent their character. The model which they follow in doing so is provided by Nicholson, whose behavior sets a benchmark for the performance of Anglo-Indian masculinity, and by Kate, an explicit target of pedagogical uplift in the novel. Describing the impact of English literary instruction in India, Gauri Viswanathan writes in *Masks of Conquest* that the “English literary text [functions] as a surrogate Englishman in his highest and most perfect state . . . The split between the material and cultural practices of colonialism is nowhere sharper than in the progressive refinement of the rapacious, exploitative, and ruthless actor of history into the reflective subject of literature” (20). In each of her books, when Steel emphasizes the necessity of instructing female characters in the process of ideal imperial identity, she follows the model articulated here: the text as stand-in for a perfected vision of British character; the reader as subject of the pedagogical lessons enacted on the characters. In this scenario, Steel’s characters and her reading audiences variously embody the “reflective subject of literature”.

In approaching that subject, Steel describes Mutiny hero John Nicholson as “a man . . . who was in the grip of Fate, but who gave back the grip so firmly that his Fate could not escape him” (449). Douglas, the novel’s hero, directly learns from him: “[With] that clasp on his, Jim

¹⁰⁴ A telling change. “Snug” is used in the original 1896 edition of *On the Face of the Waters*; the recent reissue (2004), using Steel’s drafts, replaces it with “smug.”

Douglas felt as if he were in the grip of Fate itself, and following John Nicholson's example, gave it back frankly" (456). The repeated phrasing ("in the grip of Fate"; "gave it back"), and the statement that Douglas follows Nicholson's example, emphasizes the instructive quality of their interaction. Steel's descriptions of Nicholson are similarly didactic: he is a "giant of a man" with "keen, kindly eyes" (424) and an "indescribable air of dominant power and almost arrogant strength" (429). In a further delineation between Raj and Company rule, Company administrators are portrayed as holding Nicholson—symbolic of the new generation of Raj leaders—back. The "great problem of his life" is "how to keep pace with his yoke-fellows, how to scorn consequences and steer straight to independent action, without spoiling himself by setting his seniors and superiors in arms against him" (431). The autonomy Anglo-India allows men such as Nicholson is, in *On the Face of the Waters*, part of the milieu's character-building opportunities; Steel portrays that self-actualization coming to fruition in the Raj and marking out Anglo-India from life at "Home" in Britain. "[T]he most remarkable thing to my mind about the whole affair," a soldier character writes to Kate at the end of the novel "is the rapidity with which it proved the stuff a man was made of" (552). The Mutiny, in Steel's text, is fated inasmuch as its historical events allow the formation of Anglo-Indian character in a venue unlike any other in the British imperial framework, and one which supplies heroes such as Nicholson.

On the Face of the Waters' mapping of ideal femininity, through the elimination of Alice Gissing and the elevation of Kate Erlton, also celebrates the unique opportunity of the Mutiny and the rise of the Raj over the Company. Steel equates Alice with Company life via descriptions of physical space: Alice's living room, in contrast to Kate's garden of wilting English flowers, shows "no cult of England. Everything was frankly, stanchly [sic] of the nabob and pagoda-tree style" (61). Alice's death, then, symbolically eliminates Company-era life from Steel's novel.

Further, it punishes the lack of feminine delicacy displayed by Alice, who does not fear snakes, mutineers, or Indians, does not truly mourn her dead child, and is not excited about pregnancy.¹⁰⁵ In contrast, Kate, whose son Freddy has been sent “Home” for his health and education, is motivated throughout *On the Face of the Waters* by defense of his interests. She also bonds deeply with Sonny. In this way, Steel portrays Kate as representative of Raj-style Anglo-Indian women: the community typically sent children “Home” to Britain from the age of five, a separation alienating and traumatizing in equal measure.¹⁰⁶ Steel’s emphasis on Kate’s maternal qualities is thus complicit with the cultural lionization of motherhood in the Victorian period, described by seminal texts such as Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar’s *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979). It is also a further point of superior Anglo-Indian stoicism and strength. Ideal mothers, represented in the contrasting of Kate and Alice, endure greater privations than British women at “Home,” who do not have to bear years of distance from their children.

Beyond her maternal impulses, Steel celebrates Kate’s courage and modesty: ““You are very brave,”” she is told, and she glances up “at [Douglas] . . . with a sort of scorn in her eyes” (419). For a *memsahib*, Kate is tolerant; planning a Christmas celebration, she invites “all children of parents employed in Government offices or workshops . . . not only those with pretensions to white faces” (133). But Kate’s most essential qualities are her belief in a morally upright British way of life, and her determination to maintain British character against all odds.¹⁰⁷ As with Nicholson’s self-reliance, this aspect of Kate’s persona is accentuated by the

¹⁰⁵ Early in *On the Face of the Waters*, Alice becomes pregnant with Erlton’s baby. Asked where she will go with the child, Alice replies flippantly, ““Wherever women do go in these cases. To the devil, perhaps”” (179).

¹⁰⁶ In *Plain Tales from the Raj*, Marjorie Cashman describes the experience of sending her three-year-old daughter to England: “. . . for five years we didn’t see her. In those days it took six weeks to get a letter and by the end of the five years when we got her back again she really was a stranger to us” (215). Rudyard Kipling, sent to England with his sister at the age of five, endured years of emotional abuse from the family he boarded with; this experience is recounted in his autobiographical short story, “Baa Baa, Black Sheep” (“The Week’s News”; 21 Dec. 1888)

¹⁰⁷ The scenes in which Kate is disguised as an Indian woman are portrayed as testing this resolve; e.g. BK IV.

Mutiny. In Delhi, she waits for Douglas “[w]ith something obtrusively English also for his refreshment . . . Kate took to amusing herself once more by making her corner of the East as much like the West as she dare” (339). Realizing later that Douglas cannot save her, she states, “‘I will not have him risk his life for me again’ . . . in truth, she was becoming interested in her own adventures, now that she had, as it were, the control over them” (460, 462). Steel’s feminine ideal, while brave, stoic, moral, and maternal, is also independent and self-reliant. Kate improves upon the also courageous but selfish and amoral Alice by directing her independence to actions that serve the British nation. Kate is not tempted by the “glow and glamour” (44) of her sensual life in Delhi; rather, she strives to return to the cantonment outside to aid the British soldiers. In the end, Kate wins Jim Douglas, refined by his own encounters with Nicholson. Throughout *On the Face of the Waters*, British character is achieved in personal development; Steel’s characters define themselves by subordination to Anglo-India’s needs and the British imperial ideal.

Two of Steel’s other major works on Anglo-India, *Voices in the Night: A Chromatic Fantasia* (1900), set in the fictional British cantonment of Nushapore, and *The Hosts of the Lord* (1900), about a canal opening in the fictional village of Eshwara, echo the character models and valorization of the Mutiny experience developed in *On the Face of the Waters*. Though neither is technically a Mutiny novel (in that they are not set during the years 1857-1858, and do not rehearse actual historical scenes from the Mutiny), both use the Mutiny as the “ur-text” cited by Parama Roy. *Voices in the Night* is full of descriptions of Mutiny heroism and restaged Mutiny battles; it culminates in an Indian attack on a hospital and includes a character that “reincarnates” a Mutiny hero, having the same name (“John Ellison”) and a parallel heroic destiny. By offering a recreation of Mutiny events in a new context, *Voices in the Night* provides a yet more successful testing ground for British character. *The Hosts of the Lord*’s references to the Mutiny

are not as overt, but here Steel creates a mini-Mutiny, the fictionalization of which allows her to reconstrue Indian insurgency as proof of Anglo-Indian exceptionalism:¹⁰⁸ rebellious Indians, motivated by scurrilous religious leaders, mass hysteria, and misbegotten attempts at Anglicization, attempt to take over a fort and are thwarted by the British. The ongoing use of Mutiny scenarios allows Steel to continue asserting Anglo-India as test and proof of the Raj's superior character modeling opportunities. That a reader would have picked up on such references is clear: Edward Said, writing of Kipling, argues that "[t]o a contemporary reader 'the Mutiny' meant the single most important, well-known, and violent episode of the nineteenth-century Anglo-Indian relationship."¹⁰⁹ Even oblique re-stagings accrue compulsory power, and draw avid audiences, by evoking cultural memories of the event.

Voices in the Night and *The Hosts of the Lord* also rehearse Steel's ideals of masculinity and femininity. These traits are once more strictly delineated, and their relation to a larger model of British national character is reasserted. *Voices in the Night* uses a British child, Jerry, to teach readers about the history of Anglo-Indian greatness. Lady Grace, Jerry's mother, muses: "what else was heredity . . . but the passing on of one's admirations, one's ideals? The passing on from generation to generation of one's own affinity for good or evil; the slow evolution of the spirit of a race" (143). These sweeping claims locate the inheritance of ideal Britishness in the practical reproduction of Anglo-Indian families. Grace herself is a hereditary Anglo-Indian whose family lineage stretches back to the East India Company.¹¹⁰ Moreover, Steel's term, "the spirit of a

¹⁰⁸ Steel even creates new rumours about British iniquity that mirror the story of the greased cartridges; here the objects in question are charms said to carry plague which the British have supposedly leaked into the bazaar.

¹⁰⁹ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). 146.

¹¹⁰ The rejection of Grace as the object of romantic desire in *Voices in the Night* (the hero falls instead for a young woman newly arrived in Anglo-India, who is educated into the world of the Raj) mirrors the replacement of Alice Gissing by Kate Erlton in *On the Face of the Waters*.

race,” recalls Bakhtin’s language collectives, thought to contain “the spirit of a people.”¹¹¹ The insertion of Anglo-Indian lineage into the inherited spirit of Britishness performs an intervention similar to the Raj novel genre’s insertion of Anglo-Indian narrative into the metanarrative of British imperial identity. Alison Sainsbury argues that Anglo-Indian domestic novels “marry the ideology of patriarchy to the ideology of imperialism,” merging “the ‘story’ of love and marriage and the ‘story’ of European civilization, subsuming all relations to an identity rooted in imperialism.”¹¹² In *On the Face of the Waters* and *Voices in the Night*, traditional family systems bring up children as fit imperial subjects; children learn from Steel’s heroes and heroines how daily Anglo-Indian existence refines British national character.

Voices in the Night’s hero, Jack Raymond, initially cynical about this process, tells Jerry: “Come along, young Briton, and be sentimental over the past! Come and contemplate the deeds of your ancestors and make believe you’re a hero” (58). With childish innocence, Jerry tells Jack he will be a hero when “growed up” and argues that doing one’s duty is the point of life (58-59). Later, Jerry paints a map of the world with red paint, an action that indirectly recalls the bombast of Sir George Goldie, the mastermind behind British Nigeria. Of his imperial ambitions, Goldie recalled, “[a]ll achievement begins with a dream. My dream as a young child was to color the map red.”¹¹³ In *Voices in the Night*, an inspired Jack cries to Jerry, “[m]y dear little chap! . . . if I were you, I’d paint every blessed bit of it bright scarlet!” (335), and moves to thwart the brewing Indian insurgency: “a boy who reminded him of his own boyhood, had made him feel that no other course was open to him — that he was bound to do this thing — or shoot himself for not doing it!” (336) Jack’s shift to “doing” his duty fulfills Steel’s masculine model; Jack

¹¹¹ M.M. Bakhtin, “The Problem of Speech Genres,” in *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 2nd ed. (Austin: U of Texas P, 2004). 68

¹¹² Alison Sainsbury, “Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel,” *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 170.

¹¹³ Qtd. in D.J.M. Muffett, *Empire Builder Extraordinary, Sir George Goldie* (Surrey: Shearwater P, 1978). 15.

adheres to British ideals, is strong, and behaves decisively in service of Anglo-India. The novel ends with Jack's reflection that Jerry, a "a son of heroes," "will be at Eton or Harrow" awaiting his chance for British glory. It will come "no doubt; for it is only the Spirit of Slaves that dies; the Spirit of Kings lives for ever" (418). In this grandiose phrasing, and by using capitalization to lend her invented British and Indian spiritual lineages the implicitly real status of a proper noun, Steel endows Anglo-Indian experience with an epic dimension that accords with her repeated usage of Mutiny plots. That most epic event summons up the "Spirit of Kings" nascent in the British character and refined through Anglo-Indian daily life.

The Hosts of the Lord casts a similar model for its hero, Lance Carlyon. Like many of Steel's protagonists, Lance has a sympathetic understanding of Indians, equating Indian children with his youthful self: "I've never been able to find out the least difference in kids. I talk to the little beggars when I'm out shooting, you know, and—well! the boys are just as much boys as I used to be" (169). In addition to his sympathy, Lance is a meticulous professional; he notices when a tent peg in the Viceroy's camp lines is 1.5 inches off (55-6). He possesses keen insight; his love interest muses that "you could never dip below the surface without finding him, as it were, there before you . . . clear-eyed, ready to treat the shady side of things as he treated the light side; that is, with an absolutely limpid honesty" (169). Crucially, Lance does not let a potential Mutiny among his Sikh pioneers rattle him, a quality of leadership that recalls Steel's depiction of John Nicholson, who "could take a man's heart out and look at it, and put it back sounder than it had been for years. He could put his own heart into a whole camp and make it believe it was its own" (*On the Face of the Waters* 456-57). If the Mutiny and the microcosmic mutinies Steel stages in her later novels are to truly affirm the rightness of Anglo-Indian rule, the men who administer the new Raj government must be upright models of decency. In cataloguing

Lance, Jack, Douglas and Nicholson's idealized characteristics, and melding them to a position of sympathy with their officers and Indian subjects, Steel makes this case.

Her female characters receive the same treatment. *Voices in the Night's* heroine, Lesley Drummond, is Jerry's governess; she is bold, articulate, and decisive. Through Lesley and Jack's dialogues, Steel champions Anglo-Indian identity over British character at "Home". Jack's practical experience in India refutes Lesley's assumptions of Anglo-Indian shallowness, perfidy, and racism. Reviewing a litany of Anglo-Indian hardships, Jack cites childlessness; having to send children home; the danger of the passage to India; men at remote outstations driven to insanity or suicide; lack of funds in India; lack of funds after retirement; and spousal separation (136-37). Initially dubious, Lesley later compares the growth in her character to that she might have achieved in England and finds the "Home" version lacking:

. . . she saw a vision of herself alighting from an omnibus at the corner of Bond Street on a wet day, picking her way over the greasy blister-marks of many feet on the pavement . . . to have tea at a ladies'-club with an intimate friend, and solve the problems of life by hard and fast individualism tempered by a sloppy socialism. Solve! As if it were possible to solve anything in those conditions. Above all, to solve the greatest problem in the world for women, as you drank your tea on a table littered with the literature of *chiffon*-culture, whose every page proclaimed that woman's aim was to remain temptress, her goal a garden such as this! (242)

Anglo-India becomes, through Steel's narration, a land of noble hardships. In contrast, England is a repository of evils. Overpopulation leaves the pavement "greasy" and blistered; British modernity (recall Phillip Mason's praise for Anglo-India's resolute Victorianness, even in 1939) forms characters that are "hard," "fast," and "sloppy"; the "littered" refuse of "*chiffon*-culture" degrades female virtue and results in the retrograde femininity performed by Indian women, the inhabitants of a "garden such as this" to whom Lesley refers. Steel thus distinguishes ideal male and female Anglo-Indian character from negative aspects of femininity ascribed to the colonized

“other”—Lesley’s model of femininity has points of softness (the maternal impulse; she is Jerry’s governess) but is defined fundamentally by strength and will.

Erdmuth (Erda) Shepherd, the missionary heroine of *The Hosts of the Lord*, earns the same virtues through explicit pedagogical correction: “she was yet—as women must be until experience of work-a-day life teaches them, as it has taught men, the value of subordination—curiously undisciplined, curiously lawless” (56). Steel’s model of ideal British character is underscored by order; the rigidity of her binary distinctions and the care she takes to police the hierarchies her novels establish are showcased in the stated need to “discipline” Erda. Evoking Michel Foucault’s scenario of power consolidation in *Discipline and Punish* (1979), the implication is that an overarching cultural authority (here, I argue, the metanarrative of British imperial identity) sets out terms by which members of a society can participate in that society. Cultural institutions, such as Steel’s bestselling novels, are used to enforce those terms. Steel’s sense that her text can insinuate a determinate set of laws regarding race, gender, and national affiliation plays out, in *The Hosts of the Lord* and her other novels, through a happy love story coincident with the thwarting of a Mutiny attempt. The latter offers Steel’s British characters a matchless testing ground for heroism; the former shows the dedication of the hero and heroine to one another and to the larger Anglo-Indian community. Recalling Kate and Jim Douglas, Erda’s courage wins Lance:¹¹⁴ ““You are very brave,”” Lance tells her; she replies, ““People talk as if women always had to try and not be afraid; but we are not all like that. Some of us want to fight. I do, always”” (235). During the faux Mutiny, Erda leads Lance’s Sikh troops, taking control of Indian men in a manner that shows British femininity superseding colonized masculinity. As I

¹¹⁴ Erda also demonstrates martial strength akin to that of Lesley, who operates a telegraph to thwart mutineers, and Kate, who directs her own adventurous exit from Delhi in Jim’s absence. In *The Hosts of the Lord*, Lance finds Erda “sorting cartridges as if she had done it all her life; and her face turned to him all aglow and splendid” (235).

discuss in Chapter III, the novels of Alice Perrin and Maud Diver mimic this scenario, making the trumping of race hierarchies by those of gender a major component of the genre.

In Steel, Erda, Lesley and Kate show that a “proper” British woman is strong, modest, resourceful, and dutiful in her defense of the British man and the British nation. Erda’s desire to battle for Britishness eventually leads her to refuse marriage to a fellow missionary; she flees in her wedding dress, symbolically escaping the sentimental, passive femininity Steel disdains—and the association of the missionary enterprise with misbegotten aspects of Company rule. By choosing Lance’s fight for control of the fort, Erda demonstrates the deference to duty essential to Anglo-Indian character. That such battles are overlooked by those at “Home” seems to motivate Steel’s championing of Anglo-India. “So the pageant of power passed into a garden-party,” Steel muses. “[N]othing remained to show the hand-grip which had made that garden out of a wilderness, to tell of the tireless effort to solve the problem, the ceaseless striving to be just, which underlay all the quips and cranks, the foibles and follies” (84). Steel’s novels use the cultural memory of the Mutiny to “tell of the tireless effort” undertaken by figures perhaps less heroic than Nicholson, but no less inclined to follow in the hierarchical inheritance of greatness which sediments itself, in Steel’s formulation, in the Anglo-Indian character.

“God knows I never thought of *this!*”: The Mutiny as Spectre in B.M. Croker’s *Mr. Jervis*

In *Mr. Jervis* (1894), B.M. Croker’s depiction of Anglo-Indian ideality draws upon the events of 1857-1858, while simultaneously casting a wider net in its modeling of British male and female character. This approach is consistent with the trajectory of Croker’s career. While her novels were less famous than Steel’s, Croker produced more books, including several short story collections; she wrote before and after Steel and depicted a wider geographic area, writing frequently of “Burmah” [sic]. Alongside the inevitable Kipling comparisons, her publishers

positioned Croker as an expert on British India and its environs, paralleling her to Steel in this respect: “The magician’s car of fiction next transports us to India, the magician being that very competent and attractive writer Mrs. B. M. Croker,” the *Times* wrote. “Her ‘Village Tales’ are so good that they bracket her . . . with Mrs. F. A. Steel in comprehension of native Indian life and character.” Croker’s “sympathetic” grasp of the Indian environment also won praise from the *Glasgow Herald*: “Mrs. Croker writes of India as one knowing it well, and with deep sympathy for the people among whom her time was spent . . . she succeeds in bringing home to readers at home the daily life of the East.”¹¹⁵ That “daily life,” in Croker, is full of romantic adventure—adventure underscored in *Mr. Jervis* by a history of Mutiny heroism. The insertion in this book of a capsule Mutiny narrative is a recurrent representative pattern in the Raj texts; *Mr. Jervis* is analyzed as indicative of this technique. Other, more famous Raj novels such as Kipling’s *Kim* play similarly upon the affective power of the Mutiny by inserting mentions or mini-narrations of its events into otherwise unrelated stories. Such inset narratives amplify the novels’ larger goal of constructing model British character through Anglo-Indian experience, reminding “Home” readers about the stakes of upholding the British national ideal and implying that historically Anglo-Indians have been uniquely tested along these lines. Again, a brief plot summary is useful in establishing the context within which Croker’s Mutiny narrative works.

*Mr. Jervis*¹¹⁶ opens with two sparring society matrons at the hill station of Shirani; each resolves to bring a female relation out to India for marriage. Heroine Honor Gordon is one such relation. En route to Shirani, she meets the hero, Mark Jervis, son of an Anglo-Indian soldier who has “gone native,” losing himself in India and forsaking contact with Mark, who was raised

¹¹⁵ *The Glasgow Herald*. Both reviews are reprinted in B.M. Croker’s *Jungle Tales* (London: Holden & Hardingham, 1913; n pag.) The *Herald* reviewer’s assumption that Croker’s texts are meant for a “Home” audience is notable.

¹¹⁶ Constraints in the availability of texts lead me to quote from two different editions of *Mr. Jervis*; quotations from Vol. I are drawn from the 1894 edition, while the quotes for Volumes II & III are drawn from 1895.

by his rich uncle Dan Pollitt at “Home”. Mark and Honor fall in love—but Mark is forced to leave Honor after he finds his father, Major Jervis, living alone, seemingly deranged, on a decaying indigo plantation. The couple reunites through the machinations of an unnamed “Mutiny widow,” kidnapped in 1857 and forced to live as an Indian bride. Croker halts the main action to insert the widow’s story, presented to Honor under cover of darkness as a confession of tragedy. Mark learns that his father is not actually mad, and Pollitt, on a *deus ex machina* visit to India, falls in love with the country and approves Honor and Mark’s marriage.

Mr. Jervis is a virtual Cinderella-story, with the tragedy of the Mutiny widow marking the point at which frothy love story meets dangerous Anglo-Indian reality. As in Steel’s repeated usage of Mutiny scenarios to provide pedagogical uplift for her female characters, Croker sets the Mutiny widow’s story as an instructive tale. The widow’s presence, and her struggle to share her life story with Honor and Mark, reveals the difficult battle for personal and imperial control that underscores seemingly idyllic Anglo-Indian experiences. Jenny Sharpe’s argument about Anglo-Indian fictions consolidating Mutiny narratives by voicing “what was ‘unspeakable’ in the first-hand reports” is precisely the Mutiny widow’s function, and Croker makes her tale as salacious as possible. Simultaneously, the widow lends coherence to Croker’s vision of Anglo-Indian superiority—a contrast made explicit through the education of Pollitt. At the beginning Pollitt sees India as a land of romance and adventure; he thinks Mark “‘wants to travel for a couple of years, in order to see the world. Just like the hero of a fairy tale’” (Vol. 1; 112). The revelation to Mark and Honor, via the Mutiny widow, that India is a land of great darkness as well as romance provides the reader with an instructive contrasting view, demonstrating anew the excess of hardship that Anglo-Indians must endure in the course of executing their duty.

Croker is intensely concerned in *Mr. Jervis* with articulating how Anglo-Indian ideality enables resistance to India's deleterious influence.¹¹⁷ Some exposure to India is necessary so that Anglo-Indian character can be understood in its specific manifestations and proved superior to its British counterpart. At "Home," *Mr. Jervis* implies, class concerns would disallow Honor and Mark's idealized love. Pollitt himself disapproves of the match for financial reasons. Feeding this theme, Croker draws an explicit contrast between Britain and India in her love scenes: Mark tells Honor their union "can never be repeated or effaced, —this hour, when you gave yourself to me here in this overgrown Indian garden under the Southern cross. When we are old Darby and Joan, sitting by our fireside in cold work-a-day England, we shall . . . look back on this hour as sacred" (265). But if Anglo-India allows superior freedom and open-mindedness, in Croker's portrayal too much India deteriorates British character. The Mutiny widow's tragic history of kidnap and rape displays the risks Britishness runs in India—and the strength of the Anglo-Indian character which must be developed in order to withstand those dangers.

In a departure from Steel, Mark is the character in *Mr. Jervis* who must learn and evolve into a stronger, nobler person. In its review of *Mr. Jervis*, *The New York Times* called Mark "an uncommonly good fellow" (26 Dec., 1894). Croker's initial descriptions establish him as an archetype of the British "race," evoking the larger idea of national character to which I argue the Raj novels contribute: "What the French call 'the look of race,' is the principal thing that strikes one about Mark Jervis" (Vol. I, 104). Similarly, Honor's first impression of Mark is that he is a "gentleman, not merely in his speech and actions, but in his bearing" (Vol. I, 179). But while Mark carries the seeds of Steel's model British masculinity, his character consolidation is not

¹¹⁷ This is a theme in Croker's novels. *Her Own People* (1903) tells the story of Verona Chandos, a British woman who learns her father is married to a Eurasian woman (of mixed British and Indian ancestry). Verona must struggle to maintain her Britishness against the presumption that she is of mixed-race ancestry. While the novel offers an opportunity for viewing British character as a discursive construct, Croker defuses the possibility by revealing at the novel's end that Verona is white.

complete. He initially lives in service to his individuality and ambition, a state he laments later in the book: ““When I lived a smooth, luxurious sort of life, in those days that seem years ago, I thirsted for some difficult task, something to do that would single me out and set me apart” (Vol. II, 360). Croker situates Mark’s uninformed, even selfish, desire for glamorous adventure in India as a product of a mindset acquired at “Home”. When Mark must deal with Anglo-Indian actuality, via duty performed to his manipulative father and the Mutiny widow, his fantasies of Anglo-Indian life are overwritten by Croker’s Anglo-Indian “reality”. That reality is of difficult, unrewarding struggle in which Mark’s personal desires are superseded by the calls of duty and chivalry. Later, Mark also learns to command, disciplining the debauched Indian servants who exploit his father and reforming Major Jervis’ decaying residence into a properly British home. Mark’s willingness to do his duty, “to renounce friends, fortune, sweetheart, to lead a semi-savage existence, entirely cut off from what is called life” (Vol. II, 290), and to do so in the unique context of Anglo-India, confirms him as an ideal of the British imperial mission. His modesty cements this portrayal. Told he is ““a young man in a thousand,”” he replies, ““Not at all . . . I’m simply a young man of my word”” (Vol. II, 318). Faithfulness and fidelity thus meld with devotion to duty in Croker’s Anglo-Indian hero.

Honor, in turn, stands for the strength which Croker sees as allowing Anglo-Indians to remain untouched by Indian influence. She refuses to chase a financially beneficial romantic union¹¹⁸ (the news that Mark is rich upsets her), and is honest no matter the cost—her most dangerous and praised characteristic. While a rival thinks upon meeting Honor, “The girl was a lady” (Vol. II, 134), her quality threatens lesser Anglo-Indian society, which Croker portrays as

¹¹⁸ Honor is contrasted with Miss Lalla Paske, the niece of Mrs. Brande’s Shirani social rival. Lalla, another example of the ways in which Croker perceives Anglo-India decaying persons of weaker character, takes advantage of the increased contact between men and women in Anglo-India to stage decadent plays, during which she appears scantily clad. She ultimately, and scandalously, elopes with her theatrical co-star.

down-to-earth and welcoming but gossipy and dramatic. A man in Shirani notes of Honor: ““She is too stand off; she is a woman's girl; to tell you the truth, she frightens me””; his companion jibes him, ““Poor, timid, little soldier! No doubt you mean that she never flatters you; and I admit that her honest frankness sometimes takes away my breath”” (Vol. II, 247). Honor’s quality thus emerges even in insult—she intimidates those of weaker moral fiber with her “honest frankness”. No matter the event, her calm, modesty, and strength do not waver; in what she assumes is her goodbye with Mark, she shows “indescribable dignity” (Vol. II, 255). Essentially, this goodness is part of Honor from the outset. Croker introduces her to the reader with glowing praise: with her “beauty of expression[,] Honor is the useful member of the family . . . She has a sort of quick, magic touch. Everything she undertakes looks neat and dainty . . . Her inexhaustible spirits correspond with her gay, dancing eyes” (Vol. 1, 54-55). By putting a female of such domestic accomplishment and gracious personality to the test, India produces what Croker locates as the quintessence of Anglo-Indian femininity, goodness so overwhelming it convinces a terrified Mutiny widow to speak the secrets of her past aloud for the first time.

The Mutiny widow’s appearance is the climax of Croker’s text. The widow enables the fulfillment of Honor and Mark’s romance, allowing the consummation of the British “racial” ideal that union represents; further, her narrative highlights the Mutiny novel tropes that most affirm Anglo-India’s power to surmount mindless evil and unspeakable violation. The widow is pointedly unnamed; she tells Mark that kidnap and sexual union with an Indian man led her to forsake all markers (language; name; clothing) of British identity as no longer appropriate to her existence or selfhood. In her portrayal of the widow’s abnegation, Croker echoes ambivalent depictions of “fallen women,” such as Elizabeth Gaskell’s *Ruth* (1853) or Thomas Hardy’s *Tess*

of the *d'Urbervilles* (1891), common in Victorian Era art and fiction;¹¹⁹ the suggestion, however, is that miscegenation has exacerbated the Mutiny widow's fall. But when she hears Honor playing violin, the widow is drawn—as to a beacon—to confess. She was at church when the Mutiny began, she tells Honor, and hid in the belfry while “our husbands . . . kept the wretches at bay so long that they were out of patience, and after setting fire to the church, rushed off to the cantonments and the treasury” (Vol. II, 228). Staging this battle in a church allows Croker to show British fidelity and Christian morality; the valor of British men contrasts the mercenary impulses and treachery of the Indians, who attack and loot in the midst of a religious service. Sharpe argues that the “British regarded the Hindu male to be cruel, yet physically weak, duplicitous rather than savage,”¹²⁰ which accords with Croker's portrayal. Indian perfidy is highlighted by the climax of the widow's story:

. . . as each man or woman or child alighted, unarmed and quite defenceless, they were shot or cut down. Oh, the road, — I shall never forget it! - that red, red road between two crops of sugarcane! Miss Miller, — how brave she looked! just like what one pictures a martyr,— she quietly stepped out and took off her hat, and never uttered word or cry as she faced her horrible death. Mrs. Earl and her two little children, and poor young Clarke, who had been wounded in the church. I was among the last; I had fainted, and they thought I was dead, I believe, and threw me into a ditch. Presently I crawled out and crept into the sugar-cane, but a *sowar* discovered me. He saw my white dress, and he came with a bloody upraised *tulwar*, but something stopped his arm, — my beauty, I suppose! (Vol. II, 229)

The widow escapes the *sowar* in Lucknow, but is almost immediately recaptured by an old Indian man who gives her to his “halfwitted, feeble” son as a wife. This husband dies,

. . . and I was left a widow, a native widow! Oh, *I* know native life! The fierce tyranny of the old women, of the old mother-in-law, their tongues, their spite, their pitiless cruelty. How many vengeance were wreaked on *me*! In those days I was stupefied and dull, crazy. No, I had no feeling; I was in the midst of a strange people; those of my own I never saw. (Vol. II, 229-30; emphasis Croker's)

¹¹⁹ I refer in my description of “the fallen woman” to George Watt's *The Fallen Woman in the Nineteenth-Century Novel* (1984), and to Nina Auerbach's *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth* (1982). Croker's Mutiny widow, like many fallen women in Victorian literature, is ambivalently culpable in her own disgrace.

¹²⁰ Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993). 59.

The Mutiny widow's narrative is typical of Mutiny novels more broadly: the martyrdom of innocent Britons (women; children; wounded men); gruesome violence (the "bloody upraised *tulwar*"); and insatiable Indian desire for beautiful white women. *Mr. Jervis* thus embodies what Nancy Paxton calls "the most familiar rape script in the colonial imaginary of Anglo-Indian fiction . . . pure Englishwomen threatened with rape by Indian men."¹²¹ The widow does state that her father-in-law was a friend, but he is unable to compensate for "[l]ost honour, lost life, lost soul!" (Vol. II, 227). The widow's experience is displayed for the reader as the encapsulation of Indian barbarity. That she can only tell Honor about her past under cover of darkness enhances the sense of profound shame and despair Croker associates with her experiences.

This capsule narrative has profound ideological ramifications for *Mr. Jervis*, confirming Paxton's claim that the depiction of "power and violence" in such rape scripts "helped to hold the Raj in place."¹²² The Mutiny widow's refusal to rejoin British society is portrayed as noble. Because she accepted union with an Indian man rather than martyring herself, she is excised from the standard—and thereby, the space—of Anglo-Indian identity. While *Mr. Jervis* is set thirty-four years after the Mutiny, Croker uses the widow to instruct the reader on how an ideal British woman would have performed under such circumstances. The widow tells Honor: "You would have laid down your life; I saw it in your eyes. Alas, I never was brave" (Vol. II, 231). The Mutiny thus continues to provide a space for asserting the Raj novels' ideological claims about ideal Anglo-Indian identity. In addition to reinforcing an image of Indians as barbarous and rapacious, it cleanses these elements from the Anglo-Indian sphere to such an extent that any contact with them—even forced contact, as in the case of the Mutiny widow—is unacceptable.

¹²¹ Nancy Paxton, *Writing Under the Raj* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999). 267.

¹²² Paxton 268.

Thus far, *Mr. Jervis* accords with analyses of the rape convention's ideological function in Sharpe and Paxton. However, the widow can also be read as manifesting a continued essential Britishness which testifies to the resilience of this construct in its Anglo-Indian form—and demonstrates the powerful strength and sympathy of the British imperial nation. Mark recognizes immediately that she is British (Vol. II, 344), by which move Croker hints that the Mutiny widow could rejoin Anglo-Indian life if she wanted to: the necessary elements of her persona set by Croker as fundamentally British, such as courtesy (she bids Mark goodbye by fluttering a handkerchief in the wind), remain intact. The widow's refusal to take this step, however, restores the inherent British nobility her Mutiny experiences supposedly destroyed. In the hardship she endures (again, hardship presented to "Home" readers as unimaginable), the widow proves herself to be as much of an ideal as Honor. This is made explicit in Mark's farewell: "I see nothing to stand between us. Remember that we wish to be your friends, if you will have us" (Vol. II, 392). Anglo-India is valorized as open-minded enough to accept bodies violated by a tragic incident in its history, and as the widow proves, stoic enough to refuse such acceptance in the interests of rigidly maintaining Anglo-India's racial and political hierarchies. Croker's ability to expand and contract the borders of the Anglo-Indian community is her contribution to the deployment of Mutiny novel tropes in *Mr. Jervis*. In her novel, Croker crafts a picture of Anglo-Indian superiority that accords with Steel's: women are self-sacrificing, brave, and honorable to a fault; men are stalwart, truthful, and adhere to their duty, no matter how distasteful. The best Anglo-Indians, be they "the Nine" who detonate the Delhi Magazine or the lonely Mutiny widow, sacrifice all for an ideal of Britain as honorable, sacrosanct, and racially "pure".

In this imperial context, the hardships of life in India—exemplified in Steel and Croker by the ordeal of the Mutiny—offers those of "superior" British stock an opportunity to excel in a

way their compatriots at “Home” cannot. As the Raj novel genre develops, a process I describe in the next chapter, the authors of these works shift from reliance on a specific historical incident to a valorization of Anglo-Indian daily life as the premier form of imperial duty. But while the scenario shifts, the message remains consistent; Croker and Steel anticipate themes emphasized by Raj authors such as Rudyard Kipling and Sara Jeannette Duncan. The casting of Anglo-Indian experience as inextricable from the metanarrative of British imperial identity is especially influential. Consolidation of Anglo-India as a community that models ideal aspects of British national character, is, I argue in Chapter II, the goal of the Raj novel genre, arising in response to the exigence posed by Anglo-India’s marginalization amongst narratives of British nationalism. The history of the Raj begins with the philosophical and administrative reshuffling of 1858. So too, I argue, the Raj novel project begins with Mutiny-focused texts such as Steel and Croker’s. These novels represent a point of connection between the historical incident that inaugurated the Raj form of government and the construction of an idealized Anglo-Indian identity which the Raj novels produce under that government’s auspices. Both modes of valorizing Anglo-India are essential to the nostalgic re-visitations of the 1970s/1980s Raj Revival, which return in works such as M.M. Kaye’s Mutiny novel, *Shadow of the Moon*, to specific imagery deployed by Steel and Croker, and specific ideas and ideals developed in the Raj novel genre more broadly. This process begins, I argue now, with the genre’s most famous writer: Rudyard Kipling.

III. The Raj Novel Rampant: Rudyard Kipling, Sara Jeannette Duncan, and the Consolidation of the Raj Novel Genre

Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker's Raj novels develop an idealized model of Anglo-Indian male and female identity within the existing context of the Mutiny novel. In contrast, the fictions of the authors analyzed in this chapter—Rudyard Kipling and Sara Jeannette Duncan—are essential in establishing the Raj novel as a distinct genre amongst the broader literature of British colonial exploration and rule. Kipling published at the beginning and Duncan at the high point of the period marking novel production under the Raj, demarcated by Alison Sainsbury as follows: "Novels of Anglo-Indian domestic life began to appear in the 1880s, made a strong showing through the 1920s, began to die out in the 1930s, and had mostly disappeared by the 1940s."¹²³ Within that period, I argue, Kipling and Duncan's novels make the most complex case for Anglo-India as constituent to the metanarrative of British imperial identity—the essential message of the genre. Describing "character," and what it meant to Victorians who positioned the concept as an achievable ideal, Peter Mandler writes:

"Character" represented the deep inner qualities of the developed human being . . . It encompassed both reason and emotion . . . It was widely held to be an innate potential of all human beings, although not necessarily developed by them all – that required either a propitious environment or an act of will or both.¹²⁴

Among the Raj novelists, Rudyard Kipling first enumerates the specific features of this form of character—the "deep inner qualities of the developed human being"—that the Raj novels imply manifest particularly in Anglo-India through service to the Raj. Contemporary and modern critics alike credit Kipling with consolidating a hugely influential image of Anglo-Indian life in his fiction and poetry. Edward Said writes that Kipling's "role in the definition, the imagination,

¹²³ Alison Sainsbury, "Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel," *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 163. Sainsbury speaks of the "domestic novel" specifically, but her chronology applies generally to fictional work under the Raj.

¹²⁴ Peter Mandler, *The English National Character* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2006). 67.

the formulation of what India was to the British Empire in its mature phase . . . is extraordinary.”¹²⁵ In defining and formulating Anglo-Indian character, Kipling sets Mandler’s “propitious environment” in the spaces of the Raj. The “act of will” in Kipling is the fulfillment of British national ideals by Anglo-Indians, despite the rigors of daily life in the subcontinent, through practical and authentic knowledge of India acquired by living and working “on the ground”. Similarly, in her novels Sara Jeannette Duncan explores the difficulty of conveying Anglo-India’s ideality to British audiences at “Home,” and contrasts Anglo-India repeatedly with Britain, while describing similar aspects of personal character to her readers.

The claim that Kipling and Duncan’s fictions forge connections between Anglo-Indian identities and the larger construct of British national character within the generic space of “the Raj novel” requires a definition of genre. Broadly, a genre is a system of categorization in which texts are grouped by the observed repetition of formal, stylistic, or conceptual elements. Studies of genre divide roughly into rhetorical-composition studies, which focus on the pragmatics of language (i.e. what genre helps language-users do), and the study of literary genres, which emphasize artistic elements of a text that allow it to be grouped with, or distinguished from, other artistic works.¹²⁶ Literary and rhetorical studies of genre historically have had different research aims, and have dealt differently with relationships between writer, reader, and text; Amy Devitt notes that literary theorists spotlight the ties between reader and text, while “compositionists tend to emphasize the relationship of the writer and the text.”¹²⁷ Literary genre scholarship, Devitt adds, also stresses the role of the critic. Despite this variance, scholars such as Ralph Cohen, in his seminal article “History and Genre,” have shown the constructedness of generic designations

¹²⁵ Edward Said, “Introduction,” in Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim*, ed. Edward Said (New York: Penguin, 1989). 8.

¹²⁶ Amy Devitt’s article “Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre” reviews the ways in which contemporary scholarship on genre has complicated this binary division (715; n2).

¹²⁷ Amy J. Devitt, “Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre,” *College English* 62:6 (July 2000). 699.

en masse. Cohen writes that genres are “historical assumptions constructed by authors, audiences, and critics in order to serve communicative and aesthetic purposes” (210). As Devitt argues in “Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre,” it is thus possible to use strategies of rhetorical genre study—particularly ones that show the interpenetration of genres by other genres and the socially-situated nature of utterances—to illuminate the work performed by literary genre. At the same time, literary genre theory expands the scope of rhetorical investigations, by integrating, for instance, an idea of valuation (i.e. some works are considered “better” at achieving their goal than others) in the assessment of genre works.

With this distinction between literary and rhetorical studies in mind, I use the definition of genre put forth by Fredric Jameson in *The Political Unconscious* (1981) because of its focus on the work of genre in promoting particular ideologies. Jameson writes that genre is a series of formal structures whose surface similarities (or breaks from similarity over a synchronically-organized period) reflect historical variance in the circumstances of a text’s production. This variance in turn informs the ideological valence of the work with respect to the larger “genre” within which an individual text is situated. Jameson writes that the “ideology of the form itself, thus sedimented, persists into the later, more complex structure as a generic message which coexists—either as a contradiction or . . . as a mediatory or harmonizing mechanism—with elements from later stages” (128). The Raj novel genre, I argue, is organized around shared ideological investment, by British writers who lived and wrote in India, in the definition of Anglo-Indian character and the advocacy of that character as an ideal form of British participation in the advancement of Krishan Kumar’s “imperial nationalism.”¹²⁸ Notable uptake of this generic message, again, takes place during the 1970s and 1980s Raj Revival.

¹²⁸ Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). x-xii, 30-32.

The idea of “exigence,” put forth in the rhetorical genre theory of Lloyd Bitzer and refined by Carolyn Miller in her article “Genre as Social Action” (1984), is of further use in fleshing out the relationship of genre theory to the Raj novel project. Bitzer locates exigence, along with audience and “constraints,” as one aspect of what he describes as a tri-part rhetorical interaction. Exigence is the set of instigating circumstances, Bitzer writes in “The Rhetorical Situation” (1968). It is the “problem” or dilemma which leads to a work’s production; “an imperfection marked by urgency; [exigence] is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be” (6). In the Raj novel genre, I argue that Anglo-India’s physical separation from the British Isles and the concurrent perception of Anglo-Indian inferiority or exclusion from Britain’s metanarrative of imperial identity is the problem the Raj authors seek to resolve. The dismissal of Anglo-India, to these nineteenth and early twentieth century writers, is “other than it should be”; thus, the Raj novel genre continually overwrites this obstacle, suggesting alternate scenarios in which Anglo-India is incorporated into Britain’s national sensibility of self. Developing these ideas sixteen years later, Carolyn Miller concurs with Bitzer that exigence offers “a set of particular social patterns and expectations that provides a socially objectified motive for addressing danger, ignorance, separateness.” Crucially, Miller adds that exigence dictates form, giving writers’ attempts to address the instigating problem a practical, familiar aspect. Exigence shapes “the response of the reader or listener to substance by providing instruction, so to speak, about how to perceive and interpret.”¹²⁹ Such pairings of exigence and form, in a genre, become instinctive: “The automatic, ritual unfolding of genres makes them appear normal, even inevitable; they are simply the way things are done,”¹³⁰

Anthony Paré writes. I argue, then, that from Kipling forward the Raj novels comprise a genre

¹²⁹ Carolyn R. Miller, “Genre as Social Action,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (May 1984). 158, 159.

¹³⁰ Anthony Pare, “Genre and Identity: Individuals, Institutions, and Ideology,” in *The Rhetoric of Ideology and Genre*, ed. Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, Tatiana Teslenko (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002). 59.

with a set exigence: to address the problem of Anglo-India's unwarranted exclusion from the larger British nation, the Raj novel genre uses specific, repeated forms to urge British reader to mimic the Anglo-Indian traits and patterns of behavior catalogued in the Raj novels. Such efforts also seek to deal with the "danger, ignorance, separateness" the Raj novels imply automatically accrues to Britain as an imperial nation in the world. The genre's exigence is articulated through the form of novels and short stories set in India and written between 1857 and 1947.

By describing the Raj novels as a genre, and analyzing how Kipling's and Duncan's works reveal and refine the genre's operating assumptions, this chapter notes specific thematic and plot elements that make the Raj novels a rhetorically distinct body of work. In particular, my analysis of recurrent behavioral traits assigned to characters by authors, and the claim that those character traits make an ideological appeal to readers of the Raj texts, extends the work of literary scholars who study the development of the novel in concert with new modes of thinking about national identity. Deirdre Lynch writes that in the market culture of Regency Britain "[p]eople's transactions with books came to be connected in new ways . . . to their endeavors to find themselves as 'individuals' and to escape from their social context, and . . . to position themselves within an economy of prestige in which cultural capital was distributed asymmetrically."¹³¹ As suggested in Chapter I, this exchange resembles the one in which the Raj novelists participate when they portray Anglo-Indian life to "Home" audiences in nineteenth-century Britain. Cultural capital accrued asymmetrically between "Home" and the colony, with Anglo-Indians attempting to communicate Anglo-India's role in the metanarrative of British imperial identity across geographic and conceptual divides. Discussing the national tale at the turn of the nineteenth century, Ina Ferris describes the political ramifications of such power

¹³¹ Deirdre Lynch, *The Economy of Character* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998). 6.

asymmetry for readers newly participant in what Jürgen Habermas calls “the public sphere”.

Ferris writes that

the distinction between patriotism and politics, never firm, is further blurred by the trope of the public sphere, an unstable trope in that it posits a symmetrical space but in fact divides into asymmetric spheres. In theory . . . the public sphere was one, open as a whole to all literate persons by virtue of the literacy that enabled them to communicate, in the words of Habermas, as “human beings pure and simple”. But complex exclusions and stratifications were always at work.¹³²

Habermas’ public sphere is defined as “the sphere of private people come together as a public.”¹³³ According to Habermas, as bourgeois culture expanded in the late 1700s and the reading public grew, the political realm and assumedly private spaces, particularly the family, formed an interdependent relationship in which “private people” engaged “public authorities in a debate over the general rules governing relations” between the spheres. New forms of literature, particularly the novel, helped practically redefine these symbolic realms. In Ferris’ application of Habermas’ trope, readers assume they derive cultural and political authority from participation in the public sphere. As readers, they seemingly hold the same right to partake in individual narratives (the distinct novels being read) and the hegemonic metanarratives (from which the individual narratives emerge and to which they contribute) as all other readers. But, Ferris notes, this is not the case. “[C]omplex exclusions and stratifications” exclude voices and narratives even while claiming to credit or incorporate them, and this is the asymmetrical relation of power within which the Raj novels agitate for Anglo-Indian ideality. The Raj novel genre develops a distinct ideology, and its attempts to naturalize that ideology within the larger power structures circumscribing the circulation of novels and narratives in Great Britain during the nineteenth and twentieth century leads to the genre’s emphasis on specific Anglo-Indian character traits.

¹³² Ina Ferris, “Writing on the Border: the National Tale, Female Writing, and the Public Sphere,” in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibility of Genre*, ed. Tilottama Rajan and Julia Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998). 91.

¹³³ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1989). 27.

The Raj novel genre is not alone in its deployment of fictional character as an ideological construct. The “simplification of personality required to produce a character in a novel is itself . . . an ideological statement about the role of the individual in relation to society since the early modern period,”¹³⁴ Lennard Davis writes in *Resisting Novels*. That the Raj texts rely on a distinct series of valorized traits, which gain particular prominence in Kipling’s fictions and are refined by continual reemergence in later texts during the Raj and Raj Revival, is a claim, or as Davis puts it, an ideological statement by Anglo-Indians about their right to participate in, and even guide, the shaping of British national character and imperial nationhood. The Raj novel genre develops its claims about the relation of Anglo-India to Britain by staging the specific relation of Anglo-Indian characters to British characters, and situating the Anglo-Indians as more refined by virtue of imperial service, true knowledge of India, and an informed sense of duty to the empire. Simplified to a catalogue of heroic qualities, the traits (Seymour Chatman’s *Story and Discourse* defines a novel character as a “paradigm of traits . . . ‘trait’ in the sense of ‘relatively stable or abiding personal quality’”¹³⁵) possessed by Raj novel heroes and heroines across the genre, venerate a recurrent idea of white British male and female character. Davis argues that

the very idea of character is inseparable from the moral and civilizing lesson to be learned [in the novel] . . . in the nineteenth century, the novel was seen as important for the furthering of civilization and culture, particularly as the base of readership began to spread to the lower classes. The ideological role of character was certainly part of the civilizing or, if you will, the socially indoctrinating aspect.¹³⁶

The Raj novels, as the genre whose development I theorize in this chapter, participate in the “civilizing” act the novel was felt to perform in the nineteenth century. More particularly, they use the unique power of India in the British national imaginary to imply that the novel’s moral and civilizing lessons—Davis uses the word “learned,” and as Chapters I, II, and III describe, the

¹³⁴ Lennard Davis, *Resisting Novels* (New York: Methuen, 1987). 103.

¹³⁵ Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978). 127.

¹³⁶ Lennard Davis, *Resisting Novels* (New York: Methuen, 1987). 117.

idea of pedagogy is emphasized by the Raj texts—was especially well-embodied in India. As the power and precedence of novels increased in the nineteenth century, so did the imaginary power of Britain’s Indian Empire. While Anglo-Indians were still positioned in a relation of dependence by Britons at “Home,” and while Raj texts often register a sense of exile from the bulk of the British populace, the power of India as an imaginative construct was undeniable. In *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire* (1968), a text representative of the nostalgic, romanticized imperial histories popular in late 1960s and 1970s Britain, James Morris¹³⁷ writes,

India was different in kind from the rest of the Empire — British for so long that it had become part of the national consciousness, so immense that it really formed, with Britain itself, the second focus of a dual power. If much of the Empire was a blank in British minds, India meant something to everybody . . . India was the brightest gem, the Raj, part of the order of things: to a people of the drizzly north, the possession of such a country was like some marvel in the house, a caged phoenix perhaps, or the portrait of some fabulously endowed if distant relative. (41)

Tracing the development of the romance in the nineteenth century and earlier, Northrop Frye notes that categories by which novels are understood (as “serious” or “trifling”) are not “qualities inherent in the literary works themselves”. Rather, they represent “the primary elements of the social acceptance of or response to literature” at the time a work is published. “Hence what is accepted as serious or dismissed as trifling may vary from one age to another, depending on currents of fashion or cultural attitudes operating for the most part outside literature.”¹³⁸ I argue in this chapter that in the era when the Raj novels were published, and once more under Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative government in 1970s and 1980s Great Britain, the generic exigence of the Raj novels resonated with what Frye terms the “cultural attitudes” of the moment. These texts responded to crises of British national identity by locating an imperial, martial source of Britishness in the Anglo-Indians who lived and served in India.

¹³⁷ Morris underwent gender reassignment in 1972; reissues of *Pax Britannica* appear under the name Jan Morris.

¹³⁸ Northrop Frye, *The Secular Scripture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1976). 17.

The asymmetrical field of power relations within which the Raj novel texts intervene is epitomized by J.R. Seeley's definition of the term "colony" in his influential 1883 lecture series, *The Expansion of England*. "By a colony," Seeley writes, "we understand a community which is not merely derivative, but which remains politically connected in a relationship of dependence with the parent community."¹³⁹ The Raj and Anglo-India, by this model, is derivative of Britain, dependent upon it, and figured as a child separated from a "parent" authority. India is distinct from Britain's other colonial territories, Seeley adds, because the racial difference between "English" and "Hindu" exacerbates the relationship of dependence inherent to colonialism. "[T]o withdraw our Government from a country which is dependent on it and which we have made incapable of depending upon anything else, would be the most inexcusable of all conceivable crimes," Seeley writes (196). Exacerbating this presumed power differential between colony and metropole, novel production in Anglo-India was seen to occur belatedly (from the 1880s on) with respect to Great Britain, where the novel form was well-established by the mid 1850s.¹⁴⁰ These factors help produce the visibly defensive policing of Anglo-India's literary production, with respect to the British reading public, performed by writers in the Raj novel genre. Kipling and Duncan articulate a nascent Anglo-Indian nation with notable grace and complexity; their characterization of the Anglo-Indian community's uncertain status (part of Britain, yet physically separate; part of imperialism, yet derivative and dependent) lends their novels a dramatic, politicized ambivalence that evolves into the Raj novel genre's "generic message".

Again, the role of the novel in conveying that generic message, and the understood power of the novel—noted also by Lennard Davis—in the late nineteenth century when the Raj novel

¹³⁹ J.R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1883). 38.

¹⁴⁰ Major Victorian novels published prior to 1865, the year Kipling was born, include: Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* (serialized 1860-1861), Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* (1847), Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* (1847), George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss* (1860), and William Makepeace Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* (1847).

did its primary work, is crucial. In *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), M.M. Bakhtin distinguishes the novel as unique in its relationship to “heteroglossia”—the many voices of society, power, and art which inform textual production. I take this point, and argue that the Raj novels engage in a dialogue over power with texts of British imperial understanding, such as Seeley’s, that place the colonial (thus, Anglo-Indian) actor in a subordinate position to the British nation. The Raj novel genre’s fundamental engagement is outward, directed at what Bakhtin calls the “thousands of living dialogic threads, woven by socio-ideological consciousness around the given object of an utterance.”¹⁴¹ In the nineteenth century specifically, Ian Duncan writes in *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel*, the novel offered “a panoramic and historical imitation of the life of the people, and something more: a criticism of that life” (2). The daily life of Anglo-India is the topic of the Raj novel genre, Bakhtin’s “given object” around which the “socio-ideological consciousness” of imperial Britain exerts its influence. Many Raj writers (Flora Annie Steel, B.M. Croker, Rudyard Kipling) also wrote popular short stories, yet the preponderance of novels in the field speaks to the novel form’s ideological efficacy, and its immense popularity and narrative authority, in the 1800s. Both the mimetic and critical impulses Ian Duncan notes appear in the Raj novel genre, and are detailed in this chapter with relation to Kipling and Duncan.

My description of the Raj novel genre follows but expands upon previous critical studies of works by Anglo-Indian authors who lived and wrote in India between 1857 and 1947. Bhupal Singh’s *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction* (1934), Benita Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries* (1972), and Margaret Stieg’s article, “Anglo-Indian Romances: Tracts for the Times” (1985), are the first three major surveys of Raj fiction. However, as Alison Sainsbury notes, Singh, Parry, and Stieg assume but do not describe the relationship between the texts in question; further, all

¹⁴¹ M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Michael Holquist, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, 2nd ed. (Austin: U of Texas P, 2004). 278. Bakhtin discusses heteroglossia specifically on 397-99.

three ascribe to the Raj novels a “romantic” element, but do not define what the term means in the Raj novel genre context.¹⁴² Later studies such as Jenny Sharpe’s *Allegories of Empire* (1993) and Nancy Paxton’s *Writing Under the Raj* (1999) develop complex theoretical linkages between the novels in their studies, but neither surveys or defines the Raj novels as a full, distinct body of texts. Sharpe, for instance, reads Raj works by Steel and Forster in tandem with non-Raj texts such as Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* (1847) and Virginia Woolf’s *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), and with Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet* (1966-1975). Paxton’s analysis in *Writing Under the Raj* similarly spans what she terms “metropolitan” as well as “colonial” writing; in addition, she demarcates the female Raj writers she studies from male authors such as Kipling:

Many Anglo-Indian novels by women were published in the 1890s or later, and several of the women were prolific popular writers who were regarded as direct competitors with now-famous male authors like Kipling . . . all of these novels, whether they were written by metropolitan or colonial writers, illustrate the multifarious ways that the technologies of gender worked in concert with sex, class, race, religious, culture and “nationality” in service to the Raj. (31)

Paxton’s focus on gender formation for the imperial female and the female imperial subject renders her analysis of the Raj novels, which also downplays the “now-famous male authors such as Kipling” to whom she refers, less applicable to the definition I develop here. The most useful formulation of Anglo-Indian writing as a distinct genre, then, comes via expansion of Parry’s careful study in *Delusions and Discoveries*. Parry separates Steel, Kipling, and Forster from what she terms “The Romancers” (a group inclusive of B.M. Croker, Alice Perrin, and Maud Diver). In my formulation of the Raj novel genre, I argue that shared plots, ideological content, and character depictions link the fictions of all these writers, not just the less famous female authors; further, I incorporate Duncan into the generally discussed list of Raj novelists.

¹⁴² Alison Sainsbury, “Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel,” *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 164-66.

Understanding the Raj novels thus, as a distinct genre, clarifies the purpose of element repetition between these works and helps explain the resurgence of those elements in the Raj Revival.

Alison Sainsbury's article, "Married to the Empire: The Anglo-Indian Domestic Novel" (1996), which sees domestic Raj novels as a sub-genre in Anglo-Indian fiction, also directs my understanding of the Raj novels as a distinct genre. Sainsbury urges the definition of "romance" in the Raj novels, an effort I pursue in Chapter III when discussing Diver, Perrin, and Forster, and praises critical readings of Anglo-Indian fiction that locate "particular narrative strategies . . . in relation to specific historical and ideological currents in colonial discourse."¹⁴³ This is the effect I hope to achieve when, by defining the Raj novel genre and exploring its usage of fictional character as an ideological construct, I argue that Raj novel readers were meant to cooperate in what Krishan Kumar calls British "imperial nationalism". Heroic characters in the Raj texts exhibit behavioral traits that "advance[e] the imperial mission," one of the qualities Kumar ascribes to the imperial nationalist project. Moreover, characters in the Raj novel genre take selfless action motivated by "intense feelings of loyalty and emotional attachment to the empire,"¹⁴⁴ sensations Kumar argues reach beyond the immediate participants (Anglo-Indians, in the Raj novel genre) to consolidate allegiance across the imperial territory. "Beyond the sense of their own uniqueness lies the conviction of a global purpose that prompts [imperial nations] to play down mere national pride or the cultivation of a national character,"¹⁴⁵ Kumar writes. His argument again speaks to the ways in which the Raj novel genre's depiction of heroic Anglo-Indians is a form of ideological assertion. As I argue in Chapter I, the imperial nation of Great Britain enfolds the nascent nationalizing community of Anglo-India within itself. Similarly, the metanarrative of British imperial identity explicated by theorists such as Said, Homi Bhabha,

¹⁴³ Sainsbury 166.

¹⁴⁴ Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). 34.

¹⁴⁵ Kumar 34.

Simon Gikandi, and Thomas Richards enfold the narrative of the British in India into its larger discourse. Such inscription of Anglo-India's authoritative knowledge, well-used power, and selfless service underscores the community's importance in shaping crucial aspects of British identity. The definition of influential characters within the Anglo-Indian milieu bespeaks the "global purpose" of the Raj novel writers, who yoke Anglo-Indian heroism to the cultivation of a national character that goes beyond the Raj to support the British Empire's colonizing project.

Such contrast between a dominant metanarrative and the individual work of the Raj novels recalls Jameson's assertion in *The Political Unconscious* that a dialectical understanding of history makes comparison between genres both necessary and illuminating. "[T]raditional generic systems . . . which in earlier social formations have their own objectivity and constitute something like a formal environment or historical situation into which the individual work must emerge and against which it must define itself, are for the contemporary critic the occasion for the stimulation of essentially differential perceptions" (128). Ralph Cohen argues similarly: "Genres do not exist by themselves; they are named and placed within hierarchies or systems of genres, and each is defined by reference to the system and its members. A genre, therefore, is to be understood in relation to other genres."¹⁴⁶ Exploring the Raj novels' relationship to the genres of imperial literature, the novel in the Victorian Era, and the reading culture of nineteenth and early twentieth-century Britain usefully reveals distinctive aspects of these Anglo-Indian texts. The asymmetrical relationships of the Raj novels and the Raj writers to the metanarrative of British imperial identity upheld by discourses such as imperial literature and the novel render the "essentially different perceptions" of the Raj novel genre a useful object for study. "The imaginations of nineteenth-century Englishmen and women were filled with images of empire," Catherine Hall writes, adding that empire "was part of the everyday life of the English, part of

¹⁴⁶ Ralph Cohen, "History and Genre," *New Literary History* 17:2 (Winter 1986). 207.

their imaginative landscape, part of their sense of themselves, part of their mapping of the globe.”¹⁴⁷ In this chapter, I argue for the production of specific images in Britain’s imperial imagination through tropes of style, plot, and theme—the British man who knows Indians better than they know themselves, for example, or the sacrifice of individual desire for imperial good—that emerge and are developed by the fictions of Rudyard Kipling and Sara Jeannette Duncan.

“The Bard of Empire”: Rudyard Kipling and the Envisioning of Anglo-Indian Ideality

Critical understandings of Rudyard Kipling position him as the central figure in Anglo-Indian fiction, and this understanding of Kipling’s formative role in the genre is the viewpoint from which my analysis proceeds. That is, Kipling develops stylistic devices, narratives, dialect patterns, and an ideological “vision” of Anglo-Indian life and purpose that recurs throughout the Raj novel genre, and a detailed reading of his early short stories and late novel *Kim* (1901) shows the techniques by which that development takes place. Testimonies to Kipling’s stature are manifold. “More than any single author, Kipling articulated the pride which a segment of the British people took in seeing themselves as a nation of law-givers,” Benita Parry writes. Kipling “gave a spurious grandeur to their posturing, and endowed the discomforts of the job of imperial ruler with the glory of suffering and sacrifice.”¹⁴⁸ In 1907, Kipling was the first British author to win the Nobel Prize. C.D. af Wirsén, spokesman for the committee, called him “a citizen of a world-wide Empire” who tightened “the bonds of union between England and her colonies.”¹⁴⁹ Edward Said, in his introduction to *Kim*, writes: “Kipling . . . rendered the experience of empire with such force,” bringing “to a basically insular and provincial British audience the colour, the glamour and the romance of the British overseas enterprise” (7). Karyn Huenemann argues in an

¹⁴⁷ Catherine Hall, “Going a-Trotting: imperial man travels the Empire,” in *Gender and Imperialism*, ed. Claire Midgley (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998). 180.

¹⁴⁸ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 190.

¹⁴⁹ “The Nobel Prize in Literature 1907: Award Ceremony Speech,” Nobelprize.org, n.d. Web. 28 Apr 2012.

article comparing Kipling with Sara Jeannette Duncan that “critics still base their opinions of Anglo-Indian society (as a fictional locale) on the images perpetuated most vociferously in [Kipling].”¹⁵⁰ Michael Lackey describes Kipling circa 1907 as “a Nobel Laureate . . . honored by a knowing world tribunal . . . who embodies in his poetry what is understood to be best in the English character” (3). Lackey’s emphasis on Kipling’s influence with regard to national “character” anticipates my argument that as the most influential writer in the Raj novel genre, Kipling’s attention to individual psychologies guides the work of other Anglo-Indian authors.

However, between Kipling’s death in 1936 and the rise of postcolonial re-readings of notable imperial texts in the 1980s, Kipling was effectively exiled from the literary canon. His fiction, particularly his poetry, was felt to embody the worst of Britain’s racist imperial impulses; “The White Man’s Burden,” a poem that urges the titular white imperialist to “serve . . . Your new-caught, sullen peoples, / Half-devil and half-child,”¹⁵¹ is a notorious example. George Orwell, whose criticism prefigured this critical dismissal, dubbed Kipling “the prophet of British Imperialism in its expansionist phase . . . tawdry and shallow though it is, Kipling’s is the only literary picture that we possess of nineteenth-century Anglo-India.”¹⁵² Orwell’s emphasis on Kipling’s “literary” quality elevates him above his fellow Raj novel genre writers, but establishes him as part of that group—albeit a more artful member of a “tawdry and shallow” band. It is in part this artfulness that leads Raj novels of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to register the influence of Kipling’s plots, themes, and language, whether in their ambivalent relation to India and Indians or in their careful valorization of Anglo-India’s communal and personal character.

¹⁵⁰ Karyn Huenemann, “Art and Photography: Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Response to Kipling,” *Victorian Review* 21:1 (Summer 1995). 17.

¹⁵¹ Rudyard Kipling, “The White Man’s Burden,” *McClure’s* 12 (Feb. 1899).

¹⁵² George Orwell, “Rudyard Kipling,” 1946, in *Kipling’s Mind and Art*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1964). 72, 74.

There is a deeply personal quality to Kipling's depictions of Anglo-India. He was born in India to Anglo-Indian parents; before being sent "Home" at age five for schooling, he claimed he "thought and dreamed" in "the vernacular idiom."¹⁵³ His youth in England was largely miserable, and Kipling returned to India at age sixteen eager to take up work on the *Civil and Military Gazette*, a newspaper in Lahore (in contemporary Pakistan). Upon reuniting with his family, Kipling wrote, "my English years fell away, nor ever, I think, came back in full strength."¹⁵⁴ In Lahore, he began the short stories that became *Plain Tales from the Hills* (1888). Kipling's depiction of India shifts greatly between this collection and *Kim*, yet the particulars with which he describes the Anglo-Indian character traits refined by daily life in the subcontinent are consistent. Parry calls Kipling "vocal . . . in constructing the austere traditions of imperial service and the stoicism manifest in imperialism's servants."¹⁵⁵ Indeed, Kipling locates self-sacrificing duty to nation and community as the dominant Anglo-Indian ideal. He then divides his model of imperial service along gender lines, anticipating the strict divide between male and female roles generally advocated in the Raj novel genre. Kipling's fictions dictate that men serve the Raj politically by delving into India and gaining "true" knowledge of Indians, from which Anglo-Indians may then nobly and correctly rule. Women help the Raj cohere culturally, maintaining the Anglo-Indian social norms that, to Kipling, properly regulate race and gender hierarchies. In *Plain Tales*, Kipling conveys these ideas through the foibles and humor of Anglo-Indian daily life. Many stories take place in the Himalayan hill station of Simla, where romantic mischief abounds, often involving Kipling's savvy *memsahib* Mrs. Hauksbee. Other stories delve

¹⁵³ Rudyard Kipling, *Something of Myself*, 1937 (Edinburgh: R & R Clark, 2006). 3. Anglo-India was in many ways a refuge for Kipling, whose autobiographical short story "Baa Baa, Black Sheep" (1888) describes years of abuse and humiliation endured while he and his sister, Trixie, were boarded at a foster home in Southsea, England. He also describes this episode in *Something of Myself* (5-19).

¹⁵⁴ Rudyard Kipling, *Something of Myself*, 1937 (Edinburgh: R & R Clark, 2006). 39.

¹⁵⁵ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 189.

into the intersection between Anglo-Indian and Indian society, with Police Inspector Strickland, who moves among Indians disguised as an Afghan, a recurring figure. Thirteen years later, *Kim* uses the education of a British boy who grows up believing he is Indian, but becomes a spy for the British, to model the process of subject formation which Kipling depicts taking place in Anglo-India through (ostensibly) “real” knowledge deployed in the service of Raj rule. Both iterations, in their specific details, loom large over subsequent portrayals of Anglo-Indian character in the Raj novel genre.

Plain Tales from the Hills portrays Anglo-Indian identity as a conglomeration of qualities produced, controlled, and encouraged by the isolated community of British persons in India. In “Wressley of the Foreign Office,” for example, Kipling writes,

Men often do their best work blind, for some one else’s sake . . . in India, where every one knows every one else, you can watch men being driven, by the women who govern them, out of the rank-and-file . . . A good man, once started, goes forward; but an average man, so soon as the woman loses interest in his success as a tribute to her power, comes back to the battalion and is no more heard of. (306).

The delineation between “good” and “average” Anglo-Indian men comes via interpersonal contact and gendered influence. “[E]very one knows every one else” in India, and by witness and action each Anglo-Indian individual participates in the rise or fall of communal fortunes. This effort is “blind,” but it is also strategic; imperialism itself is a dogged effort for “some one else’s sake,” and Kipling expands that relationship outward, making selfless individual sacrifice one of the constituent virtues of Britain’s imperial personality and the Anglo-Indian community.

Additionally, power in the Raj, as envisioned by Kipling, is divided along gender lines. Marking a characteristic of the genre seen also in the Mutiny novels of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker, Kipling’s narratives develop a binary model of masculinity and femininity as strict, set categories. Part of the Raj novel project is to show how the division of bodies into gendered

types helps facilitate imperial rule. Summarizing what has become a truism in postcolonial and gender studies, Claire Midgley writes that “gender shaped the ways in which men and women participated in and were affected by empire, and in turn empire affected the gender identities of both colonizer and colonized.”¹⁵⁶ The Raj novel genre does not question the constructedness of gender-based identities or the effects of empire upon the gender identities of colonizer and colonized. (Though this is the task to which postcolonial critics Jenny Sharpe and Nancy Paxton put the Raj novels). Rather, Raj texts from Kipling forward augment the process of construction, demarcating ideal behavior as properly “male” or “female”; this is carried out in addition to the process Edward Said famously critiques in *Orientalism* (1978), by which the colonizing “West” portrays the colonized “East” as “female,” thereby justifying economic and political domination as part of an ostensibly ‘proper’ gender hierarchy.¹⁵⁷ The Raj novels thus follow the model Judith Butler critiques in *Gender Trouble* (1999): gender as “an abiding substance . . . produced through the compulsory ordering of attributes into coherent gender sequences.”¹⁵⁸ I read the portrayal of personality traits in Kipling as specifically “masculine” or “feminine” as part of the compulsory ordering by which British and Indian subjectivities in the Raj texts are produced along gendered lines. This production augments the simultaneous consolidation of racial stratification, and the unsettling by the Raj texts of Anglo-India’s hierarchical relationship to the British at “Home”.

For beyond codifying the gender roles of its constituent members, Kipling’s emphasis on Anglo-Indian community establishes the Raj novel genre’s efforts to construct Anglo-India as a distinct entity within the larger British nation. Anglo-India’s constituent members participate in advancing British imperialism, and offer an ideal of British character constituted through direct

¹⁵⁶ Claire Midgley, “Introduction: Gender and Imperialism: mapping the connections,” *Gender and Imperialism* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998). 14.

¹⁵⁷ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage, 2003). 138; 200-20.

¹⁵⁸ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 2nd ed (New York: Routledge, 1999). 32.

exercise of imperial power. To that end, part of the imperial project is the accrual of knowledge about the area of colonial control (e.g. Thomas Richards' thesis in *The Imperial Archive* [1993]). Such knowledge, in the nineteenth-century understanding, allowed the proper operation of British rule. Kipling's Anglo-India follows this pattern, but in the Anglo-Indian community knowledge must be used for the common good or it is wasted. "Wressley of the Foreign Office" writes the ultimate guide to the Central Indian States, only to discard it and descend into mediocrity upon rejection by a love interest. In eschewing the larger group for individual satisfaction, Wressley and the Raj administrators deprived of his knowledge both suffer. "Few people can afford to play Robinson Crusoe anywhere — least of all in India, where we are few in the land and very much dependent on each other's kind offices," Kipling writes in "By Word of Mouth" (309). This story depicts a couple who cut themselves off from Anglo-Indian society; the wife dies of typhoid despite the intervention of the Station, whose attempts to save her testify to the acts of communal dedication regularly carried out in Anglo-India: "The women sat up nursing the women, and the men turned to and tended those bachelors who were down, and we wrestled with those typhoid cases for fifty-six days" (309-10). After losing his wife, the husband isolates himself further—and dies. The story implies again that participation in the wider imperial undertaking sustains the British colonizers; the couple that refuses this communion suffers. In Anglo-India, "Every one knows every one else far too well for business purposes. How on earth can you rack and harry and post a man for his losings, when you are fond of his wife, and live in the same Station with him?" ("The Broken-Link Handicap" 166). Here and elsewhere, Kipling's short stories repeat a message of community at all costs that echoes through the Raj novel genre.

Nowhere is this quality of Anglo-India more evident than in “Thrown Away,” a story with clear universalizing aims: Kipling’s young protagonist is an archetype (“The Boy”). Reared by overprotective British parents, a detail that evokes the distaste in the Raj novel genre for “Home” attempts to interfere in Anglo-Indian affairs, the Boy cannot cope with his difficult life in India and commits suicide over a minor incident. The Narrator and a Major (again, both are archetypes) pretend his death was cholera to avoid humiliating his family. While the preservation of British dignity is an important theme, the reader is primarily left with an image of the Anglo-Indian community’s sense of duty, generosity, and kindness. Anglo-India cares for its own, even nascent members (the Boy is a boy, not a man) unable to come of age amongst the subcontinent’s rigors. Kipling’s introduction to “Thrown Away” is a masterpiece of ambivalent praise for the community that can survive such necessities:

Now India is a place beyond all others where one must not take things too seriously — the mid-day sun always excepted . . . Flirtation does not matter, because every one is being transferred and either you or she leave the Station, and never return. Good work does not matter, because a man is judged by his worst output and another man takes all the credit of his best as a rule. Bad work does not matter, because other men do worse and incompetents hang on longer in India than anywhere else. Amusements do not matter . . . Sickness does not matter, because it’s all in the day’s work, and if you die, another man takes over your place and your office in the eight hours between death and burial. Nothing matters except Home-furlough and acting allowances, and these only because they are scarce. It is a slack country, where all men work with imperfect instruments; and the wisest thing is to escape as soon as ever you can to some place where amusement is amusement and a reputation worth the having. (15-16)

The miracle of Kipling’s Anglo-India is that anyone survives, that the Raj’s civil and military servants, denied romance and personal achievement, weakened by sickness, and forbidden the escape of furlough and acting allowances, do not follow the Boy and take their own lives. By ostensibly condemning this “slack country, where all men work with imperfect instruments,” Kipling ironically elevates the majority of Anglo-Indians who, in reality, stay and serve. His

litany of difficulties becomes, contrariwise, a litany of hardships Anglo-Indians willingly endure to serve the Empire. Flora Annie Steel repeats this pattern in *Voices in the Night* (1900), when her hero regales the heroine with a list of Anglo-Indian miseries. The Raj novel genre argues largely that Home life is easier (“amusement is amusement”), but in its difficulty and lack of personal reward, Anglo-Indian life is nobler.¹⁵⁹ This characterization recalls one of Kipling’s most famous poems, “If—” (1895), which urges the reader to “force your heart and nerve and sinew / To serve your turn long after they are gone, / And so hold on when there is nothing in you / Except the Will which says to them: ‘Hold on!’” (ll. 21-24) If such stoicism in the face of hardship is displayed, dominance and personal—specifically masculine—fulfillment is ensured: “Yours is the Earth and everything that’s in it, / And . . . you’ll be a Man, my son!” (ll. 31-32). More emphatically, “If—” again sets out the qualities which even Kipling’s earliest Anglo-Indian short stories view as essential for the elevation of British character.

What, then, do the behavioral traits of Kipling’s idealized Anglo-Indians convey to British reading audiences about the traits and behaviors essential for upholding the British metanarrative of imperial identity? The answer emerges piecemeal in Kipling’s stories. “The Phantom Rickshaw” begins “[o]ne of the few advantages that India has over England is a great Knowability” (1);¹⁶⁰ this preoccupation with knowledge pervades Kipling’s Anglo-Indian fiction, setting a benchmark for the genre. *Plain Tales from the Hills*’ recurring male protagonist, Police

¹⁵⁹ In his autobiography, *Something of Myself* (1937), Kipling describes “If—’s” impact on British society, which speaks again to the power of his construction of character. The poem “for a while ran about the world . . . [It was] printed as cards to hang up in offices and bedrooms; illuminated text-wise and anthologized to weariness” (142). This “weariness” with the valorization of self-abnegation for the national good may be attributable to Kipling’s loss of optimism toward the end of his life, when he wrote *Something of Myself*. The death of his son, John, in World War I, the looming end of Britain’s imperial dominance, and fears of a second world war consumed the poet in his last decade, as biographer David Gilmour notes in his biography, *The Long Recessional* (2002).

¹⁶⁰ The sentence that follows bolsters my argument about Kipling’s valorization of Anglo-Indian community. The narrator adds that by “Knowability,” he means the Anglo-Indian ability to be after five years “directly or indirectly acquainted with the two or three hundred Civilians in his Province, all the Messes of ten or twelve Regiments and Batteries, and some fifteen hundred other people of the non-official caste. In ten years his knowledge should be doubled, and at the end of twenty he knows, or knows something about, every Englishman in the Empire” (1).

Inspector Strickland, is distinguished from the rank and file of imperial actors by his ability to “know” India. Going undercover, he passes as an Indian, gaining intimate association with life outside the British cantonment. Strickland foreshadows Col. Creighton in *Kim*. Both are amateur ethnologists whose capacious interest in India is channeled into more mundane jobs that uphold the Raj; their devotion to duty echoes the call in Kipling to communal service above personal desire or individual fame. In Strickland, Kipling’s elevation of Anglo-India’s authentic knowledge of India is refined and dramatized. Strickland is the closest the author comes to positing a male ideal in his short stories, though this depiction is complicated by Anglo-India’s reluctance to accept Strickland: “[P]eople did not understand him, so they said he was a doubtful sort of man . . . Strickland had himself to thank for this. He held the extraordinary theory that a Policeman in India should try to know as much about the natives as the natives themselves” (“Miss Youghal’s Sais” 25). The lack of understanding Strickland faces is not unique. In more complex Raj novel genre works such as Kipling’s and Duncan’s, heroes and heroines are often only belatedly embraced by Anglo-India, a technique that celebrates the strength of character required to briefly stand outside the norm while showing the final necessity of communal belonging. The characters are eventually embraced, and expressly choose to serve the group, at times to their own detriment—a theme later developed by Sara Jeannette Duncan.

The casting of protagonists in the Raj novel genre as distinct, well-rounded individuals who make a choice to serve the Anglo-Indian community assists reader identification with these figures, which seem more human as a result of their complexity. Analyzing the preponderance of rounded characters in novels of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, Deirdre Lynch argues that “characters became the imaginative resources on which readers drew to make themselves into individuals, to expand their own interior resources of sensibility. The expanded

inner life of the literary character—the psychological depth of the ‘new style of novel’” is “an artifact of a new form of self-culture.”¹⁶¹ Lynch claims readers learned to model personhood, new opportunities for which multiplied as massive technological and cultural changes swept 1800s Britain (4-5), on characters in the newly complex books they consumed. This “new form of self-culture” instructs a reader in the value of individuality even as it dramatizes the difficulty of self-actualization. Strickland’s struggle to integrate himself with the Anglo-Indian community thus offers Raj novel readers an example of how to reconcile personal wishes and national goals.

Further, Strickland demonstrates Kipling’s understanding of properly exercised British imperial power. By learning about Indians, Strickland gains power over them, which he is able to use responsibly. “Natives hated Strickland; but they were afraid of him. He knew too much” (“Miss Youghal’s Sais” 27). Gauri Viswanathan’s analysis of scholarly Orientalism in *Masks of Conquest* illuminates the collusion between power and knowledge in Kipling’s descriptions of Strickland (and later, Creighton): “The acquisition of knowledge about those whom [Britain] governs is clearly perceived to be of vital importance to the state for the purposes of domination and control” (29). Following Viswanathan’s emphasis on knowledge acquisition as a tool of dominance, Strickland uses his knowledge of India to advance British rule. “[B]efore Strickland was married,” Kipling writes, “he was, as I have told you already, a power among natives” (“The Bronckhorst Divorce-Case” 246). What specific knowledge does Strickland gain, and how does his possession of that knowledge show Kipling leading the Raj novel genre in lionizing Anglo-Indians who do onerous duty to advance Anglo-India and the Raj? Musing on Strickland’s authority, Kipling writes that “[w]hen a man knows who dance the *Halli-Hukk*, and how, and when, and where, he knows something to be proud of. He has gone deeper than the skin. But Strickland was not proud” (“Miss Youghal’s Sais” 26). This description puts particular value on

¹⁶¹ Deirdre Lynch, *The Economy of Character* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998). 126.

the ability to go below “the skin,” to move past the surface to a supposed “deeper” truth. Such knowledge sets aside arbitrary markers of division (tints of “the skin”), replacing them with a cultural authority that accounts for practices and motives (“how, and when, and where”). Again, in *Nation and Narration* (1990), Simon During distinguishes “culturalism” from “nationalism,” arguing that the former predates the latter, which is a politicized construct of modernity.¹⁶² By valorizing Strickland as a “cultural” authority, Kipling plays upon a similar notion of culturally based unity, implying that the Anglo-Indian Strickland has greater political power because he amasses knowledge of what Kipling sets as essential Indian cultural “truths”. Understanding this ostensive truth facilitates and justifies British rule in India.

At the same time, Strickland’s knowledge is controlled by a moral code: “Strickland was not proud.” Modesty and humility continue to define the idealized Anglo-Indians set forth in the Raj novel genre. In “The Mark of the Beast,” the sources of cultural authority are enumerated further as duty, hard work, perseverance, and a touch of quirkiness: Strickland learns “by virtue of his official position, long residence in the country, and weakness for going among the natives” (292).¹⁶³ With the mention of weakness, Kipling also incorporates into his short stories a note of caution: “To Be Filed For Reference,” the final story in *Plain Tales from the Hills*, uses the character of McIntosh Jellaludin to showcase the fall of one who goes too far below India’s skin.

Jellaludin has advantages greater than Strickland’s, but sinks into drugged dissipation and does

¹⁶² Simon During, “Literature – Nationalism’s other? The case for revision,” in *Nation and Narration*, ed. Homi Bhabha (London: Routledge, 1990). 138-53.

¹⁶³ Kipling reinforces this assertion in his portrayal of a high-born Hill widow in *Kim*. He establishes her as a figure of authority: “If Kim had walked proudly the day before . . . to-day he paced with tenfold pride in the train of a semi-royal procession, with a recognized place under the patronage of an old lady of charming manners and infinite resources” (75). He then has her loudly praise a British Superintendent of Police for operating in the Strickland mode: “These be the sort to oversee justice. They know the land and the customs of the land. The others, all new from Europe, suckled by white women and learning our tongues from books, are worse than the pestilence. They do harm to Kings” (76). Again, Kipling venerates in-depth experience of India learned via time spent in the country over information gained at “Home,” where would-be authorities “lear[n] tongues from books”. Edward Said calls this “Kipling’s way of demonstrating that natives accept colonial rule, so long as it is the right kind of rule” (28). Anglo-Indian rule, in Kipling, was the right kind because of its emphasis on community and “true” knowledge.

not complete his life's work, a monumental novel of India. Nonetheless, he imagines himself an authority: "he knew enough about the natives, among whom seven years of his life had been spent, to make his acquaintance worth having. He used actually to laugh at Strickland as an ignorant man" (321). When Jellaludin dies, the narrator and Strickland sort his papers: "Strickland . . . said that the writer was either an extreme liar or a most wonderful person. He thought the former" (324). Strickland's honesty, integrity, and proper deployment of knowledge gained during controlled ventures beneath "the skin" of India reify the character traits Kipling celebrates in the British imperial male actor. *Plain Tales from the Hills* thus sets a pattern of knowledge-based authority repeated, with variants by author, across the Raj novel genre.

What of a woman? Feminist readings rightly rebuke Kipling for a lack of sensitivity and depth in his portrayal of Anglo-Indian women; Pat Barr calls the average Kipling *memsahib* "frivolous, vain, sometimes adulterous, a heartless bitch with an ever-tinkling laugh and the occasional soft spot for a handsome subaltern."¹⁶⁴ While I agree that female characters such as the manipulative Mrs. Hauksbee are not ideal or even admirable in a standard sense, Kipling does situate Mrs. Hauksbee as having an express role to play in the maintenance of empire. Mrs. Hauksbee is valorized for reasons similar to those distinguishing Strickland: she possesses authoritative knowledge of Anglo-Indian (in contrast to Indian) cultural mores. This division between knowledge of Anglo-India versus knowledge of India reinforces my claim that Kipling conceptualizes imperial service differently for men and women. Following Alison Sainsbury's hearth and battlefield division in "Married to the Empire," Kipling depicts Mrs. Hauksbee as an authority in the social realm, whereas Strickland uses knowledge of Britain's Indian subjects to facilitate political processes of imperial rule. The divide further recalls During's analysis of culturalism versus nationalism. Kipling's texts deny Indians the right to nationalism by

¹⁶⁴ Pat Barr, *The Mem-Sahibs* (London: Seeker & Warburg, 1976). 143.

repeatedly situating India in the realm of a vague, pre-modern culturalism. In contrast, Kipling's construction of Anglo-Indian "culture" gives that nascent community a historico-cultural background that justifies its status as a nation. In dealing with Anglo-India, then, Kipling sets a Raj novel genre pattern of producing a culturalism that justifies Anglo-Indian "nationalism"; he uses vivid descriptions of Anglo-Indian cultural life to argue for a higher-functioning form of British national identity theoretically achievable by replication of Anglo-Indian cultural practices. Such emulation is in line with nineteenth-century Victorian ideals of improvement: texts such as Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) elevate cultural practice to a near religious level, claiming "[t]he aim of culture [is to set] ourselves to ascertain what perfection is and to make it prevail."¹⁶⁵ By locating Mrs. Hauksbee in the cultural arena and making Strickland a model of control in the political milieu, gendered modes of participation in British rule emerge in Kipling as equivalent.

Sainsbury argues that this equivocation then allows Anglo-Indian domestic novels to use stories of home life to validate their female protagonists as imperial actors. Indeed, introducing Mrs. Hauksbee, Kipling plays on her social adeptness: "She was clever, witty, brilliant, and sparkling beyond most of her kind" ("Three And – An Extra" 9). As with Strickland, Kipling emphasizes Mrs. Hauksbee's exceptionalism; "beyond most of her kind," she subtly serves as a model within Kipling's Anglo-India. Her grasp is wide: she has "the wisdom of the Serpent, the logical coherence of the Man, the fearlessness of the Child, and the triple intuition of the Woman" ("Kidnapped" 136). In combining these qualities, Mrs. Hauksbee goes "beneath the skin" of Anglo-India. She has no qualms about doing what is necessary to assert her vision of the morally right: in "Three And – An Extra," she saves a marriage by interfering in it; "The Rescue

¹⁶⁵ Matthew Arnold, 1869; preface 1875, *Culture and Anarchy*, ed. John Dover Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971). 44. Arnold goes on to state that this is also the goal of religion.

of Pluffles” and “Kidnapped” see her saving two men from rash marriages that would muddle Anglo-India’s racial hierarchies. Like Strickland, Mrs. Hauksbee’s “true” knowledge allows her to exert power over all persons within her sphere of influence. Her authority, realized in social interaction, is built up through observation and decisive action. For example, in “Consequences,” secret government correspondence falls into her hands. Mrs. Hauksbee uses it to goad Simla officials into giving her favorite, Tarrion, a job. Tarrion thinks that if she were twenty years younger and his wife, “I should be Viceroy of India in fifteen years” (103). Indeed, Kipling’s narrator adds: “if Mrs. Hauksbee gave the order, the whole Great Indian Administration would stand on its head” (“Kidnapped” 137). Kipling thus portrays efficiency and decisiveness as traits desirable in men and women alike. Mrs. Hauksbee is logical, serves imperial necessity with wry wit, and sees human nature without romantic illusions. She is not self-serving, however, and here she is contrasted to the disdained Mrs. Reiver: “Mrs. Hauksbee was honest — honest as her own front-teeth — and, but for her love of mischief, would have been a woman’s woman. There was no honesty about Mrs. Reiver; nothing but selfishness” (“The Rescue of Pluffles” 51). Self-regard, again, cuts off individuals from the Anglo-Indian community. In contrast, honesty is essential to British identity in Kipling, and Mrs. Hauksbee’s ability to follow a moral code even when seeming to dissemble is a redemptive aspect of Kipling’s Anglo-Indian female identity.

The qualities and themes of Anglo-Indian character established in Kipling’s short stories find fruition in *Kim*. A bestseller in its time, it was made into a movie starring Errol Flynn¹⁶⁶ in 1950 and is the direct model for M.M. Kaye’s blockbuster Raj Revival novel, *The Far Pavilions* (1979). Kimball O’Hara or “Kim,” the orphaned son of two Anglo-Indians, grows up in the bazaars of Lahore (located in contemporary Pakistan). Though his father was a colour-sergeant

¹⁶⁶ Playing the Afghan horse trader and spy Mahbub Ali in an example of the “blackface” casting—white actors playing characters written as ethnically other to their race—which also prevails in 1970s/1980s Raj Revival films.

in the Mavericks, an Irish regiment, Kim is largely unaware of his British heritage. Kipling asserts Kim's ambivalent identity from the outset, and much *Kim* scholarship focuses on this ambivalence: "Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazaar; Kim was white—a poor white of the very poorest" (3). Kim's transformation into an Anglicized player in the "Great Game" of British espionage along India's northwest border comprises the plot of *Kim*, which unfolds in a series of picaresque episodes. In this novel, Kipling uses Kim's maturation as a blueprint for becoming a British male imperial actor: the qualities Kipling highlights in Kim's self-actualization refine the list of character traits essential for performing British masculinity in the imperial space.

Recalling the texts of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker, *Kim* is a novel of education. Jeffrey Meyers emphasizes this educational aspect in his introduction to the 2004 edition of the novel, noting Kim's "rainbow coalition of indigenous teachers, who lead him to his true identity and real vocation" (xix). Each of the secondary characters Kim encounters is an instructor of some kind, from the Tibetan lama who adopts Kim as his *chela* (disciple) to Col. Creighton, the British espionage master, who sweeps Kim into the world of the Great Game. At their first meeting, the lama tells Kim "in the voice of authority" that he "will teach thee other and better desires" (20). Later, Kim thanks him in a poignant moment of cultural fusion: "I was made wise by thee, Holy One," said Kim . . . forgetting St. Xavier's; forgetting his white blood; forgetting even the Great Game as he stooped, Mohammedan-fashion, to touch his master's feet in the dust of the Jain temple" (185). Here, Kim sheds layers of British identity (St. Xavier's, white blood, Great Game) in a fit of filial affection, yet the effects of his "Western" training are borne out by the action in this final section of the novel: Kim deceives the lama to carry out a spy mission for

Britain. Further, he begins to counter the lama's philosophical statements with "Western" lessons learned at St. Xavier's, as when the lama tells him "[t]o abstain from action is well—except to acquire merit." Kim counters, "[a]t the Gates of Learning [St. Xavier's] we were taught that to abstain from action was unbecoming a Sahib. And I am a Sahib" (206, 207).¹⁶⁷ The exchange sets Kim's identity in the British camp, and marks decisive action as a key aspect of Britishness.

While Kim refers to himself as a "Sahib" with increasing consistency in the last third of the novel, his final acceptance of white British identity nearly drives him to a breakdown. Kim "looked with strange eyes unable to take up the size and proportion and use of things . . . he felt, though he could not put it into words, that his soul was out of gear with its surroundings—a cog-wheel unconnected with any machinery" (272). When the "wheels of his being lock up with the world anew," Kim sees India once more through eyes that perceive logical purposes: "Roads were meant to be walked upon, houses to be lived in, cattle to be driven, fields to be tilled, men and women to be talked to" (272).¹⁶⁸ Edmund Wilson argues that in this moment Kim "commits

¹⁶⁷ Kim is initially hostile toward identification with the British, telling Mahbub Ali, "I am *not* a Sahib . . . To the *madrissah* [St. Xavier's] I will go. At the *madrissah* I will learn. In the *madrissah* I will be a Sahib. But when the *madrissah* is shut, then must I be free and go among my people. Otherwise I die!" (133). Again, Kipling makes Kim's adventures distinctly educational—he "will learn" at school. What he learns, essentially, is to shed his personal identification with Indians ("my people") and locate himself among the British.

¹⁶⁸ The repeated use of wheel imagery in this passage resonates symbolically with the lama's quest to free himself from "the Wheel of Things" and gain enlightenment (12, 13). It is a quest for which Kim is originally enthusiastic, but from which he pulls away as the novel proceeds. His final experience of breakdown and affirmation is mediated through the image of "a cog-wheel unconnected with any machinery" and "an almost audible click [as] he felt the wheels of his being lock up anew on the world without" (272). The former state, which marks a near loss of consciousness by Kim, would seem to be the lama's ideal; the latter affirms the mechanized "modern" British subjectivity to which Kim turns at *Kim's* end. E.M. Forster uses similar mechanical images to describe Adela's participation in British society in *A Passage to India* (1924). When she cooperates with the Anglo-Indian community's desire to prosecute Dr. Aziz for attempted rape, her fiancé and his mother observe: "the case has to come before a magistrate now; it really must, the machinery has started.' / 'She has started the machinery; it will work to its end.'" (229). Adela's failure to testify against Aziz is visualized as a mechanical breakdown: "The Superintendent gazed at his witness as if she was a broken machine" (256). This imagery sets British imperialism as a space of modernity, for better (Kipling) or worse (Forster), in contrast to the timeless India of Kipling's lama and Forster's implacable *punkah*-puller who live, "[u]naware that anything unusual had occurred" (Forster 257).

himself to a role in the hierarchy of a practical organization” through “mechanical metaphor.”¹⁶⁹ Indeed, Kipling’s phrasing confirms for readers that a shift to Western modes of being is the proper culmination of Kim’s education: roads are “meant to be” walked upon, a directive phrasing amplified by Kim’s emotional movement from anguish to peace after he “locks” into the Raj’s hierarchical order. In the final talk between the lama and the other mentor of Kim’s youth, the Afghan horse trader and spy Mahbub Ali, the lama says Kim ““must go forth as a teacher”” (274). As with Strickland finding his place in the Anglo-Indian community, Kim’s transition from Raj novel pupil to educator offers a vision of a successful reconciliation of self to imperial nation. Parama Roy writes that the project of *Kim* “is the figuring of the colony as a nation,”¹⁷⁰ and Kim’s education is essential to that figuration, a schema for perceiving and absorbing Anglo-Indian character traits to the point at which one can convey their ideality to others. Ian Duncan, describing Sir Walter Scott’s *Waverley* novels, argues that they “represent the historical formation of the modern imperial nation-state in relation to the sentimental formation of the private individual.”¹⁷¹ The same dynamic is visible in *Kim*, whose “sentimental formation” into a proper, private British individual who desires to serve the British Empire allows Kipling to catalogue the stages by which colonial Anglo-India emerges as a player in that larger national and imperial British community..

What specifically does Kim learn in his maturation from Indian street urchin to British spy? From the outset Col. Creighton’s conception of the boy’s destiny is rooted in Kim’s identity as a British male and in the qualities of decency, hard work, and imperial duty Kipling associates with that masculine character. Edward Said argues that the Great Game “demand[s]

¹⁶⁹ Edmund Wilson, “The Kipling That Nobody Read,” 1941, in *Kipling’s Mind and Art*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966). 31. Edward Said’s analysis of this scene in his introduction to *Kim* (17-21) links Kim’s breakdown to collapses in George Eliot’s *Middlemarch* (1874) and Henry James’ *The Portrait of a Lady* (1880-1881).

¹⁷⁰ Parama Roy, *Indian Traffic* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1998). 86.

¹⁷¹ Ian Duncan, *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992). 15.

from Kim an exacting and precise discipline.”¹⁷² Indeed, Creighton tells Kim when he enrolls at St. Xavier’s, a move that marks the onset of Kim’s complicity in his British education,¹⁷³ ““thou art a Sahib and the son of a Sahib. Therefore, do not at any time be led to condemn the black men. I have known boys newly entered into the service of the Government who feigned not to understand the talk or the customs of black men. Their pay was cut for ignorance”” (117). As in *Plain Tales from the Hills*, knowledge that can only be acquired within the physical space of the Raj is essential for the maintenance of imperial institutions—and the fulfillment of British self as authority. The lesson of Kim’s imperial education thus accords with that provided by Kipling’s short stories, a point emphasized when Strickland makes a cameo in *Kim*. Deep, firsthand knowledge of India, and an appreciation for the lessons the country teaches, are acquired by both characters *en route* to finding their place in the communal group they choose to serve.

Parama Roy argues additionally that in *Kim*, Kipling establishes particular Anglo-Indians as models—a pattern that extends to the Raj novel genre broadly. “These Anglo-Indians are also different, and better educated in citizenship and nationness, than are the teeming but transparent masses that populate the pages of the novel, the masses that have no capacity to transcend their differences in order to imagine the nation,”¹⁷⁴ Roy writes. Drawing a distinction between Anglo-Indians and Indians based on the ability of each to actualize as a nation usefully returns the discussion to relations in Kipling between self, nation, and the narratives that sustain these constructs. Such distinctions are applicable to Anglo-Indians and the British at “Home,” with the former attempting to demonstrate to the latter the Anglo-Indian community’s imperial and imaginative abilities. What Kim learns in the course of Kipling’s book is to use his inborn skill at knowledge acquisition to carry out the tenets of Krishan Kumar’s imperial nationalism, to feel

¹⁷² Edward Said, “Introduction,” in Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim*, ed. Edward Said (New York: Penguin, 1989). 13.

¹⁷³ Kim is previously enrolled at another school, which he dislikes and refuses to attend.

¹⁷⁴ Parama Roy, *Indian Traffic* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1998). 87.

“intense . . . loyalty and emotional attachment to the empire.”¹⁷⁵ At the outset, Kim performs “commissions” for “sleek and shiny young men of fashion. It was intrigue . . . but what he loved was the game for its own sake” (5). By describing Kim’s early adventures, which lack a moral agenda, as “the game,” Kipling draws a comparison to the structured “Great Game” of *Kim*’s second half, the purpose of which is imperial control. Kim eagerly chooses to participate,¹⁷⁶ telling the Bengali spy Hurree Babu, “I am a Sahib . . . I hope to play the Great Game” (215). In pointedly selecting the Great Game, just as the characters in *Plain Tales from the Hills* elect to serve Anglo-India instead of pursuing individualistic ends, Kim acquires a sense of duty and ceases to act for the sake of acting, both qualities idealized in the Raj novel genre.

The shift in Kim’s character accords with Alan Sandison’s analysis of how Kipling portrays Anglo-India’s “[u]nremitting work and sacrifice” as “the only means of achieving and sustaining integrity” in the colonial space (154). Kim’s achievement of self-cohesion by affirming Western hierarchies of order and power, and by voicing a desire to work and sacrifice for empire, defuses the moments in Kipling’s text when Kim troubles his identity, asking “[w]ho is Kim—Kim—Kim?” (182, 272). That his upbringing hybridizes Kimball O’Hara is unquestionable. Kipling gestures toward Kim’s positioning between India and Britain throughout the novel; postcolonial readings of Kipling, such as Zohreh Sullivan’s *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling* (1993) and Bart Moore-Gilbert’s article “‘The Bhabhal of Tongues’: reading Kipling, reading Bhabha” (1996) often use Homi Bhabha’s concept of the resistant colonial hybrid as a way of explicating Kipling’s narratives. Bhabha posits the hybrid as a site at which discourses of

¹⁷⁵ Krishan Kumar, *The Making of English National Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003). 34.

¹⁷⁶ Indeed, as critic Edmund Wilson notes, Kim never registers a sense of guilt about spying on, and thus helping subjugate, the Indians he previously considered his own people (“The Kipling Nobody Read” 30-31). I agree with Wilson that Kipling’s staging lacks complexity; however, Kipling partially deflects Wilson’s criticism by having the major mission in which Kim participates be directed against two racist Russian interlopers, a scenario that allows Kim to work with Indian spies for what Kipling portrays as a “common” good.

empire fracture: the hybrid subject approximates colonial discourse's notion of a subordinate Indian, but in exceeding the limits of that discursive construction, the hybrid forces recognition that colonialism's dominating power and knowledge structures are finally untenable.¹⁷⁷ While I deal with Bhabha's theory of hybridity in more depth in Chapter IV, it is useful to consider here how Kipling, despite showing his protagonist occupying both the Indian and British worlds, sets Kim as a force by which the hybrid's insurgent possibilities are contained. Kim's "learning" of Britishness reveals the constructed nature of this category, but at the same time, Kipling implies that there is a British essence in Kim which Indian culture cannot hybridize or affect. This is obvious even in *Kim*'s first sentences, as Kim sits atop the cannon Zam-Zammah, lording over a crowd of Indian boys. "There was some justification for Kim," Kipling writes, "since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English" (3). The implication, seen also in Strickland's ability to impersonate an Afghan, is that Indian identity is permeable, easy for "knowledgeable" Anglo-Indians such as Kim and Strickland to imitate. Having grown up amongst Indians, Kim can mimic their cultural mores but still remain dominant—and dominance is implicitly British.

What I am suggesting is the opposite of Bart Moore-Gilbert's conclusion in his discussion of Indian characters in Kipling's short stories: "the very forms of knowledge which imperialism generates and on which it relies depend on a dialogue with native culture, which allows the native subject to turn those discourses back against the dominant power."¹⁷⁸ While the dialogue Moore-Gilbert describes takes place in *Kim*, I argue that it is Anglo-Indians, 'inherently' British but able to gain insight into Indian cultural practices, who control imperial forms of knowledge. A nation is being built in Kipling's fictions, but rather than an insurgent Indian presence creating

¹⁷⁷ Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). See particularly "Signs taken for wonders: Questions of ambivalence and authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817" (102-22).

¹⁷⁸ Bart Moore-Gilbert, "'The Bhabhal of Tongues:' reading Kipling, reading Bhabha," *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 117.

what Bhabha describes as a “Third Space” of interpretive ambivalence, one in which colonialist descriptors can be refuted,¹⁷⁹ Anglo-India is empowered and served by knowledge accrued via practices of cultural hybridity. When Kim’s joyful acquiescence to Anglo-Indian rule replaces his desire to live as a hybrid member of British and Indian society, Kipling sets out another trope of the Raj novel genre. The Raj novels’ Anglo-Indian protagonists learn elements of “proper” British character. In so doing, they confirm an innate ideality that supports the notion of British national character as an enduring construct to which Anglo-Indian daily experience is a crucial component. Kipling’s reconciliation of Kim’s discursive scattering shows how Anglo-India’s hegemonic modes of understanding continually reconcile the subject with the community; Kim’s desire for that reconciliation sets this union as a proper or ideal Anglo-Indian goal.

An earlier scene in which Kim’s Britishness enables him to thwart the unabashedly hybrid spy Lurgan’s mesmerism confirms this formulation. Kim, “firmly resolved to cling to his Sahibdom,” confronts Lurgan, “a Sahib in that he wore Sahib’s clothes; [but] the accent of his Urdu, the intonation of his English showed that he was anything but a Sahib” (148). At first enchanted by Lurgan, Kim stops “thinking in Hindi” and deploys Western rationality to strengthen his willpower: “his mind leaped up from the darkness that was swallowing it and took refuge in—the multiplication tables in English!” (151). By having Kim escape “darkness” through a Westernized knowledge scheme, Kipling again shows his protagonist expressing control through logical thought. Here, as at the novel’s end, Kim’s sense of duty and ability to access Indian and British cultural practices guarantees his authority and power. *Kim* is thus, as critic-biographer William Dillingham notes, “Kipling’s ode to that component of service, two-sidedness.”¹⁸⁰ Hybridity is re-envisioned as a means by which the ideal Anglo-Indian displays his or her “real”

¹⁷⁹ Homi Bhabha, “The Commitment to Theory,” in *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). 36.

¹⁸⁰ William B. Dillingham, *Rudyard Kipling: Hell and Heroism* (New York: Macmillan, 2005). 242, ll. 13-16.

knowledge of India and properly exerts duty in the course of imperial rule, an idea that recurs in other Raj novel genre texts such as Maud Diver's *Far to Seek* (1921), which presents a man of mixed British and Indian ancestry as the ideal ruler in the subcontinent.

In *Kim* then, as in his Anglo-Indian short stories, Kipling establishes the essential tenets of the Raj novel genre: distinct male and female roles, which accord to differentiated tasks within the imperial schema; authentic knowledge as a way to gain power; community over individuals; the choice by the individual to serve the community; and the distinct character traits (duty, hard work, humility, abnegation of self) that make Anglo-Indian men and women so ideal. Kipling's characters do not render unthinking duty to empire, and this reflects the author's lifelong attitude toward imperialism. His famous poem, "Recessional" (1897), written for Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, evokes a sense of uncertainty about the Empire's future. Without sustaining moral sensibilities, Kipling warns, the imperial mission is doomed ("Lo, all our pomp of yesterday / Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!"¹⁸¹) Yet the core of Anglo-Indian character leads the men and women of this community to rule, and rule they must. Later Raj novels revisit scenes and images, themes of personal character, and ideals of individual behavior, rendered by Kipling in contexts equally complex, more overtly nationalistic, or—in the case of E.M. Forster—more critical. Sara Jeannette Duncan's is one of the most complex visions, dramatizing a set of ideal attributes for men and women similar to Kipling's, but focusing her texts on the difficult work of transmitting the ideality of Anglo-India's attributes to British audiences at "Home".

¹⁸¹ Rudyard Kipling, "Recessional," *Kipling: Poems* (New York: Everyman's Library, 2007). 95. The reference to Nineveh and Tyre, two ancient, powerful empires, is Biblical; Kipling cites the preordained destruction of these cities, which grew too powerful and violated God's Holy Word.

“We are what we can conquer”: Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Ironic Visions of Anglo-India

Sara Jeannette Duncan was born in Brantford, Ontario, in 1861, and met her husband, Everard Cotes, while traveling the globe as a journalist. Cotes worked for the Indian Civil Service; Duncan lived with him in Calcutta from their marriage in 1890 until the start of World War I in 1914. Her life thus afforded her opportunity to observe two modes of colonial rule: the Canadian settler colony and the direct rule of India by the Raj.¹⁸² Duncan’s works describe both milieus; her novel, *The Imperialist* (1904), is set in a fictionalized version of Brantford, but the majority of her books take place in London or India. The latter, like Kipling’s narratives, show a prescient, often ironic, insight into imperial rule. These authors praise the same virtues (choosing to serve the communal good; acquiring authentic knowledge on the ground in India; doing one’s duty; being humble), and Duncan’s analysis of the Anglo-Indian self that emerges amidst the dangers of imperial service is similar in its complexity to Kipling’s. She is viewed posthumously as a noted chronicler of Anglo-India, one whose life experience and work as a reporter prior to her marriage allows her a unique perspective. One critic notes that “[Duncan] shows how some of the major features, issues, and personalities of British Indian society . . . appeared to an intelligent contemporary who was, in a sense, outside ‘the Establishment.’”¹⁸³ As in Kipling, Duncan’s books display genuine affection for the Anglo-Indian community, and praise specific of its members who sacrifice personal gain for duty.

Duncan’s participation in the nation building project, again, echoes the work of the Raj novel genre—and the larger work of the novel in the 1800s and 1900s. Katie Trumpener argues in *Bardic Nationalism* that it is “useful to describe how the novel (in an era of intense discussion

¹⁸² I use a definition of “settler colony” drawn from *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* (1998): a territory in which, “over time, the invading Europeans (or their descendents) annihilated, displaced and/or marginalized the indigenes to become a majority non-indigenous population” (174).

¹⁸³ S. Nagarajan, “Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Anglo-Indian Novels,” *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 12:33 (1977). 33.

about the developmental pattern of national characters and histories) grasps nations as distinct life worlds, yet begins, at the same time, to experiment with the relations of setting and time, plot and character” (xii). Duncan’s work operates at the confluence of the trajectories Trumpener describes. Duncan treats Anglo-India as a “distinct life world,” rendering its daily habits, culture, and political crises as compositional elements of a nation; at the same time, her later novels experiment with plots in which ideal character does not ensure personal happiness. Being a good man or woman is possible in Duncan’s Anglo-India, where the hardships of daily life draw out idealized qualities of service, stoicism, and bravery. Such heroism, however, does not mean Duncan’s characters live happily-ever-after—in fact, it does not mean they live at all.¹⁸⁴ And no matter how heroic their death, the quality of the departed is rarely recognized by the British at “Home.” Deirdre Lynch argues that “certain ways of writing character establish [pacts], at given historical moments, with other, adjacent discourses . . . discourses that instruct people in how to imagine themselves as participants in a nation.”¹⁸⁵ *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib* (1893), *Set in Authority* (1906), and *The Burnt Offering* (1909) variously show how the often mundane grind of Anglo-Indian daily life is itself a strategy of nation-building. Duncan’s books thus assist the Raj novel genre’s attempts to “instruct people in how to imagine themselves as participants in a nation,” showing the details of Anglo-Indian life and repeatedly elevating that life through contrast with the character and actions of persons at “Home.”

¹⁸⁴ I disagree with Karyn Huenemenn’s claim in “Art and Photography: Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Response to Kipling” that “Duncan, female and incorporating a refreshing idealism with her political realism, approaches her world with a humor and compassion seldom found in Kipling’s works” (18). Duncan does model idealism in parts of her novels, primarily her depictions of British character under pressure, and her books can be very humorous. But the image of Duncan as a “light-hearted” counter to Kipling’s dour “misogyny” (17) seems to overlook Duncan’s frequent less-than-flattering portrayals of Anglo-Indian femininity. Further, it obviates the considerable cynicism of *Set in Authority*, *The Burnt Offering*, and the final moments of *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, which paint a pessimistic picture of British India’s future. Similarly, I disagree with Huenemenn’s claim that there is a comparable “absence of contempt” (22) in Duncan’s work as opposed to Kipling’s; for characters such as Joan and Vulcan Mills or Jonas Batcham, M.P., contempt is her byword, and even Duncan’s heroic characters are often treated ironically.

¹⁸⁵ Deirdre Lynch, *The Economy of Character* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998). 11.

Duncan's first novel of India, *The Simple Adventures of a Mem sahib*, is the story of Helen Peachey, a young Englishwoman engaged to Mr. George William Browne, an Anglo-Indian tea company employee. Helen sails to India via P&O steamer to marry George and begin life as a mem sahib. Duncan's initially-unnamed narrator, Mrs. Perth Macintyre, wife of a partner at the tea company, tells Helen's story, using Helen as a stand-in for the average mem sahib's experiences: the difficulty of the sea voyage and setting up house; acquiring servants and finding proper tasks for each; managing what Duncan depicts as the habitual dishonesty of Indian employees; enduring the low season and monsoon; journeying to Simla and viewing the glory of the Himalayas. The novel ends with Mrs. Macintyre's departure for dull retirement in England, and her bittersweet observation that Anglo-Indian routine is making Helen "a mem sahib like another" (310). But in that universality, *The Simple Adventures of a Mem sahib* celebrates the grace and dignity of Helen's character, and affords Duncan opportunities for positively contrasting Anglo-Indian character with the "lesser" Britishness of persons at "Home."

Duncan immediately makes it clear that *The Simple Adventures of a Mem sahib* will set the story about Anglo-India straight. Early in the novel, a young woman tells Helen: "The very first thing everybody does here is to form an opinion of Anglo-Indians. It can't be postponed, it's involuntary. Besides, it's a duty" (139). Playing on the rhetoric of service so prevalent in the Raj novel genre, Duncan suggests that by forming an opinion "very first thing," without the benefit of practical knowledge acquired through years living and working in the subcontinent, visitors from Britain misapprehend the ways in which Anglo-Indians embody an ethos of duty to the metanarrative of British imperial identity. This confusion is dramatized in *Simple Adventures* by Jonas Batcham, M.P., a corpulent, egotistical British textile manufacturer visiting India to campaign against Anglo-Indian iniquity. More insidiously, he wants to bring down the Indian

textile industry to help his business at Home.¹⁸⁶ Batcham's inability to understand Anglo-India emphasizes qualities of personal character honed by service there, and clarifies Duncan's ideal of character formed on the Anglo-Indian model.

Batcham initially seems compassionate, concerned for Indians and Indian opinions of the British. Duncan portrays this interest as a usurping of emotional authority; Batcham uses India as a site upon which to exercise his liberal sensibilities and display excess sympathy:

Any trifling benefits that have accrued to the [Indian] people through British administration — one thinks of public works, sanitation, education, courts of justice, and so forth — Mr. Batcham either depreciated or ignored. We had done so little, so “terribly little,” as Mr. Batcham put it, compared with what we might have done, and of that little so much had been done badly! Daily Mr. Batcham discovered more things that had been neglected . . . He looked for them carefully, and whenever he found one he wept audibly. (173)

Batcham's performance of sympathy, his determined ignorance of the benefits of Raj rule, listed in a sly aside, and the heavily satirical tone of Mrs. Macintyre's description place Batcham in unflattering contrast to the Anglo-Indian administration he so derides. Moreover, the reader soon sees that Batcham is callous at heart. Hearing of a British man in the Education Office whose death left his family penniless, he declares: “I should consider marriage under those conditions an improvidence, and I don't understand people being ill in this climate. I think it must be largely due to the imagination. So far as my testimony is worth anything, I find myself much benefited” (202). The key, of course, is that Batcham's testimony is worthless. His “knowledge” of Anglo-Indian amorality and sickliness, like that of all globe-trotter characters in the Raj novel genre,¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶ Introducing the globe-trotter as subject, Duncan writes: “It is also possible, I believe, if one lives in India long enough, to come across a globe-trotter who is modest and teachable, but we have been out here only twenty-two years, and I am going home without having seen one” (169). The use of irony and understatement is characteristic of her writing, and emphasizes her authoritative knowledge by underplaying it, as Kipling does in *Plain Tales*.

¹⁸⁷ Rudyard Kipling also includes a globe-trotter character in *Plain Tales from the Hills* (1888), making him again an innovator with regards to this trope of the genre. The narrator of “A Friend's Friend” is visited by Jevon, an arrogant, hypocritical globe-trotter who gets sloppy drunk and commits innumerable social sins at the regiment's annual Afghan Ball. Kipling's advice with regards to globe-trotters is to “keep them moving, [so] they have no time to say insulting and offensive things about ‘Anglo-Indian Society’” (262). Again, Kipling's mockery focuses on the

lacks the proof of experience. Batcham desires an India that corresponds to images of bygone 'John Company' days: "The great concourse of his kind in the hotels, the telegrams in the morning's *Englishman*, the presence of overland cheese, the electric light, and the modern bacteriologist, should have rebuked this pretension somewhat, but it is doubtful if anything could do that" (170-71). Batcham, once decided—and he decided, Duncan implies, before leaving "Home"—will not see Anglo-India as it is.

Moreover, a feedback loop exists between globe-trotters such as Batcham and the British media. Those just arrived, names not yet "dry in the Bombay hotel register," publish books in Britain which new globe-trotters read and from which they draw false inferences (172). They presume to know Anglo-India better than it knows itself: "Mr. Batcham was not the Government of India, [but] was he not entitled from his seat in the British House of Commons and the depth of his righteous indignation, to call the Government of India to account?" (174) It is all politics, Duncan argues, noting in an aside that "The initials 'M. P.' have become cabalistic signs" for Anglo-Indians, filling the population with "the memory of past reproaches, and the certainty of coming ones" (169). Duncan's defensive stance against Batcham's generalizing, prejudicial view of Anglo-India, like Kipling's celebration of Strickland and Kim's knowledge-gathering work, polices and elevates Anglo-Indian knowledge as earned and authentic. This theme is essential to the Raj novel genre. Anglo-Indians, in the harsh experience of daily life in the subcontinent, gain authoritative insight that cannot be replicated, or even grasped, by visitors from "Home". This knowledge validates the power they wield as colonial authorities. Thomas Richards writes that "never has the alliance between knowledge and power been more clearly presented than in turn-

presumption of authoritative knowledge about Anglo-India. In Kipling, as in Duncan and the other Raj writers, the actual possession of such knowledge brings both modesty and humbleness to its possessors.

of-the-century fiction,”¹⁸⁸ and it is the precise alliance of these two concepts which consolidates the vigor and justice of Anglo-Indian rule portrayed by authors in the Raj novel genre.

Having established the validity of Anglo-Indian authority, Duncan’s fictions repeatedly address the question of how an ideal man or woman uses such power. In *Simple Adventures*, Helen arrives in Calcutta and entertains guests. The first raves about life in India; the second decries it: “‘It’s really awfully frivolous here . . . Don’t you think so — after England? . . . The frivolity’s all right — if there were only anything *else*, but there isn’t’” (112). Duncan’s novel examines this claim in depth (is there more to Anglo-India than frivolity?), ruling that yes, there is, a ‘more’ superior to anything offered in India *sans* the Raj, or Britain *sans* the Anglo-Indians. This process begins and ends with Helen, whom Duncan makes a stand-in for Anglo-Indian women generally. Bidding her goodbye, Mrs. Macintyre notes, “Mrs. Browne has become a memsahib . . . That was inevitable. I have watched it come to pass with a sense that it could not be prevented” (308). Helen’s symbolic value thus established, the Brownes’ evening drive in Calcutta dramatizes the privileged access gained by those who endure Anglo-India’s hardships:

[They] saw a Calcutta that never revealed itself to any globe-trotter, and which you will not find described in the printed experiences . . . of Jonas Batcham, for instance. They saw the broad Maidan laid out in lakes and rivers, with a theatrical sun, set in purple and gold, dissolving in each of them, and all the spaces between a marvellous lush green . . . Floating over it they saw a gossamer white pall that consisted of water and bacilli in a state of suspension, and hung abreast of the people. Calcutta has a saving grace, known to her Anglo-Indians as the Casuerina-avenue. You can lose your soul in the infinite filmy shadows of the marching trees. (254-55)

While the description holds traces of irony, there is a palpable sense of awe at the genuine beauty of an Indian night—and a sense of pride in “her” (Calcutta’s, but also Duncan’s) Anglo-Indians who glimpse it. Similarly, the Brownes’ adventures in the hills near Simla, during which they ride ill-suited horses for twenty miles a day and are charged by a mad buffalo, lead the reader to

¹⁸⁸ Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive* (London: Verso, 1993). 5.

note and admire their unspoken pluck and courage. A dangerous horseback ride through the Himalayas is embarked upon like a pleasure cruise, and Helen, who is not athletic or markedly strong, rises to every challenge with aplomb.¹⁸⁹ Duncan does not dwell on this evidence of her character, rather showing it silently through the Brownes' actions. Her declamations against the Brownes as average ("they were not remarkable people, these Brownes; from the first I told you so" [290]), thus take on a ring of knowing falseness. In light of their adventures, if the Brownes are "average," then the "average" in Anglo-India is high indeed.

While the qualities the Brownes model are similar to those espoused throughout the Raj novel genre (fortitude, strength, willingness to endure great hardship to serve the national good), Duncan is quick to point out that in India such hardship regularly takes banal, domestic forms as well. Of Helen's transport she writes:

If you could see a *dak-gharry* you would probably inquire with Mrs. Browne if there wasn't any other way of going. There is no other way of going. There are large numbers of places in India to which there is no other way of going. And if one had answered you thus, you would have said that if you had known that you wouldn't have come. Mrs. Browne said that when she saw the travelling-carriage of this Orient land of dreamy luxury, but she didn't particularly mean it. (267)

Duncan again pokes fun at the idea that Anglo-Indian life is easy ("land of dreamy luxury") while speaking to its uniqueness ("large numbers of places in India") and praising the character that uniqueness nurtures, a character that allows normal men and women to do remarkable, empire-building things in the course of daily life. Helen, the end of this quotation notes, might say she would not have come to India—but she would not have meant it. Affection for India, and the desire to serve the Anglo-Indian community, emerges yet more strongly in *Set in Authority*

¹⁸⁹ The break with gendered expectations of feminine delicacy recurs in later Raj novelists such as Maud Diver, whose heroine Honor Desmond is a crack shot. The Raj novel genre situates Anglo-Indian women as hardier than British women at "Home," and praises them for that strength—which is carefully delineated as less than that of Anglo-Indian men. Hierarchies of gender in the Raj novel genre thus elevate Anglo-Indian women over "Home" women, and as Chapter IV discusses, over Indian men, but keep women secondary to their male counterparts.

(1906). In this novel, the wider scope of Duncan's plot raises issues of the imperial relationship and more clearly lionizes individual Anglo-Indians who serve the Raj, even to the detriment of their own happiness;¹⁹⁰ I will summarize the narrative briefly to frame my analysis.

Set in Authority's action is divided between London and Ghoom, a fictional Indian province. The novel begins with the appointment of Anthony Andover, Lord Thame, as Viceroy. Thame, who is courting Victoria Tring, a politically active British woman obsessed with her missing brother, Herbert, resolves to establish a more liberal administration in India. To this end, he takes up the case of British Army officer Henry Morgan, accused of murdering an Indian man. The original sentence by "Mohammaden" (Muslim) judge, Sir Ahmed Hossain, has let Morgan off easily. Thame forces a retrial; Morgan is sentenced to death. The British community erupts, outraged that Thame only cares about British justice in the abstract rather than its concrete racial particulars. Ghoom's Chief Commissioner, Eliot Arden, obstructs Thame; the King is called upon to override the verdict, but all for naught—Morgan commits suicide the night before the execution. In the aftermath, Dr. Ruth Pierce, Arden's thwarted paramour, finds Morgan's supposed victim alive in Calcutta. The case turns out to be vengeance for the murder of Indians by the British in the aftermath of the Mutiny. Ruth returns to England and discovers that Morgan was Herbert, Victoria's missing brother. Victoria and Thame are now engaged and Ruth burns the letter in which Morgan revealed his identity, allowing their union to proceed. As his last act before leaving India, Thame makes Arden Lt. Gov. of Bengal and knights him.

Duncan uses the Morgan case as a microcosm of imperial India, one that encapsulates the precariousness of the British position there. A British officer, a symbol of colonial authority, acts

¹⁹⁰ *Set in Authority* is also more overtly satirical than *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, as is later novel *The Burnt Offering*. In this chapter I primarily treat those aspects of the text (the valorization of specific Anglo-Indian characters; Anglo-Indian contributions to Britain's metanarrative of imperial identity) which Duncan treats seriously; in Chapter IV, while discussing her portrayal of Indians, Indian characters, and Anglo-India's solipsistic views of race and race relations, I consider how her use of sarcasm highlights these points.

“badly,” failing to treat Indians as equal human beings. Yet the belief in British superiority that underpins the Raj justifies such behavior; Indians cannot be equal or there is no need to rule them. As I argued in Chapter I, this characteristic Raj attitude emerged particularly in the wake of the Mutiny. That the roots of the conspiracy against Morgan lie in the events of 1857 is thus more significant, an effect augmented by Duncan’s staging of Morgan’s trial in late May—the month the Mutiny broke out. The Mutiny led to the establishment of the Raj, via claims that the liberal, pedagogical agenda of uplift pursued by the East India Company had been invalidated by Indians’ ‘brutality’; depictions of this brutality as a rationale for more autocratic Raj rule is a focus of the Mutiny novels analyzed in Chapter I. *Set in Authority* makes the ramifications of this ideological shift ongoing by returning to the Mutiny and reevaluating the moment in which the contradictory basis for Raj rule emerged. Duncan supplements this theme by dramatizing the ways in which imperialism’s moral imperative, embodied by Thame, is not enough for people living daily life in India. If the actions agreed upon to be morally ‘right’ (here, a life for a life) are taken, the Raj cannot stand. Yet Duncan’s text is ambivalent; she undercuts her critique of Raj hypocrisy by making the Morgan affair an insidious Indian conspiracy, and making Morgan sympathetic through his familial link to Victoria. In the end, while *Set in Authority* troubles the character model constructed by the Raj novel genre, Duncan’s text affirms that genre’s claim that Anglo-Indians’ fulfillment of duty in the course of daily life best answers the dictates of Britain’s metanarrative of imperial selfhood.

As is common in the Raj novel genre, duty in *Set in Authority* falls along gendered lines. As the male ideal, Lord Thame is an unshakeable force of British imperial power, displaying the characteristics common to Raj novel heroes. He is an accomplished textual scholar with a wide knowledge of India, having written a book, *The Real Empire*, whose “finer, higher, and wider

conclusion . . . is that England should govern, and does govern, by moral force” (71). More importantly, he is a man of action who has set aside textual abstracts to deal with frontier policy on the ground in India. As Victoria puts it, “[w]ho could rule India for three years and talk about empires of the plough?” (96). Victoria’s statement gestures to the practical nature of Thame’s knowledge, which is directed by Thame’s sense of duty and his unshakeable moral principles. As one Anglo-Indian ruefully notes, “Thame won’t yield . . . That’s what he was born for—to hang an Englishman for shooting a native of India, and to take the glorious consequences” (219). Duncan undercuts the sarcasm of this statement by having Thame’s actions in the Morgan case win Victoria’s heart. Observing his determination, Victoria says, “Tony is right; we cannot let Morgan off without shame before a whole Empire . . . Let [Tony] take his own high course. You have put India in the hands of a Thame and his conscience, and I think you ought to leave it there” (232). Victoria refuses Thame’s offer of marriage several times, unsure he is the man he seems. His display of stoicism—a Raj novel genre ideal of masculine virtue—puts an end to her doubts. “It was his Viceroyalty that did it. Such a splendid range for his genius and character! Victoria has simply gone down before it,” Mrs. Tring declares. “Especially that wonderful Morgan tragedy . . . Anthony Thame came out of that very grandly, we all thought. And it won him Victoria” (267). Mrs. Tring specifically emphasizes the opportunities afforded Thame in developing “character” by service in Anglo-India. The evolution of Thame’s personal traits while Viceroy locates him as an ideal imperial male, conquering the land and the woman he loves with decisiveness and authority.¹⁹¹

¹⁹¹ Duncan’s plot supports the idea that Anglo-Indian character is superior to that of Britons at “Home”: the former live in a world without romantic delusions of service; the latter discuss Empire theoretically in fashionable salons. Persons such as Victoria and Mrs. Tring thus fail to grasp daily life in India, *Set in Authority* implies, and Victoria’s symbolic “defeat” by Thame’s Viceroyalty offers an image of Britain seduced by Anglo-Indian moral authority.

An ideal portrait indeed. Yet Lord Anthony Andover, fourth Baron Thame, Viceroy of India, a primary character in *Set in Authority*, never appears in Duncan's text. He is discussed, critiqued, and praised, but he is not actually a character. Similarly, we do not see Morgan's trial, despite it being the event to which the entire narrative builds and despite multiple characters describing it as a testing ground for empire: "One would think, during those last ten days of May, that the fate of the Empire depended on that of Henry Morgan. If he did not hang, it would totter morally, according to the Liberal press; if he did hang, it would crumble every other way, according to the Conservative opposition" (227). This "Home" obsession with Morgan allows Duncan a sideways opportunity for endorsing Anglo-Indian superiority: British persons outside Anglo-India miss the crucial symbol, Thame, in favor of lazy ne'er-do-well Morgan, and misread the situation even as they misread the values necessary for ideal British character. Duncan hints that this is part laziness, noting that "the centre of the Empire became vaguely aware that far out upon those circling boundaries which she manages with such magnificent unconcern something was happening" (206). Such "magnificent unconcern," matched against Thame's magisterial conscience, cannot make a lasting impression on British character. But if Thame and the trial are also removed from the narrative, what message is Duncan's text finally sending? If the British at "Home" are intent on misinterpreting the action taking place on the "circling boundaries" of their empire, what does this mean for Anglo-Indians and their place in the British national imaginary?

It is a tribute to the sophistication of *Set in Authority* that the novel makes doubts about the Raj novel project of idealizing Anglo-Indians a point of thematic concern. The difficulty of rendering Anglo-India's culturalism as a source of British nationalism, discussed with regards to Kipling, is evidenced by Duncan's inclusion in her plot of what Deirdre Lynch calls the "asymmetrical" distribution of "cultural capital"—here, between audiences in Britain and the

Anglo-Indians whose stories those audiences consume. In *Set in Authority*, Anglo-Indian narratives are only engaged at “Home” if they accord with extant stories of British superiority. Even Thame, the Viceroy, is only an acceptable narrative if he is familiar. The alternative—viewing Anglo-Indian ideality as a new model for character—is politically fraught. “Even positing the idea of a national character requires assumptions about an irreducible level of equality,” Peter Mandler writes in *The English National Character*. “The more elaborated the idea of national character – the more characteristics attributed to the whole of a nation – the more equality is implied”¹⁹². Following Mandler, to take Lord Thame as a model of male behavior implies the equality of Anglo-Indians within the metanarrative of British identity formation via the imperial project. “The power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism,” Edward Said argues.¹⁹³ Applied in this context, the power of an Anglo-Indian novelist such as Duncan to create a narrative of Anglo-Indian ideality and to dramatize, in her text, the acceptance of that narrative, stages in microcosm the power to narrate Said describes. It also upsets the presumptive power of “Home” Britons to block narratives of Anglo-Indian identity flourishing in the subcontinent. The exclusion of Thame and Morgan’s trial from *Set in Authority* emphasizes the incommensurability Duncan establishes between ideals learned in Anglo-India and the acceptance of those ideals at “Home”. Thame, for all his perfection, cannot be understood as a distinct character. Rather, Duncan writes, he “stands for the idea, the scheme, and the intention to which [Anglo-Indians] are all pledged; and through the long sacrifice of the arid years something of their loyalty and devotion and submission to the idea gathers in the human way about the sign of it” (84). Thame’s absence demonstrates the difficulty of conveying idea, scheme, and intention, as well as the “loyalty and

¹⁹² Peter Mandler, *The English National Character* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2006). 8.

¹⁹³ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Vintage, 1994). xiii.

devotion and submission” of Anglo-Indians to said idea. Duncan thus gives her text a meta-political element absent from *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, implying that “Home” audiences’ “magnificent unconcern” stems from an unwillingness to render the equality Mandler describes, and the power Said cites, to the emergent Anglo-Indian model of national character.

Having questioned the ability of readers to accept idealized Anglo-Indian types, Duncan uses her female ideal, Dr. Ruth Pierce, to further emphasize “the long sacrifice of the arid years” and the lack of benefit reaped by Anglo-Indians who serve the Raj. Ruth’s familial history in India gives her a concrete Anglo-Indian legacy; removing Morgan’s trial ensures that the action of the book rests on her decision about what to do with his letter. Like Strickland, Kim, and Mrs. Hauksbee, Ruth holds authentic knowledge—here, of Morgan’s real identity. She determines the success of Thame’s “conquest,” and Thame’s absence from the narrative thus loses some of its heft, as the power to win Victoria (to conquer, to rule) is not his. Ruth is “set in authority” by Duncan, though her own romance is thwarted by her Britishness. She and Arden cannot prevail against the forces of duty and morality that divide them: “They came back so constantly, these two, to the question of conscience, duty, right” (157). To enter her authoritative role, Ruth sacrifices personal happiness in a clear example of Anglo-Indian stoicism. Seeing her, Mrs. Tring cries, ““Your eyes tell me that India is a tragedy. Your beautiful eyes have suffered”” (270). Her statement is ironic: Mrs. Tring, author of a “tragic” play based on the Morgan case, glorifies the imperial majesty Thame earned (albeit unknowingly) through the death of her son—a relationship, again, about which Ruth alone knows the truth and which causes the “tragedy” in her eyes. Musing on this tangle of British ideals and realities, Ruth emerges into decisive action:

He *was* the Viceroy – she, too, owed something just to that. Owed perhaps the sacrifice of her sense of duty – after all, when one came to compare – was it so much to sacrifice? Far down the street the notes of a band struck upon the air. She listened thrilling, a smile upon her lips and tears standing in her eyes. It played ‘God Save the

King' . . . The great moment of her life it was, this conscientious woman's, when she threw Herbert Valentia Tring's dying letter to his sister into the fire. (271)

The imperial ideal is so great that even Ruth's sense of duty, itself an inseparable part of Anglo-Indian character, defers to it. This defeat, however, is simultaneously victory, and the "great moment" of Ruth's life is set to a soundtrack of British nationalism ("God Save the King"). For the British Empire to win, its servants must sometimes lose. The Anglo-Indians in *Set in Authority* do so willingly, fulfilling the ideals of character established in the Raj novel genre and forsaking personal gratification to aid the larger goal of Britain's imperial success.

Duncan expands on these imperial sensibilities and ideals in *The Burnt Offering* (1909). Observing Duncan's political agenda in this novel, critic George Woodcock describes *The Burnt Offering*'s "central message" as the idea that "India's problems must be solved by those who know the country and have brought it forward into the nineteenth century". Duncan thus traces the Raj novel genre's pattern of elevating Anglo-Indians' "real" knowledge of India above that of what Woodcock calls "benevolent intruders from outside who do not realize the complexity of the situation" (225). To this end, *The Burnt Offering* begins with the arrival in India of House of Commons Party Leader Vulcan Mills and his suffragette daughter Joan, with whom Home Secretary John Game falls in love. Calcutta is in political foment, the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act having led to tension and threats of violence. Nationalist guru Ganendra, who takes Vulcan and Joan under his wing, is secretly printing anti-British newspaper *The Lamp of Youth* and committing acts of terrorism against the British. He is arrested, and Vulcan tries, but fails, to make his cause an issue at "Home". Joan's devotion to India leads her to form an attachment to the Indian nationalist, Bepin; she concocts an Orientalist fantasy in which she will wed him, don Indian garments and study Hinduism while Vulcan campaigns for India at "Home". Ganendra is found guilty, and Calcutta erupts. Vulcan plans a public speech in defiance of the Meetings Act,

but at Game's order he is arrested and deported. Joan tries to deliver his speech, but the meeting disbands. In England, the State Socialists turn on Vulcan for his views on India. Bepin is arrested moments before he can wed Joan; upon release, he throws a shell at the Viceroy, an assassination attempt of which Game is aware. He misses, and kills himself. Game dies from injuries sustained in the attack; in death, he wins the heart of India for his education reforms. Joan retains her fanatical love for India, but her Indian "friends" forcibly send her back to England.

The Burnt Offering opens on a scene of flagrant racism: two young British men bar Bepin entry to their carriage while Joan watches critically. Foreshadowing *The Burnt Offering's* focus on "Home" British versus Anglo-Indian relations with Indians, Duncan stages the extremes of interracial social contact at the outset: unthinking racism; and the sophisticated scorn for such racism that the Raj novel genre portrays as "real" Anglo-Indian behavior. Joan's presence, however, makes the scene more complex: *The Burnt Offering* shows repeatedly how Joan and Vulcan's views cloak their own prejudices. They are more misguided in their desire to ignore difference between India and Britain than the racist British men in the carriage whose actions highlight it. Bepin himself defends the "better" Anglo-Indians to Joan, who cries, "these are the people who govern you—these are your civil administrators!" No, Bepin says, "[t]he officials do not speak in that way to Indians. Those were common men, what we call *chota-sahibs*" (12). Duncan's use of the term "*chota-sahib*," and Joan's inability to understand the nuances of Hindi, is significant because it sets Joan, newly arrived in India and lacking practical experience of the country, apart from senior Anglo-Indians who can speak the language. *Chota* is the Hindi word for "small"; *chota-sahib* was a term used for junior Anglo-Indians (*Plain Tales from the Raj* refers to "junior sahib; sahib's son" in defining it). The opposite is "*burra-sahib*," connoting

respect, with *burra* meaning “great” or “big.”¹⁹⁴ Joan does not realize that her lack of experience with India aligns her with the *chota*-sahibs she so disdains. Like them, she lacks the authoritative knowledge that marks Duncan and Kipling’s ideal Anglo-Indian actors. *The Burnt Offering* thus eschews the idea that what Joan witnesses in the carriage is an example of habitual Anglo-Indian racism. Duncan instead depicts Joan’s predatory desire to “belong absolutely to the people—to live among them, wear their dress, adopt their habits, speak their language, think their thoughts” (194) as the real abuse of British imperial power.

Similarly, the purest ideal in *The Burnt Offering* is that which Joan ignores. John Game is one of Duncan’s most obvious heroes, a model of masculinity and a counterpart to the stoic Ruth Pierce. Both are images of lives lived in service to Anglo-India; as complement to Ruth’s family history, Game has “twenty years of service in this far country” (141). Critic S. Nagarajan calls him “one of the best of the bureaucrats, very decent and altogether free from racialism” (38), and Joan herself acknowledges that Game has “so fair a mind” (109). As with Kipling’s models of male and female character, the practical daily routine of service to the Raj establishes Game’s principles and grants him authorizing knowledge: “[s]uch satisfaction as he had he found in hard work leading to certain definite perspectives” (300). Where Joan patronizes the Indian persons she claims to uplift, Game enjoys easy social interchange with Indians, including the beautiful widow Rani Janaki and the radical nationalist Jotindra. The latter praises Game thus:

“Oh, he is a very fine fellow,” said Jotindra feelingly. “He has true sympathy with us. His is a heart of flesh and not a clod of clay. Yet not at all open to persuasion. You have heard how all the Hindu gun-licenses were withdrawn from Eastern Bengal last month? Mr. Game will not hear any appeal. He is a very strong man. And yet always the kind word. You inquire and you will find him very popular among the natives. If we had a few more like Mr. Game everything would be alright.” (88-89)

¹⁹⁴ Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 275-76.

This is one of Duncan's most obvious idealizations of a specific Anglo-Indian. The qualities "feelingly" cited by Jotindra ("true" sympathy; a heart of flesh; honesty; strength; kindness) embody the best Raj rule can offer its subjects. That these virtues are vouchsafed by a radical Indian nationalist, who attributes them to "natives" more generally, augments Game's appeal. A subtheme in the Raj novel genre is the idea that, as Edward Said argues in reference to Kipling's Raj narratives, "natives accept colonial rule, so long as it is the right kind of rule."¹⁹⁵ Game, in Duncan's formulation, models that right kind of rule in all aspects of his character.

An early conversation with Joan emphasizes the fact that, while Game is an ideal of properly utilized imperial power, that ideality stems from the fact of his being Anglo-Indian. Anglo-Indians "'are a species," Joan tells Game. "You're not a bit like Englishmen in England" (91). By distinguishing Game from British persons at "Home," Duncan makes it clear that the qualities venerated in Game are specific to men and women who have done service in India. They are not simply inborn aspects of the British character. Game describes his life of service to Joan in mechanical terms, implying a progressive, industrial mindset: "'You see we're put on the rails, and we have to just go on the rails. It's an iron system'" (91).¹⁹⁶ Like Kipling's Strickland, he then displays great modesty, refusing Joan's praise that he is "'too good for it'" and adding, "'The job's too big for the best of us.' / 'Then you don't take the line that the English are a heaven-sent boon for which these miserable people should be grateful every hour of their lives?' / 'What about the opportunity of service? After all there's that . . . I love my job. And,' he smiled at her, 'I shall defend it to the last'" (91). The sincerity and sense of duty that defines the Anglo-Indian personal character Game embodies reveals the shallowness of Joan's knee-jerk

¹⁹⁵ Edward Said, "Introduction," in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, ed. Edward Said (New York: Penguin, 1989). 28.

¹⁹⁶ One of several subtle testimonies in *The Burnt Offering* to the great good delivered to the Indian people by the British train system. Indian holy man Yadava cites the railways as a gift from the British to India (168); Edward Said, analyzing mechanical metaphors in his introduction to *Kim*, states wryly that such metaphors are "apt . . . the Indian railways were British built, and they did assure some greater hold than before over the place" (19-20).

liberalism. By thus distinguishing her male and female protagonists along ‘national’ lines, with the Anglo-Indian “species” delineated from “Englishmen in England,” Duncan moves in *The Burnt Offering* beyond modeling personal character along solely gendered lines. The issue of imperial service in this later novel is felt most potently in the contrast of Anglo-Indians to the British at “Home,” who condemn Anglo-India from a position of deep misunderstanding.¹⁹⁷

This contrast recalls the Batcham subplot in *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, but in that early text Duncan did not raise the stakes of a division between Anglo-Indians and Britons at “Home” by involving her primary characters with her globe-trotter. In *The Burnt Offering*, Joan’s misguided choice of Bepin costs Game his life. The passage of Game’s education reforms shows that India and Anglo-India alike suffer from the inability of those at “Home” to accurately perceive the virtues of Raj rule. Joan chooses Bepin because she thinks he is better for India, an idea that stems from Bepin’s race making him more purely “of” the country. The globe-trotter’s characteristic misunderstanding of knowledge and power under the Raj produces the novel’s closing image of a noble Anglo-Indian who dies to advance an imperial cause which—as symbolized by Joan—does not recognize the worth of his “species”:

John Game died, and the ranks closed up, and another man made the foot-prints that would have been his where the flag moves on in the history of the race. The ranks closed up, as they always have, as they always will, since there can be no faltering at the front, whatever they may do in the rear, no turning back for the vanguard from the end they cannot see. And to this official was accorded a funeral which was almost a demonstration of loyalty to the Raj whose servant he was. (311)

The British see in Game’s death a role to be filled, the flag moving “on in the history of the race”. Duncan does not condemn the idea that “there can be no faltering at the front,” but in the

¹⁹⁷ I concur with Nancy Paxton that “[t]he novels of Kipling [and] Duncan . . . defend themselves against this knowledge [that child-rearing practices in British India could ‘implant alternative meanings of “race”’] by asserting . . . the spontaneous emergence of ‘innate’ gender-specific signs of ‘English’ identity in their heroes” (169). Part of *The Burnt Offering*’s appeal, however, is its ability to transcend gender-specific markers in plotting a version of Anglo-Indian identity, and focusing on that identity in contrast to Britishness, as I discuss here.

context of *The Burnt Offering* the ongoing momentum of the colonial mission is tied to the knowledge that Anglo-Indians must continue to serve a cause whose end they “cannot” see. This exile from the future of the imperial effort recalls the sense of exile from the metanarrative of British imperial identity which I argue the Raj novel genre strives to correct. Game’s funeral pays tribute to an overriding sense of duty in the Anglo-Indian character. As the Viceroy praises Game’s “sagacity, patience, and devotion” (309), the Indian audience leaps onto chairs to cheer.

It was England and the man they cheered . . . then, as ever, England and the man . . . More than that, like an electric flash in the midst of the storm of hands and feet and cheers, and most-of-all applauding tears, there ventured a sudden shrill boyish note from the back, and instantly, while the University stood upon the platform as one man, there swelled the old words of peace and honour “*God save our Gracious King! God save our noble King!*” And again and again “*God save the King!*” (309)

The parallels to Ruth Pierce’s pyrrhic sacrifice are clear. Duncan again celebrates a character’s personal defeat with the British national anthem, a song of victory for the nation that seemingly justifies the loss incurred by its stalwart Anglo-Indian servants. Duncan uses the sacrifices of Ruth and Game to validate Anglo-Indians as national actors and to show that the men and women who see daily Anglo-Indian life in all its flaws, but sacrifice themselves for its good regardless, represent an ideal of British character, knowledge, and power properly deployed.

A reading of this type, which sees gender playing a lesser role in *The Burnt Offering*, diverges from Nancy Paxton’s analysis of this novel in *Writing Under the Raj* (1999). Paxton lionizes Joan as a model of female agency, but in celebrating Duncan’s depiction of Joan as a woman making active choices, Paxton downplays the tragic consequences—for Game, for India, and for Joan herself—of Joan’s actions. By setting in play the events that kill Game, Joan indirectly robs India of a “better” form of rule—one that benefited the Indians Joan claims she wants to help. In the end, Joan’s Indian friends essentially force her back to England: “‘We . . . think you had better go away . . . You will be well with your father,’ repeated the mother of

Ananda, with all the obstinacy of an undeveloped intelligence. It was more than a hint, and was an admonition” (315). The mother’s statement reads as an admonition to Joan from Duncan, with Joan’s refusal to perceive events and persons outside the distorting lens of her Orientalist savior complex lending her, not Ananda’s mother, “the obstinacy of an undeveloped intellect”. A lack of authentic knowledge, rather than Joan’s gender, makes her culpable in undoing the good accomplished by the dutiful work Duncan ascribes to Anglo-Indians such as Game.

As in *Set in Authority* and *The Simple Adventures of a Mem sahib*, *The Burnt Offering* finally endows the Raj, and the work done for the Raj by its “loyal” Anglo-Indian servants, with moral rightness and authority. Duncan’s contribution to the Raj novel genre is twofold: a nuanced articulation of the challenge of conveying Anglo-Indian ideality to readers at “Home”; and an exploration of the difficulty of showcasing the “truth” of Anglo-Indian knowledge to Britons who have not experienced India, but who construct their own narratives about the country regardless. Like other authors in the Raj novel genre, Sara Jeannette Duncan makes a point of noting the hardships of Anglo-Indian daily existence. In *The Burnt Offering*, an Indian holy man, Yadava, describes Anglo-Indian achievement thus:

[W]hat is our dear country to the English? . . . It is the Pit. What is their great, their immensely creditable achievement? They have conquered, they have held, they have administered and developed the Pit. We have our own ways of returning this obligation. Cholera and enteric and frontier bullets we offer freely, with a moderate scale of pension to the survivors. We have drained England of her best blood and her best brains at that price for a hundred years. I sometimes ask myself if we had to offer the contract for our protection to the world, who else would do it so cheap? They are a people of strange ideas. They take it out in satisfaction. (168)

This summation elevates Anglo-Indians as Britain’s best, in terms of intelligence, breeding, and strength; praises the longevity of their service, and implies that Raj rule is motivated purely by a desire for “satisfaction”—a motivation similar to that stated by Game: “the opportunity of service”. The ennobling of Anglo-India proceeds in Duncan’s books through a relationship of

counterpoint. The years of service in India are an unending slog of “[c]holera and enteric and frontier bullets”. The only reward, as dramatized in *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, *Set in Authority*, and *The Burnt Offering*, is to see that service ignored in favor of facile or Orientalist assumptions made by “Home” Britons such as Joan or Batcham.

While Rudyard Kipling sets forth the forms and tropes of the Raj novel genre, and prefigures its basic message of Anglo-Indian ideality, Sara Jeannette Duncan examines the difficulties in communicating that message decades after the establishment of the genre and its exigence. In so doing, Duncan renders a vision of Anglo-Indian ideality more complex than many productions in the Raj novel genre. In *Delusions and Discoveries*, Benita Parry observes that “[i]f Kipling is compared with those novelists writing about India concurrently and immediately after him, it can be seen that his work contained the obvious, which was easy to imitate, as well as the more paradoxical, which escaped the counterfeiters” (201). I ascribe the same blend of the overt and the paradoxical to Duncan, though I hesitate to dismiss the bulk of the Raj novel genre—which I analyze through representative authors Alice Perrin and Maud Diver—as mere “counterfeiters”. Rather, in Chapter III I explore Raj novel formulations of Anglo-Indian ideality more broadly, but with attention to the specific ways various authorial voices and ideological stances manipulate tropes initially presented in the work of Kipling. Throughout, and particularly in the lead-up to Forster’s markedly critical late Raj novel, *A Passage to India* (1924), the formative, cautionary gestures seen in the works of Duncan and Kipling provide a guiding influence to an analysis of the Raj novel genre’s evolution. By establishing the hallmarks of the genre, and showing how the Raj novel’s constructions of Anglo-Indian character and daily life are deployed in works of considerable sophistication, Duncan and Kipling further forecast the critical, but nostalgic, efforts of the Raj Revivalists.

Ultimately, it is the blend of Kipling and Duncan's genuine affection for Anglo-India and praise for the "duty" British imperial rule carries out there, paired with an awareness of the disconnect between "Home" and the Raj, that makes these works so formative to the Raj novel genre.

Duncan and Kipling are integral to an understanding of how the Raj texts cohere around a particular ideological stance that sets Anglo-India as constituent to British imperial identity; their novels lay out the blueprint by which the group of texts I term the Raj novel genre proceed.

IV. The Raj Ascendant – Construction and Breakdown of Genre Ideals in Alice Perrin, Maud Diver, and E.M. Forster

The works of Alice Perrin and Maud Diver are analyzed in this chapter as representative of the bulk of novels produced within the Raj novel genre. Each author spent years of her life in India, Perrin as the wife of an Indian Civil Service officer and Diver as the wife of an army officer;¹⁹⁸ each wrote many popular, well-reviewed novels about Anglo-Indian life while living in India, and after returning “Home” to Britain. Their books vigorously carry out the generic aims I ascribe to the Raj novel in Chapter II: the advocacy, by means of repeated forms, plots, and character descriptions, for Anglo-Indian character as an ideal, and for Anglo-Indian knowledge as true and authoritative. This authority is confirmed by contrast with British persons at “Home,” and in this way the Raj novel genre continues to make Anglo-India essential to the metanarrative of British imperial identity operant in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Great Britain. Perrin and Diver are selected to represent the bulk of Raj novel genre output because their novels provide a clear, broad-ranging view of how the Raj authors use varied tones to convey shared ideological claims about Anglo-Indian character and British rule. Benita Parry writes that “it is difficult to distinguish concept, style, and texture of language”¹⁹⁹ in many Raj novel genre offerings, yet Perrin and Diver’s books are vastly different. Perrin writes short, briskly-paced novels in a mannered style; her plots shift between British and Indian settings. Diver, in contrast, embodies excess: her sprawling novels, often 400 to 500 pages long, are set almost exclusively in India and teem with flowery, melodramatic description, hyperbole, and what Parry calls “exegesis” on the glories of Britain’s Empire.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁸ Nancy Paxton, *Writing Under the Raj* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999). 31.

¹⁹⁹ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 78.

²⁰⁰ Parry 93.

That Perrin and Diver pursue a similar ideological agenda in these varied tones – what Parry calls the shared concept of their work – evidences the power of the Raj novels to unite seemingly disparate styles in the deployment of common ideological assertions that address the genre’s exigence. Published as the high period of Raj novel production, during which Diver and Perrin wrote, drew to an end, E.M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924) also contributes to the body of Raj novel genre works. However, Forster participates in the genre by troubling its attempts to situate Anglo-Indian character as ideal. His work deploys Raj novel conventions, including character types, exposition that recalls Sara Jeannette Duncan, and images of Indian landscape that evoke Perrin and Diver, to highlight what Forster casts as false ideals constructed by the Raj novel genre. In so doing, *A Passage to India* evokes Ernest Gellner’s claim that “pervasive false consciousness”²⁰¹ supports the forging of nations: Forster’s interrogation of Raj novel tropes implies that awareness of the methods by which Raj texts construct British imperial identity shows the artificiality and thus reduce the effectiveness of that construction.

Forster’s efforts further recall Frederic Jameson’s argument that “a conflict” exists in genres “between the older deep-structural form and the contemporary materials and generic systems in which [a work] seeks to inscribe and to reassert itself.”²⁰² When discussing Forster, I argue that Raj novel genre tropes and themes are the “deep-structural form” Jameson cites; Forster shows the incommensurability of these elements with the “contemporary material” of life in mid-1920s India, a country moving inexorably toward independence from Britain. While *A Passage to India*’s conflict is on the surface an accusation of rape, I argue that the novel also writes back against the inherited, “deep-structural” schemas of the Raj novel genre, over whose claims Forster works to “reassert” a more contemporary, pessimistic vision of British/Indian

²⁰¹ Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 2nd ed (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006). 119.

²⁰² Frederic Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981). 128.

relations. His later historical position with relation to the genre, I argue, allows him to interact with the Raj novels that precede him in a new way. Critic Marjorie Perloff writes that “genre, far from being a normative category, is always culture-specific and, to a high degree, historically determined.”²⁰³ It is this sense of historical determinancy to which I refer. When *A Passage to India* was written, the ideologies of the Raj novel had sedimented to the point at which the genre had the capacity for self-critique. An author could take up Raj novel tropes and reasonably expect reader familiarity with those components. Forster’s novel, written later than the majority of Raj works, upsets what has come before—frustrating the genre’s claims of Anglo-Indian ideality and unsettling the trajectories of British imperial destiny and sacrosanct imperial spaces which the Raj novels work to secure.

Unlike Forster, Perrin and Diver do not alter the Raj novel genre’s basic project. Rather, a close reading of their books shows how authors in the Raj novel genre use specific recurrent devices (love stories; direct address to the reader; transcendental encounters with the Indian landscape; historical verisimilitude) to strengthen the message of Anglo-Indian ideality their works convey. Perrin and Diver’s novels are deeply invested in the domestic; their focus is often on women’s daily lives and the running of Anglo-Indian households, with these venues set out as sites at which desirable character traits are refined. Alison Sainsbury, in her description of the Anglo-Indian novel as domestic, ably encapsulates these elements. She writes that the Raj novels “are concerned with domestic life: with courtship and marriage . . . with the relations between family members and among households in the Anglo-Indian community, with the status of the Anglo-Indian household in India.”²⁰⁴ To this list I add Nancy Armstrong’s description of

²⁰³ Marjorie Perloff, “Introduction,” in *Postmodern Genres*, ed. Marjorie Perloff (London: U of Oklahoma P, 1989). 7.

²⁰⁴ Alison Sainsbury, “Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel,” *Writing India, 1757-1990*, ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996). 165.

domestic novels published after 1848 as books that “dealt with problems of misguided desire and . . . resolved them in marriage.”²⁰⁵ This arc of desire and resolution is prominent in Diver, whose later Raj novels explore interracial romance in the imperial context. Benita Parry, Jenny Sharpe, and Nancy Paxton cogently argue that such desire is commonly seen in the Raj novel genre as “misguided”. By using images of domesticity, Diver makes even potentially subversive Indian/British unions a tool of Anglo-Indian imperial rule—a gesture indicative of the ways domestic elements in the Raj novel genre accrue potent ideological force. *A Passage to India*, in contrast, largely unravels the domestic scenarios Raj novelists such as Perrin and Diver craft. Though the book begins with a woman traveling to India to become engaged, that union and the happy resolution it promises fails, in part because the “misguided desire” Armstrong describes is entertained, rather than rejected, by Forster’s narrative.

As this discussion of desire and marriage indicates, love stories are a recurrent element in the Raj novel genre. Suzanne Leonard argues that a similarity in the gender hierarchies of empire and romance encourages this inclusion: “The fictions of romance, with its strong moral man and his demure female counterpart . . . appear easily translatable to the colonial context, for it, too, is structured around the mythology of white male righteousness and female dependency.”²⁰⁶ Perhaps because of this similarity in the assignation of prescriptive identities, analysis of romance in the Raj novels dominates early readings of these texts. Benita Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries* (1972; 1998) groups Perrin and Diver, whom Parry calls “The Romancers,” into a chapter with three other authors, including B.M. Croker. Parry calls these books “virtually indistinguishable”; together, they “reveal a community’s norms and troubled apprehensions of India, and are principally interesting as symptomatic of Anglo-Indian attitudes” (32). Following

²⁰⁵ Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction* (New York: Oxford UP, 1987). 177.

²⁰⁶ Suzanne Leonard, “The Threat to Whiteness: White Women’s Marital Betrayals in Colonial Settings,” in *At Home and Abroad*, ed. La Vinia Delois Jennings (Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2009). 134.

Parry's claim that the "Romancers" are unworthy of individual analysis, Margaret Stieg in an influential early article on Anglo-Indian fiction called the bulk of the genre "sub-literature" interested only in "Love, with a capital letter" and happy endings.²⁰⁷ Subsequent scholars, such as Sainsbury, Paxton, and Loretta Mijares, who explores the depiction of Eurasians in Diver's *Candles in the Wind*, reject this understanding of the love story-centered Raj novels as critically uninteresting. I follow their claims, particularly the argument in Sainsbury and Paxton that these novels offer productive insight into the formation of British imperial femininity.

Moreover, I add two points of analysis. First, in keeping with my formulation of the Raj novel genre as one which attempts a political intervention in the construction of British national character, I note how the Raj novels of Perrin and Diver engage the reader on political topics, often utilizing direct address which interrupts the primary plotline. Second, Diver and Perrin's novels endow India's landscape with the power to provoke the imagination and thereby inspire personal excellence in their Anglo-Indian protagonists. Diver's particular indebtedness to this idea is seen in her direct quotation of Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882), whose philosophical writings in the mid-1800s inspired the American Transcendentalists' construction of landscape as creatively and spiritually evocative. Forster disputes this figuration in *A Passage to India*, rejecting the idea that Anglo-Indians experienced uplift from what Emerson describes as the transformative encounter with nature. "Nature stretcheth out her arms to embrace man, only let his thoughts be of equal greatness," Emerson writes. "Willingly does she follow his steps . . . and bend her lines of grandeur and grace to the decoration of her darling child. Only let his thoughts be of equal scope, and the frame will suit the picture."²⁰⁸ In this chapter, I argue that Raj novelists such as Perrin and Diver use the unfamiliar qualities of the Indian landscape to further

²⁰⁷ Margaret F. Stieg, "Indian Romances: Tracts for the Times," *Journal of Popular Culture* 18.4 (1985). 3.

²⁰⁸ Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Nature* (Boston: James Monroe, 1836). 27.

evidence Anglo-Indian ideality, making India a “frame [to] suit” the community’s picture. Because India is more unusual, it provides greater benefits to the hardy Anglo-Indians who, as in Emerson’s formulation, can think thoughts equal to its rigors. Diver and Perrin thus pursue the emphasis on Anglo-India’s unique hardships seen in earlier works by authors such as Flora Annie Steel and Rudyard Kipling, but transmute those hardships into yet greater opportunities for personal growth.

In discussing the confluence of landscape and personal character, and the ongoing focus on romantic narrative in the Raj novel genre, it is important to note that the Raj novels do not participate in the project of literary “romance” documented by scholars of the long eighteenth century. This distinction is necessary because, as Alison Sainsbury notes in “Married to the empire,” the Raj novels have been referred to variously in scholarly analyses as “‘romances’ or ‘romantic novelettes’, or, more recently, ‘Romances’”; however, these classificatory terms “are not always explained, well-supported, or internally consistent” (164). My analysis is devoted specifically to defining the Raj novel genre, and to tracing how the formal and thematic elements I spotlight recur in the 1970s/1980s Raj Revival novels and films. In so doing, I refer to “romances,” but I do so exclusively in the sense of relationships between men and women (or men and men, in Forster)²⁰⁹ motivated by feelings of intense emotional attachment (love) and/or physical desire. These relationships often, but not always, end in marriage; the love story then evolves over the years of the couple’s partnership.

The Raj writers’ novels thus operate along the lines described by Ian Duncan in *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel*; summarizing the “great age of the novel” in nineteenth-century Britain, Duncan writes that the form “totalize[d] its mimetic range . . . A

²⁰⁹ While my definition of romance encompasses relationships between women and women as well, there are no representative examples of this type in the Raj novel genre works I analyze.

novel could describe, by metonymy and metaphor, the shape of the world and everything in it” (2). This is the project to which I argue the Raj writers apply themselves. Their texts strive to capture the “reality” of Anglo-Indian life. While they use dramatic devices (Duncan notes metonymy and metaphor) to achieve this end, their primary focus is on the use of specific forms to render the far-flung world of the Raj as palpable fact, and thus address a felt Anglo-Indian alterity. In contrast, Duncan argues that Romance is located in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the point at which a novel’s failure to accurately render reality—or the visibility of fictionality within the text—makes itself known.²¹⁰ For instance, in *The Progress of Romance* (1785), the novelist Clara Reeve calls the “Romance . . . an heroic fable, which treats of fabulous persons and things”; “[t]he Novel,” in contrast, “is a picture of real life and manners, and of the time in which it was written” (69). While literary scholars such as Duncan, Miranda Burgess, and Ioan Williams testify to the constructed nature of this dichotomy between Romance and novel,²¹¹ the perception in the 1800s of what Duncan terms “difference” between novelistic verisimilitude and imaginative Romances is a determining factor in my terming the Raj works novels.

For to situate their productions as necessarily constitutive to the British metanarrative of imperial identity developed via fictions of empire, Raj writers such as Perrin and Diver must implicitly emphasize the accuracy of their portrayals. It is this emphasis which Forster parodies in *A Passage to India*’s mocking depictions of Anglo-Indian self-mythologizing. Adela, Forster’s heroine, wants to see “the *real* India,” a desire that Anglo-Indians, convinced they are the real India, cannot grasp. The Raj novel genre’s strides toward accuracy of representation are further akin to the ideological efforts of Mutiny writers such as Flora Annie Steel. As noted in Chapter I,

²¹⁰ Ian Duncan, *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992). 2-3.

²¹¹ I refer to Burgess’ analysis in *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order: 1740-1830* (2000; 4-10), Duncan’s discussion in *Modern Romance and the Transformation of the Novel* (2-10), and Williams’ introduction to *Novel and Romance, 1700-1800* (1970; 1-24), which compiles a range of eighteenth-century writing that engages the relationship between novel and romance.

Steel peppers her novel, *On the Face of the Waters* (1896), with citations that confirm the accuracy of her fictional depictions, and by extension, support the case for British superiority made in her novel. When Perrin details the meager budgets of retired Anglo-Indians or Diver provides exhaustively detailed accounts of British military campaigns on India's Northwest Frontier, a similar effect is achieved: the "realism" of the events in question is used to support the simultaneous veracity of claims for Anglo-Indian ideality, particularly as the Raj authors claim such ideality forms through the endurance of real hardships. In their novels, Diver and Perrin take up clear ideological positions about Anglo-Indian character, British rule, and the linkages between the two. Like Forster, but from the opposite perspective, Diver and Perrin use tropes of the genre set forth in the works of Kipling to assail "Home" neglect of Anglo-India—and later, to attack Indian advocates of independence. In all three authors, I argue, the focus is on the Anglo-Indian actor, but the points of emphasis are vastly different, anticipating in their variety the range of representations that emerge later in the Raj Revival.

A Mannered Empire: Alice Perrin's Legacy of Anglo-Indian Life

Alice Perrin's depiction of Anglo-India shifts notably over the course of her career. Her early Raj novels portray India as a deleterious environment, and show lifelong Anglo-Indians to be racially "othered" by time spent in the subcontinent. Describing Perrin's first piece of Raj fiction, the short story collection *East of Suez* (1901),²¹² Benita Parry notes a "preoccupation with sudden, violent death and sinister disasters," and argues that India in this text is "a place of vast mysteries and immense horrors."²¹³ To Parry's accurate summation, this chapter adds the claim that Perrin initially takes a dim view of what Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Burnt Offering*

²¹² The title is possibly a reference to Rudyard Kipling, who begins his short story "The Mark of the Beast" (1899), "East of Suez, some hold, the direct control of Providence ceases" (*Life's Handicap* 296).

²¹³ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 81.

(1909) dubs the Anglo-Indian “species” (91). Perrin’s refusal to idealize Anglo-Indian character in her early work sets her apart amongst the Raj novelists, and shows the negative attitudes about the Anglo-Indian community which, I argue, the Raj novel promotion of Anglo-Indian character seeks to address. Perrin’s later message about the value of Anglo-Indian knowledge and daily life is also unique in its suggestion that British high society degrades the traits that shape an ideal British man or woman. This visible shift to the championing of Anglo-Indian experience offers a productive point of analysis. Finally, Perrin’s Raj novels give useful insight into the era in which she wrote. Her later emphasis on Anglo-Indian interest in Indian welfare coincides with growing Home Rule agitation in the subcontinent, and with the beginning of serious discussions in the British government about Indian independence. Like Maud Diver, Perrin breaks the fourth wall, speaking to readers directly about the superiority of Anglo-Indian character and implying that the quality of the Indian/Anglo-Indian interactions she depicts justify ongoing Raj rule.

The theme of accurate Anglo-Indian knowledge, a key point of emphasis in the Raj novel genre, also looms large in Perrin, a focus which did not leave reviewers of her novels unaffected. Praising Perrin’s depiction of India in *The Charm* (1911), *The New York Times* wrote: “Miss Perrin seems to possess remarkable knowledge of the region and the people . . . Not even Kipling has written more convincingly.”²¹⁴ The reviewer’s acknowledgment of Perrin’s “remarkable knowledge” underscores the Raj novel tactic of locating Anglo-Indians, such as Perrin herself, as authorities. Describing her career, Perrin similarly cites longevity of service to Anglo-India as the basis for her authorial clout; her life thus emerges in her description as exemplifying the Raj novel genre’s theme of authoritative Anglo-Indian experience. “I am deeply interested in India,” she told Douglas Sladen, author of *Who’s Who*, “in the people and their religions, and histories and social systems, and as I was sixteen years in the country I had an opportunity of receiving

²¹⁴ “Review of *The Charm*,” *The New York Times*, 22 October 1911.

lasting impressions, and of gaining invaluable experience. I come of a family which has been officially connected with India for five generations.”²¹⁵ Perrin’s cataloguing of areas in which she holds “lasting impressions” and “invaluable experience,” alongside her family history in Anglo-India, indicates a personal sense that time spent in India makes her an authority. In her career, Sladen writes, Perrin was a “leading figure at literary clubs and receptions . . . As storyteller and psychologist combined, she has no superior.”²¹⁶ The situation of Alice Perrin as Anglo-Indian authority, and the transition within her fictions to acceptance and valorization of that role, offers a revealing example of how success in the Raj novel genre validated its practitioners as authors and authorities, and how authors validated their characters as “ideal” rulers.

Initially, Perrin’s description of Anglo-Indians leans heavily on racial groupings, with “Anglo-Indian” close to the category of “native”. Describing Anglo-Indian women in *The Waters of Destruction* (1904), Perrin observes their “quick emotions and readily-stirred impulses . . . so curiously combined with the easy good nature and indolence of those who are born and bred in India, and who have consequently assimilated many racial characteristics of the country, though their descent may be . . . purely European” (59). Separating British and Anglo-Indian is a recurrent tactic of the Raj novel genre, one typically used to elevate Anglo-Indians. Here, Perrin sets herself apart by viewing Anglo-Indians critically. “Quick emotions” and “readily-stirred impulses” evince a lack of control; an “easy good nature” is tempered by “indolence,” a term which puts Anglo-Indians in a reactive space akin to that used in the Raj novels to characterize Indians. Intriguingly, Perrin casts the distinction as largely geographic. In Chapters I and II, I argue that part of the Raj novel genre’s aim is to make Anglo-Indian “separateness” an argument for a distinct, valuable national identity within the metanarrative of British imperial selfhood. In

²¹⁵ Qtd in Douglas Sladen, *Twenty Years of My Life* (London: Constable, 1915). 122-23.

²¹⁶ Sladen 122.

The Waters of Destruction, Perrin takes the opposite view: that the distance between Britain and India thwarts Anglo-Indian integration into the British national whole. Cut off from the geographic source of Britishness, Anglo-Indians are subject to harsh criticism even from their colonial subjects. Sunia, an Indian woman, fearing that her British husband has abandoned her for an Anglo-Indian *memsahib*, rants: ““Now hath he left me for her, and but for the colour of her skin she is as native as thou or I . . . neither she nor her people had ever crossed the black water, or so much as beheld my lord’s country”” (176). The similarity of Sunia’s claim and Perrin’s narrator’s description of Anglo-Indian women makes it difficult to dismiss Sunia as jealous or irrational. Indeed, when Loo Larken, the Anglo-Indian in question, goes to England, she finds it anathema to her person: ““I shall be so glad when it is time to go back to India. I cannot endure this England”” (209). Perrin’s depiction of Anglo-Indians at the start of her career thus reverses Rudyard Kipling’s portrayal of figures such as Inspector Strickland, who gains “real” knowledge of India by going “beneath the skin” of the country. In *The Waters of Destruction*, “the colour of [Loo’s] skin” is all that prevents her from being grouped among the Indians with whom she shares geographic displacement from Britain.

Perrin’s negative characterization of Anglo-Indians in this early work has an intriguingly personal element: events in *The Waters of Destruction*, including its main plot about aqueduct construction, accord with Perrin’s descriptions of her early life in India. As an eighteen-year-old, she moved with her husband to “a place in the jungle where he had charge of an enormous aqueduct which was under construction. He had several Coopers Hill assistants under him, not one of whom was married, and I was the only English woman in the locality. There was no station . . . our houses were temporary erections of mud, and we were miles from the railway.”

Isolated, Perrin began writing “from sheer need of occupation.”²¹⁷ It is possible that the sense of Anglo-Indian inferiority in *The Waters of Destruction* stems from remembered feelings of exile and loneliness. But Perrin’s personal investment does not diminish the connection between her portrayal and a broader sense of the inadequacy with which Anglo-Indians felt British persons at “Home” viewed them. As discussed in Chapters I and II, Anglo-India’s sense of exile from the metanarrative of British imperial identity helps spur the Raj novel genre’s emphasis on the ideality of Anglo-Indian character. In J.R. Seeley’s lecture series, *The Expansion of England* (1883), Benita Parry writes, Seeley tries to “allay disquiet about the adverse effects which India’s inferior culture could exert on the imperial homeland; and this he does by strenuously denying mutuality and situating England as the donor of a ‘superior enlightenment.’”²¹⁸ Seeley’s gesture is perhaps more cautious than Parry indicates; he makes a point of downplaying the possible effects of Indians and Anglo-Indians alike on the British at “Home,” claiming “England . . . is singularly disengaged from the enormous Empire which it governs . . . it has produced no change in the internal character of the English state” (Seeley 245). Seeley’s disavowal by geographic disengagement, like Sunia’s linkage of Anglo-Indians and Indians as one group of persons who have not “crossed the black water,” frames Perrin’s displacement of the “adverse effects” Seeley fears onto the bodies of Anglo-Indians. By setting Anglo-Indians apart racially and spatially, Perrin’s text establishes British character as something outside the Anglo-Indian milieu.

After the success of *East of Suez* and *The Waters of Destruction*, however, Perrin became an active producer within the Raj novel genre, writing a new book every two or three years between 1904 and 1932. Her books enjoyed strong sales,²¹⁹ and as her career progressed, her depictions of

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 9.

²¹⁹ In 1907, Perrin’s publisher, Chatto & Windus, offered her the then-substantial advance of £150 for her novel, *A Free Solitude*. Her contemporary, the author Arnold Bennett, complained to his literary agent that he had only

Anglo-India grew more positive. The spoiled heroine in *Idolatry* (1909) follows her Anglo-Indian mother to India, where she learns the values necessary to become an ideal Christian woman. However, Anglo-Indians are still depicted harshly; Perrin describes Edith Stapely, “a typical ‘memsahib’” who has lived in India since the age of fifteen, as “tiresomely helpless and prejudiced where England was concerned” (45, 44). Edith’s strength and kindness are praised (she is “wiry, energetic, an indefatigable manager, kind hearted, good-tempered”), but this list of positive traits ends with the note that Edith is “unimaginative,” and in *Idolatry* she warps her son with overly indulgent parenting (45). The short-sightedness and insularity with which Perrin characterizes Edith recalls the stifling insularity of Anglo-India depicted in *The Waters of Destruction*, and shows that Perrin’s embrace of the community is not yet fully enthusiastic.

Perrin’s earlier Raj texts also portray overt Anglo-Indian racism, an aspect of the Anglo-Indian community which the Raj novel genre, despite the implicitly racist elements of these novels discussed in Chapter IV, largely disavows. *Idolatry*’s otherwise heroic male protagonist, Capt. Dion Devasse, is willfully oblivious to Indian culture. Despite years in the subcontinent, he has only the surface knowledge typically attributed in the Raj novels to globe-trotters: “his knowledge of previous happenings was shadowy, his notion of the difference between Hindu and Mohammedan confused, and he was practically insensible to the old civilisations of the people. To him, as yet, natives were all ‘niggers’” (35-36). This is a harsh portrayal, but Perrin’s description of Devasse’s ignorance represents a shift from *The Waters of Destruction*, a shift which hinges on the phrase “as yet”. An essential aspect of *Idolatry*, seen also in the reformation of the novel’s heroine, is the improvement of British persons through time spent in Anglo-India.

been advanced £50 for a short story collection, writing, “Why can they afford to be, comparatively, so generous when they buy outright as they do from Mrs. Perrin? This lady is a particular friend of mine & I am sure she told me the truth as to the price . . . If everything is quite on the square, the inference is that Mrs. Perrin’s books sell three times as well as mine: which I do not believe” (*Letters of Arnold Bennett* 78). Sales figures contained in Bennett’s letters show that, despite his doubt, *A Free Solitude* sold at least twice as well as Bennett’s work (80n).

By showing Devasse to be on a presumptive learning curve, Perrin's diction speaks to a growing reliance in her books on the Raj novel tactic of empowering Anglo-Indian authority through knowledge gained via service in the subcontinent.

In later novels *The Anglo-Indians* and *The Woman in the Bazaar*, Perrin sets virtuous personal characteristics firmly within the purview of Anglo-India's community. Mrs. Fleetwood, the heroine's mother in *The Anglo-Indians*, is an "admirable advertisement for Anglo-India.

Thirty years of married life, and many hot weathers in the plains, had not withered her skin nor drained her health . . . [She] came of a well-known Anglo-Indian family, whose sons for four generations had governed, and soldiered, and distinguished themselves in various branches of Indian service — whose daughters came out to marry in the country, sending their children again to be soldiers, and civilians, and wives in the land where most of them were born and had spent their early childhood. Surely they are to be acclaimed, these time-honoured Indian families, inheritors of history, true to tradition, doing their duty without question, almost unconsciously, towards their great foster-mother India, often at the expense of health and home, sometimes of life itself, giving her their children to do likewise in their turn. (15-16)

Stylistically, this description represents a distinctive aspect of Perrin and Diver's Raj novels: the breaking of the fourth wall between book and reader to offer prescriptive advice and opinion. Anglo-Indian families are "surely" "to be acclaimed," a directive statement that recalls Kipling's affirmation of Western systems of order at the end of *Kim* (1901): "Roads were meant to be walked upon" (272). Perrin's phrasing enforces a clear idea of Anglo-Indian superiority, citing evidence and posing a rhetorical question that urges the reader to respond with the acclaim Perrin suggests. "Four generations" of Fleetwoods have served India. Perrin's positivity about this fact is another change from *The Waters of Destruction*. So too is her claim that the Fleetwoods do "their duty without question" to "their great foster-mother, India". As seen in, for example, John Game in Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Burnt Offering* (1909), duty is a trait that defines ideal Anglo-Indians in the Raj novel genre. Here, Perrin justifies that duty by rendering Britain and India's relationship as familial—India is the "great foster-mother" of Anglo-India. The depiction

of the British as children caring for a parent naturalizes imperialism, slotting it within the heteronormative matrix circumscribing “proper” relations in novels of empire more broadly.²²⁰ Like Flora Annie Steel, B.M. Croker, Kipling, and Duncan, Perrin’s novels define ideal behavior along gendered lines. The endorsement of static familial bonds within the confines of Judith Butler’s “compulsory and naturalized heterosexuality” allows the justification of colonial rule as part of the duty done by children to parents. In a genre such as the Raj novel, whose texts strictly regulate male and female identity, “institutional heterosexuality both requires and produces the univocity of each of the gendered terms.”²²¹ Perrin’s idealization of the family sphere is part of this effort—one whose scope she extends to imperial and racial hierarchies of relation.

In her later novel *The Woman in the Bazaar* (1914), Perrin’s acclimatization to Raj novel genre norms of Anglo-Indian authority, ideality, and rightly-disposed power can be seen. The novel’s heroine, Trixie, is born in Anglo-India and sent to England for schooling, where she grows up spoiled (the opposite of Edith Stapely’s son in *Idolatry*). In India, young Trixie is “vigorous, daring, self-willed, giving promise of a passionate, generous nature” (39). In England, she is “vain and selfish and rebellious,” troubling her mother with “capricious and extravagant” (99) whims. Perrin’s description emphasizes Trixie’s self-centeredness; she has not learned to function as a member of a community, a failing Anglo-India, whose communal aspect the Raj novel genre venerates, is well suited to correct. Nor, recalling Butler, has Trixie found what Perrin implies is her appropriate place in the gender schema regulated by the familial unit. Duty, again, exists between parent and child; at “Home” in Britain, Trixie fails to develop proper awareness of this fact. In contrast, when she reaches India, Trixie’s immediate appreciation of the landscape presages the change that will occur in her character: “India was perfect. How she

²²⁰ It also recalls Seeley’s dismissal of the colonies as serving the imperial “parent community,” Britain, in *The Expansion of Empire* (38). Perrin thus reclaims a metaphor used to subordinate Anglo-Indians as valorizing.

²²¹ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 2nd ed (New York: Routledge, 1999). 30.

loved the sun, the space, the colour, the friendliness, and the novelty of her surroundings!” (117). At the outset of this chapter, I referenced the elevating appreciation of rural landscape described by Transcendentalists such as Ralph Waldo Emerson. The parallel between “undeveloped”—in contrast to British cities such as London—India and the uplift Emerson locates in communion with nature shows a reversal of how geographic separateness functions in Perrin.

In later works such as *The Woman in the Bazaar*, India comes to represent a pastoral retreat within which British sensibilities can be elevated and purified. Emerson writes in *Nature* (1836) that the ability to appreciate the world’s beauty is “Taste”; attempts to embody that beauty anew are “Art” (29); a man’s “power to connect his thought with its proper symbol, and so utter it, depends on the simplicity of his character . . . his love of truth and his desire to communicate it without loss” (37). Emerson’s focus on character, honesty, and the desire to serve honesty by clear communication all appear in Raj novel genre depictions of encounters with the Indian landscape. Trixie’s enjoyment of India’s beauty recalls the glimpse of paradise afforded the Brownes during a Calcutta carriage ride in Sara Jeannette Duncan’s *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib* (1893). It also anticipates the dismay experienced by Perrin’s idealized Anglo-Indian Fleetwood family when they retire to London in *The Anglo-Indians*. In this novel, London’s “atmosphere” kills the strong, duty-bound Mr. Fleetwood, whose upright character is mentally repelled by urban life. Perrin sets his repulsion in contrast to life in India:

[A] crowd collected from nowhere as if by magic—a crowd of unwholesome looking men in dirty clothes, all apparently of the same age and size and type, strangely alike, equally repulsive. He wondered vaguely what they would look like washed and trimmed and deprived of their filthy coverings. Surely it was chiefly their clothes that made them so disgusting? He thought of an Indian crowd, clothed in white or bright colours, picturesque, polite, quiet perhaps to apathy or noisy with a naive, childlike excitement. What a contrast to these rough, squalid human beings. (148)

Perrin's description attributes to urban life a lack of discrete personhood; the Londoners are the same "type," unlike Anglo-Indians, characterized in her novel as unique, excellent individuals.

But rather than dwelling on the contrast between Anglo-Indians and British persons at "Home," Perrin contrasts the "Home" Britons with a "picturesque" Indian crowd, strategically made part of a clean, "bright" Indian landscape. The British at "Home" are less elevated than their colonial subjects abroad, and are thus placed still further below Anglo-Indians, who have been improved by the experience of imperial life and rule. As here, Perrin's later novels show a reversal of her originally negative attitudes toward Anglo-India, and encapsulate the Raj novel tactic of using scenic vistas to hint at the opportunity for personal growth India offers those who can endure the rigors of daily life there. Entirely differentiated from Britain, the Anglo-Indian environment gives the inspiration that comes when nature and mind accord; this accordance produces elevating effects on personal character. After a night romp through India's wilderness in *The Woman in the Bazaar*, for example, Trixie rejects selfish rebellion and resolves to be an ideal wife. An analysis of how Perrin, between *The Waters of Destruction* and *The Woman in the Bazaar*, comes to idealize Indian landscape and the Anglo-Indian character that landscape produces shows the indebtedness of her authorial choices to the broader Raj novel genre. Further, it shows how the genre's exigence evolved as the future of British rule grew increasingly unsure.

Idolatry, a mid-career text, is a clear example of Perrin using the trope of "authentic" Anglo-Indian experience to finesse protagonist Anne Crivener's self-actualization. A belle of British high society, Anne is left penniless by her grandmother's death (this recurrent premise in the Raj novels, seen also in B.M. Croker's *Her Own People* [1903], facilitates the relocation of the hero or heroine to India). In *Idolatry*, Anne's widowed Anglo-Indian mother, Mary Williams, has wed an Anglo-Indian missionary. Anne joins her in India whilst pursuing a rebuffed suitor,

Capt. Dion Devasse, who is excelling in the Indian army. She finds the Williamses to be hard-working, poor, genuinely good people. Though attracted to Oliver Wray, a missionary and Christian zealot who awakens her lapsed sense of morality, Anne becomes secretly engaged to Devasse. Wray takes ill, overcome by love for Anne, Christian guilt, and a desire to preach to the Hindus in a guise he feels they can grasp—a “true” holy man or *sadhu*. Anne wants to help, but after confessing his love, Wray asks her to leave India. Anne does; breaking her engagement, she lives simply in London and dedicates herself to good works. Devasse returns “Home” to find Anne now sees his worth and loves him truly. They wed.

In depicting Anne’s moral evolution, Perrin offers an example of the traits that define ideal British female character, and dramatizes the ways in which daily Anglo-Indian life enables the consolidation of those traits. *Idolatry* again plays upon the idea that India’s landscape spurs spiritual self-discovery. Here, Perrin uses Indian vistas and history to stage Anne’s awakening while she wanders in a field of ancient statues: “[A]mong these shattered Buddhist relics that breathed of past sacrifice and renunciation . . . Anne’s soul awoke and demanded the noble right to live. She became sharply conscious of her selfish nature, of her cruelty, her pride, her treachery” (345). What causes this revelation, and how does Anne’s alteration offer an instructive example of ideal Britishness? The answer lies in Perrin’s early descriptions of Anne, which imply that British high society blunts her positive capacities and makes her a selfish social animal. In England, Anne learns

the art of being agreeable without trouble to herself; of being polite and punctilious without going to any great personal inconvenience; of evading tiresome obligations and engagements by the manufacture of such excuses as would please and convince instead of causing offence— all the little niceties of the craft of humbug. (12-13)

These qualities make Anne a great success—she has wealth, suitors, beautiful clothes, and high society at her fingertips—but her splendor reflects negatively on Britain. Benita Parry argues that

the Raj novels repeatedly rehearse scenes in which “fine and upright Anglo-Indians are favorably contrasted with the snobbish and trivial people who constitute good English society” (96), and this is the case here. Unlike Anglo-India, the British at “Home” reward “the craft of humbug” at which Anne excels. By encouraging her social climbing, British society makes Anne weak and dependent, unable to bear deprivation or suffering. In her “Home”-crafted character, Anne is a negative example for the reader. Contrast with Anglo-India emerges when, pondering her plan to wed Devasse “the difference of his nature as compared with her own smote Anne with a sense of shame” (98). This observation maintains a divide between Anglo-Indian and British natures but uses Anne’s shame to signal that Anglo-India is acquiring the upper hand in Perrin’s fictions.

Indeed, over the course of *Idolatry* implicit and explicit contrast with Anglo-Indians forces upon Anne an awareness of her moral failings. Devasse is honesty itself—“falseness” the one sin he cannot abide (363). Wray is devoted to God and the educational project (a subplot sees him attempt to convert a Rajah’s son to Christianity). Anne’s inability to equal Devasse and Wray’s goodness repeatedly pushes her to flee: “out of India, she would find herself free from this uneasiness of soul; she would be able to set her mind in order, and regain her old attitude towards existence” (267). Perrin’s use of geographic distance in this description harkens back to *The Waters of Destruction*, but where that novel denigrated Anglo-Indians who had not been to Britain, *Idolatry* portrays “Home” as a hiding place for persons of weak character who cannot thrive in Anglo-India. Proper behavior, of which Anne’s “uneasiness of soul” and “sense of shame” indicate incipient awareness, develops through experience of daily Anglo-Indian life. Perrin thus depicts her protagonist’s growth in a manner that confirms the Raj novel genre’s exigence: advocacy of practical experience in Anglo-India as a venue within which superior,

because authentic, knowledge of India is earned, British selfhood is tested and uplifted, and Anglo-Indians are effectively incorporated into the metanarrative of British imperial identity.

Upon her return to England, Anne is a changed woman. Her “expression held a sympathy and softness that before had been absent; there was a sweet depth in the eyes that had learnt to look with compassionate understanding upon suffering, want, and sorrow. A new strength, added by victory over self, lay in the curves of her mouth and chin” (385). Perrin’s books often use physiognomy to explicate character. This technique, Sharrona Pearl writes in *About Faces: Physiognomy in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (2010), was prevalent in creative works (theatre, portraits, novels, and later, photography) of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and carried great weight with British audiences. Perrin exploits the assumption of verisimilitude between appearance and reality by making Anne’s features display the worth of character acquired in India, where an excess of “suffering, want, and sorrow” are part of daily life. These rigors produce in Anne the sympathy, softness, and strength which *Idolatry* sets as essential feminine character traits. Wray, an Anglo-Indian who gives his life in the service of India, facilitates this change. For him, Anne “had suffered, and striven, and conquered . . . it was through her love unbetrayed, unspoken, for the man whose life was dedicated so resolutely to his cause, that she had learned to be brave and true” (396). Through Anglo-Indian dedication to Wray’s “cause,” the civilizing mission, Anne learns to manifest idealized personal character.

Yet, it is not Wray Anne marries, and here Perrin shows continued ambivalence about the lengths to which Anglo-Indians may acceptably go in pursuing duty in the subcontinent. Musing on his life, Wray thinks, “from the time of his arrival in India, five years back, his mind had held nothing but an intense fervour for his work; his thoughts had circled about a single object only — *i.e.*, how best to fulfil his duty” (200). His passion for mission work is so extreme that he

foregoes food and sleep, endangering his health. Anne offers a possibility of ameliorating this single-minded focus, but Wray banishes her from his life (293). Through his character, Perrin argues for a balance between zealotry and duty. In becoming “Indianized” and wandering the country as an ash-smearred *sadhu*, Wray crosses a line between British and Indian, passing from duty to fanaticism. Studies by Parry, Jenny Sharpe, and Nancy Paxton have shown that the desire to police the borders between Anglo-India and India is as much a focus of the Raj novel genre as the desire to define the relationship between Anglo-Indian and British. What *Idolatry* emphasizes in carrying out this policing is a twist on the Raj novel genre theme of authentic Anglo-Indian knowledge. Part of knowing India is knowing when to stop. In Kipling’s Raj texts, Zohreh Sullivan writes, “[t]oo much knowledge about India tests the boundaries of the social system, victimizes both the knower and the known.”²²² Sullivan’s phrasing picks up on the rhetoric of service which characterizes Raj novel depictions of Anglo-Indian relations to Indians: British imperialism construed the maintenance of separate social spheres (smashed by Wray in “going native”) as beneficial for the colonized subject. Edward Said calls the idea of British persons moving unnoticed among Indians “a fantasy” dependent “on the rock-like foundations of European power.”²²³ In this context, Wray’s attempt to live as a *sadhu* reinforces the power dynamic of imperialism (he has the knowledge, and therefore, the power to do so) but violates the moral imperative assigned to proper imperial roles by the Raj novel genre, and by British imperial discourse more generally. In the end, Wray loses Anne, loses himself, and does not gain new converts for Christianity. By leaving Anglo-India, he vacates the sphere within which his knowledge of Indians might have, to Perrin, a useful effect.

²²² Zohreh T. Sullivan, *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993). 112.

²²³ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). 161.

The ideals of Anglo-Indian character that begin to emerge in *Idolatry* are realized in *The Anglo-Indians*, Perrin's great stand on the higher quality of Anglo-Indian knowledge, devotion to duty, and superior communal life. In its focus on retired Anglo-Indians, the novel again stands in for a subset of texts in the Raj novel genre (B.M. Croker's *A Family Likeness* [1892] and *A Third Person* [1893] are two other examples). In these novels, the Raj writers stage the genre's usual contrast of British and Anglo-Indian by sending Anglo-Indians "Home" and dramatizing the struggles that ensue. *The Anglo-Indians* begins in the Himalayas, as Fay Fleetwood slips out to watch the sun rise. The youngest daughter of an archetypal Anglo-Indian family (husband; wife; two soldier sons; three daughters—the elder two, Marion and Isabel, idealize life in England), Fay adores India. But the family is retiring "Home." Before they go, Fay meets Capt. Clive Somerton, who teaches the young Rajah of Rotah British deportment, and on the plains, the family meets the pompous globe-trotter Sir Rowland. In England, Mr. Fleetwood takes ill from the climate and dies; the family spends above their means and must move to a tawdry house in the suburbs. After hearing the Indian Army officer she loved has died, Marion becomes engaged to Sir Rowland. The Rani and Rajah of Rotah visit London with Somerton; Fay takes a position as cicerone to the spoiled, lazy Rani. She and Somerton become engaged. Fifteen months later, Marion controls Rowland but has a cold marriage; Fay and Somerton are deliriously happy.

The novel ends with two characters reminiscing fondly about golden Anglo-Indian days; here and throughout the novel, Perrin works to lionize her titular community. Describing a gathering in India, she writes: "There was general good-fellowship and gaiety of spirits without any approach to rowdiness, for the average Anglo-Indian is, on the whole, an extremely well-mannered, self-respecting individual" (132). The phrasing of this description has a scholarly cast, assuming the narrative authority to characterize the "average" Anglo-Indian as a type. That type

is, further, “extremely” preferable in manners and deportment. As here, Perrin’s characterization in *The Anglo-Indians* reiterates the idea that the enforced closeness experienced by the British in India produced a dynamic, self-supporting community, a theme in Raj novels written as early as Rudyard Kipling’s *Plain Tales from the Hills* and recalled in Maud Diver’s portrayal of life on the Northwest Frontier in her Desmond trilogy, published just prior to *The Anglo-Indians*.

As the novel’s heroine, Fay embodies a blend of cultural hybridism that shows Perrin’s valorization, in her later books, of exchange between India and Britain. Fay speaks “fluent Hindustani” and uses gestures “more native . . . than English” (6). This characterization may be attributable to *The Anglo-Indians*’ later publication date, which coincided with a rise in Anglo-Indian efforts to show the positivity and openness of the community’s relationship with Indians. *Plain Tales from the Raj* sets World War I, which began two years after the publication of *The Anglo-Indians*, as a turning point in Anglo-Indian/Indian relations: “Attitudes changed with time. Those who went out to India in the early years of the century found a marked lack of familiarity between the races, the strongest prejudice coming from ‘senior officials, old die-hards and hesitant partners.’”²²⁴ In this light, it is significant that Fay is the youngest Fleetwood daughter. Her open-mindedness reflects changing generational attitudes amongst Anglo-Indians. In Perrin’s text, Fay effuses over her motives for engaging with India: “I love India. I love the people and the language and the life, and the sun and — and — the very smell of it all” (41). Her desire to continue life there inspires her to pursue rigorous educational goals, to:

. . . conceal her love of all things Indian because she had heard it said that to keep her out in India at her age was a mistake. Therefore she strove to prove that she was in no way deteriorating . . . [and] contrived to teach herself far more than she ever learned from the superior and presumably “finished” Marion and Isabel. It was all

²²⁴ Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 232. Allen notes in his preface that in editing the oral interviews which comprise the volume “I have not always identified quotations where commonly expressed attitudes or experiences are given” (10). The description of prejudiced persons in this quote falls into this category.

for the sake of India—that she might not be banished from India back to school life in England where there was no romance, no room, no time, no colour. (33-34)

By describing Fay's learning as superior to the "presumably" better education Marion and Isabel had in England, and "all for the sake of India," Perrin completes the shift begun in *Idolatry*. Now her characters learn ideal British behavior in India, for love of imperial service, by observing models of Anglo-Indian duty and community. Rather than deteriorating, Fay grows into an ideal young woman in Anglo-India. Perrin's *The Woman in the Bazaar*, written two years after *The Anglo-Indians*, stages a similar scenario. Here Perrin contrasts Rafella, a spoiled young woman from "Home," with an Anglo-Indian Commissioner's wife, "a wise and benevolent lady, whose long experience of Indian life had only increased her natural kindness of heart and broadened her tolerant views" (78). The Commissioner's wife describes Rafella as "a typical example"

"... of the kind of girl who deteriorates rapidly in India; and then people at home, who won't try to understand, think India is to blame. She would have been just the same in England... If she doesn't come to grief, as I fear seems likely, she will probably go home and talk about her servants and her carriage and her men friends, and help to spread the false impression that out here all English women live like princesses and are nothing but brainless butterflies. It is such a mistake!" (79)

Fay and Rafella offer two separate studies which encourage the same conclusion. The issue is personal character; the claim is that such character is best developed by persons strong enough to excel amongst the rigors of daily life in Anglo-India. Fay, with her passionate adoration of the landscape and rigorous work ethic, is refined by life in the subcontinent. Flighty, spoiled Rafella would be "just the same in England," but falls faster and further (she becomes a prostitute, the titular "woman in the bazaar") because Anglo-India's hazards are far greater. The message of Perrin's later texts thus accords with the general claims of the Raj novel genre: knowledge of India must be acquired accurately, by hard work, with respect for the dangers of spending too much time crossing an assumed boundary between Indian and British worlds. If a balance is

found, as with Fay, a character's success is validated by personal happiness. This scenario allows the Raj novel writers to subtly campaign for ongoing British rule in India, suggesting that the best Anglo-Indians have "true" knowledge of the subcontinent and—in the later Raj novels, as real-life disputation of British rule increased—deep affection for the country and its people. Simultaneously, the contrasting of those who thrive in Anglo-India versus those who do not elevates Anglo-Indians above their "Home" counterparts by dramatizing the dangers of carrying out Raj rule. The character traits that allow Anglo-Indians to balance the work of ruling and the work of maintaining Britishness is treated, in the Raj novel genre, as the sort of heroism that upholds an idealized British imperial identity.

The same message emerges in Perrin's depiction of the hero of *The Anglo-Indians*, Capt. Clive Somerton. A man of "natural, wholesome tendency" (201), Somerton's eyes are "alert, watchful, direct" (10); his face holds "the calm strength of expression gained by a life of wise self-ordering, his whole air that of a man of sense and good breeding" (293). As with Anne Crivener upon her return to London, Somerton's physiognomy displays the traits with which Perrin's novels mark out the category of the ideal male. In addition, Somerton's professional instruction of the Rajah sets those qualities within a context that invokes the imperial mission of "civilizing" India through education. Selected "from the Indian Army to inculcate British notions of manliness and self-control" (25), Somerton is eager to engage the Rajah: "He told [Fay] of the youth's desire to learn all that would tend to make him a judicious ruler of men, of his acts of self-control, and his studious leanings" (252). The qualities Perrin shows Somerton imparting to the Rajah (justice, self-control, studiousness) mirror the qualities of ideal character the Raj novel genre implies are honed by Anglo-Indian daily life. The duty done by figures such as Kipling's Strickland and Duncan's John Game endows the imperial ruler with knowledge of Indians so

authentic that, the Raj novels imply, Anglo-Indians serve India better than it can serve itself. If “power is strong,” Michel Foucault writes, it “is because, as we are beginning to realize, it produces effects at the level of desire—and also at the level of knowledge. Far from preventing knowledge, power produces it” (59). In *The Anglo-Indians*, Perrin uses the Rajah’s desire for British education to cast the desire Foucault describes outward, justifying imperial rule through presumptive Indian desire for it. The knowledge Somerton imparts demonstrates the basis for British authority (he has the knowledge necessary to teach), while facilitating the continuation of that authority: as the object of pedagogical uplift, the Indian Rajah is continually subordinate, seeking “truth” from Somerton.

Musing on his work, Somerton thinks the Rajah will “assume a weighty responsibility, rendered all the more onerous by the training he had received and the moral discipline he had assimilated” (260). In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, such training in “moral discipline” was thought to advance Britain’s “civilizing” agenda in its colonies. Describing educational practices under the East India Company, Gauri Viswanathan notes that education in English endorsed “a new function and purpose . . . the dissemination of moral and religious values.”²²⁵ While almost a century separates Somerton’s educational work from the historical milieu described in *Masks of Conquest* (1989), Raj pedagogical projects still resonate with the claims cited by Viswanathan. Western education, Francis Warden, a council member in the Government of Bombay, claimed, could only produce positive effects in Indians: “If education should not produce a rapid change in their opinions on the fallacy of their own religion, it will at least render them more honest and industrious subjects.”²²⁶ This is the argument in Perrin’s novel, in which the Rajah becomes an able, grateful ruler by virtue of correctly controlled

²²⁵ Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (New York: Columbia UP, 1989). 44.

²²⁶ Qtd. in Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (New York: Columbia UP, 1989). 89.

Anglicization. Somerton's ability to control himself, control the Rajah, and instruct the Rajah in the art of self-control are a further figuration of the ideal imperial male in the Raj novel genre: he is the bearer of authentic knowledge gained in the experience of daily life and then impressed upon the colonial subject. That the Rajah does not manifest the other side of the educational dynamic Viswanathan describes (an awareness of imperialism's hypocrisy in failing to fulfill the values represented by its instructional texts) speaks to the era in which Perrin wrote. Immediately prior to World War I, with the clamor for Indian independence growing, it was politically salient to depict fictional Indians as happy participants in Western education schemes, and thereby validate Anglo-Indian rule.

To emphasize the quality of that rule, in *The Anglo-Indians* Perrin stages multiple contrasts between Anglo-Indians and British persons who have not spent time in India. This Raj novel genre convention is introduced in Perrin through globe-trotter Sir Rowland, a dimwitted fool eager to confirm stereotypes of Anglo-India learnt at "Home". Like Duncan's foolish M.P. in *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*, Rowland is writing a book, *Indian Notes* (66), but lacks the knowledge to fill a page. Perrin has Rowland repeatedly observe how hard ICS officers work (82), a theme that shows the superiority of Anglo-Indians when Sir Rowland cannot keep up with Mr. Fleetwood: "'Your husband,' grumbled Sir Rowland, as distinctly as his quivering jaws would permit, 'is made of cast-iron, Mrs. Fleetwood!' / 'Well, perhaps he is . . . but there are plenty of men like him out here'" (89-90). Even mentally, Anglo-India bests Sir Rowland:

A hopeless feeling overcame him of the impossibility of generalizing about this country that was such a mass of contradictions . . . As soon as he formed any theory to his own satisfaction it was weakened or overthrown by something in proof of the exact opposite; nothing could be positively asserted; a remedy for one part of the population would spell disaster for another . . . He was aware of an unwilling respect for such men as Fleetwood who did their duty, did their best, endeavoured to be just and fair and patient with the people in their charge, all the while thwarted by these very people themselves. (84)

Rowland cannot understand his own conclusions, but in articulating his puzzlement, Perrin portrays Anglo-Indian service as a noble balancing act. The excess of issues at play, and the multitude of contradictory interests to which Anglo-Indian men and women must answer in the performance of their duty, renders service in the subcontinent especially rigorous. Anglo-Indians soldier on in conditions that—in Rowland’s case—bring lesser men to their knees.

In counterpoint to Rowland’s defeat by India, while moving through London’s alienating streets, “Mr. Fleetwood walked on, and all the time his heart was heavy with a vague restlessness which he did not recognize as a tinge of nostalgia for his old life, for the power, the purpose, the sun and the space” (149). In Perrin’s novels, Anglo-India comes to animate Britishness. The power and purpose found there build British character; by being driven to do one’s duty in hard conditions, freed into “the sun and the space,” ideal qualities flourish and result in heroes and heroines such as Fay and Somerton. In the course of her career, Perrin moves from a rejection of Anglo-Indian value to a wholehearted embrace of it, an embrace made yet more distinctive by Perrin’s portrayal of Indian landscape as inspiring the traits praised in her texts. Mr. Fleetwood does not recognize his nostalgia for his old life, but over the course of Alice Perrin’s career, a reader is given opportunity to understand the cause for it—and to link that nostalgia with a larger desire for the British national character only achievable in Anglo-India.

The Englishwoman in India: Maud Diver’s Fictional Campaign for Empire

In the first decades of the twentieth century, Maud Diver was “a global bestseller, a household name, and a favourite of the Royal Family.”²²⁷ As with Rudyard Kipling and Flora Annie Steel, the popularity of Diver’s Raj novels meant that her championing of Anglo-Indian knowledge and authority enjoyed a wide circulation among reading audiences at “Home” and in

²²⁷ Anne Warburton, “Maud Diver: lost gem of the British Raj,” [The Book Show](#). 6 Dec. 2007. Web. 31 August 2011.

Anglo-India. As with Alice Perrin, reviewers attributed to Diver great knowledge of India; *The Athenaeum* praised *Captain Desmond, V.C.* (1907) for “representing the better side of Anglo-Indian life, in bringing vividly before us its strenuousness, self-sacrifice, and loyalty.”²²⁸ Diver wrote more than twenty Raj novels and three nonfiction books championing Anglo-India, such as *The Englishwoman in India* (1909) and *The Unsung: A Record of British Services in India* (1945). The latter text counters imminent Indian independence with valorizing biographies of colonial engineers such as Gen. Alexander Taylor, who oversaw construction of the Grand Trunk Road, and Lionel Jacob, John Benton, and Thomas Ward, who designed an ingenious series of canals to irrigate the Punjab province. Diver portrays these men as literally building India into its contemporary form. The *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* praised the ideological impact of her text: *The Unsung* “gives us true and attractive impressions of great work done by great men under great difficulties. It goes far toward filling a real gap in our retrospect of the labors undertaken by British officers in the India of the last hundred years.”²²⁹ Dramatizing “great work done by great men under great difficulties” is the goal of Diver’s nonfiction and fiction alike. In what Benita Parry calls a “strident” “tone of pride in the British as a master-race,”²³⁰ Diver celebrates Anglo-Indian contributions to the metanarrative of British imperial identity.

Diver’s early novels include the Desmond trilogy (*Captain Desmond, V.C.*, *The Great Amulet*, *Candles in the Wind* [1909]),²³¹ written “to giv[e] a fuller presentment of the varied vicissitudes of life and work on the Indian Frontier than the scope of one book would admit”

²²⁸ Qtd in Maud Diver, *Candles in the Wind* (New York: John Lane Co., 1909). 393.

²²⁹ E.D. MacLagan, “Review: The Unsung: A Record of British Services in India. By Maud Diver,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 78 (Jan. 1946). 113.

²³⁰ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 78.

²³¹ Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries* misidentifies the novels in this trilogy (93), omitting *Candles in the Wind* and adding late novel *Desmond’s Daughter* (1916), perhaps on the basis of these three being published in a subsequent omnibus edition (*The Men of the Frontier Force*). Diver specifically marks *Candles in the Wind* as the third book in the trilogy in a Prefatory Note.

(*Candles in the Wind* Prefatory Note). In *Lilamani* (1911), Diver explores interracial romance, describing a somewhat fantastic union between a British man and a high-caste Rajput princess. This novel is not set in British India, but Diver returns to the Raj in her other books, including *Far to Seek* (1921), about the couple's son, Roy, and the Desmonds' son, Lance, who dies heroically subduing an Indian mob rioting against the 1919 Rowlatt Act. Here and elsewhere, the inclusion of current political events, and interjected authorial commentary by Diver on those events, makes the ideological slant of Diver's Raj novels hard to ignore. As pressure for *Swaraj* (Home Rule) grew, Diver increasingly depicted ideal Anglo-Indians as those who knew and sympathized with their Indian subjects—a tactic akin to those in Perrin. Overall, however, the message of Diver's novels is consistent with the emphases of the Raj novel genre. She portrays British imperial rule as best for India, and heroic Anglo-Indians, able to amass daily experience and “true” knowledge of India via the rigors of life there, as best suited to carry out that rule.

This consistency of message is present even in Diver's first Raj novel, *Captain Desmond, V.C.*, which introduces Diver's recurrent hero and heroine, Theo and Honor Desmond. The couple is consistently described as possessing character traits idealized by the Raj novel genre. In *The Great Amulet*, Diver writes of the Desmonds: “at very rare intervals, Nature seems to select a favoured man and woman to uphold the torch of the ideal” (62). This explicit claim that her characters are an ideal is one of the ways in which Diver stands out amongst the Raj writers. Unlike authors such as Flora Annie Steel, B.M. Croker, and Rudyard Kipling, Diver's claims about the ideality of Anglo-Indian character are not made via contrast with “Home” or depiction of historical incident. They are stated outright to the reader. In *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period* (2008), Angelia Poon describes a “categorizing imperative that establishes and structures a series of distinctions such as those between citizen and foreigner, colonizer and

colonized, and metropole and colony. These distinctions have epistemological borders that require policing” if the “power that comes from being English in the Victorian period”²³² is to be maintained. As Chapters I and II argue, this regulatory dynamic is present in the Raj novel genre from the outset, established by Victorian authors such as Kipling. Diver’s novels, published in the decades immediately before and after World War I, show another means by which Raj novel genre texts articulate and police the hierarchical distinctions their novels establish. Over the course of Diver’s career, the end of British rule in India was negotiated, and then enacted. Diver’s direct ideological interventions in debates over the quality of Anglo-Indian rule reveals a greater instability in the “power that comes from being English” described by Poon.

That is, authors in the Victorian Era might assume an exchange with readers in which the reader shared the author’s belief in British imperial rule as ongoing, infallible, and right. This is not necessarily the case for Diver. I draw here on Lyotard’s concept of “pragmatics,” or “the set of very complicated relations that exist between the person who narrates and what he is narrating, between the person who narrates and the one who listens to him” (16).²³³ The early Raj novelists’ relation to the objects of their narration (the Anglo-Indians, Indians, and British at “Home”), and to audiences at “Home” and in Anglo-India, operate via a pragmatics of assumed British superiority. The Raj novel genre’s aim, to inscribe the ideal aspects of Anglo-Indian character within the metanarrative of British imperial identity, is still evident in Diver’s texts. However, the ways in which Diver promotes those ideal traits reflect a shift in the pragmatics of her relationship to readers, British and Anglo-Indian alike. The increased instability of imperial rule produces a concurrent increase in Diver’s programmatic emphasis on Anglo-Indians as the manifestation of an impossibly perfect Britishness.

²³² Angelia Poon, *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period* (Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2008). 49.

²³³ Lyotard offers a description of pragmatics in “The Pragmatics of Narrative Knowledge,” *The Post-Modern Condition*, 2nd ed., trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984). 18-23.

Nowhere is this tactic more visible than in Diver's depiction of the Desmonds. In *Captain Desmond, V.C.*, Honor Meredith comes to Kohat on the Northwest Frontier to stay with Theo and Evelyn, his spoiled, childish wife. Evelyn is unsuited to Anglo-India, particularly the rigors of the Frontier, and is too close to Owen Kresney, the Eurasian District Superintendent of Police, who aims to crush Theo by driving his wife into debt. *Captain Desmond, V.C.*'s varied subplots depict the dangers of Frontier life and give detailed accounts of border skirmishes—in each, Theo's heroism is celebrated, and we learn he earned the Victoria Cross saving an injured Indian from the line of fire. Honor, in turn, earns her symbolic name through mastery of domestic work and fidelity to the Desmonds: she saves Theo's life by shooting a mad pariah dog and pays off Evelyn's debts. She and Theo love one another but remain silent to avoid dishonoring his marriage vows—until Evelyn's *deus ex machina* death at the hands of a mad “fanatic” frees them. Throughout the novel, Honor and Theo's relationship testifies to the qualities of reticence, fidelity, and selflessness set out in the Raj novel genre as part of ideal Anglo-Indian character.²³⁴

A speech by wise *memsahib* Mrs. Connolly, who perceives Honor's desire to flee Kohat, sets Honor and Theo's relationship as part of the process of living and maintaining British character:

You have promised to take over charge of Captain Desmond, and a soldier's daughter should not dream of deserting her post. Mind you, I would not give such advice to ninety-nine girls out of a hundred in your position. The risk would be too serious; and I only dare give it to you because I am sure of you, Honor. I quite realise why you feel you ought to go. But your own feelings must simply be ignored . . . You must be at hand to protect him, and uphold her, in case of failure. In plain English, you must consent to be a mere prop—putting yourself in the background and leaving her to reap the reward. It is the eternal sacrifice of the strong for the weak. (257-58)

²³⁴ Diver's construction of British character is inextricably bound up with an overtly Christian world view. Her Britishness is a Protestant creation; her books are peppered with Bible quotations, calls to God, Biblical phrases, and thanks for divine intercessions voiced by Diver's “good” characters, all of whom follow a strict code of Christian ethics. The qualities Diver dislikes fall similarly along Christian moral lines, and her later championing of interracial marriage may be partially attributed to a sense that Indian women maintain a Christian femininity (demure, reticent, self-abnegating, gracious) that feminism has led contemporary British women to eschew.

The frankness of Diver's statements about appropriate Anglo-Indian behavior, morality, and character makes her vision of ideal Britishness easy to describe. As a "soldier's daughter," Honor possesses a profound strength which necessitates abandoning self-interest and weak emotion. She must "simply" ignore her love for Theo and continue as his family's selfless helpmeet. In this mission, Diver echoes ideals seen throughout the Raj novel genre. As with Dr. Ruth Pierce in Sara Jeannette Duncan's *Set in Authority* (1906), Honor puts aside romantic feelings for the Anglo-Indian communal good; like Honor Gordon in B.M. Croker's *Mr. Jervis* (1894), with whom Diver's Honor shares a name as well as an idealized character, Honor's nobility is affirmed by her willingness to suffer in silence. This is "the eternal sacrifice of the strong for the weak" which heroines of the Raj novel genre perform without question.

Indeed, Honor accedes instantly. After paying Evelyn's debts, she thinks that

to her had been assigned the task of Sisyphus . . . So long as these two had need of her, heart and brain and hands would be at their service. She did not definitely think this, because true heroism is unaware of itself. "It feels, and never reasons; and therefore is always right." (308)

Into her description of Honor's duty, Diver inserts a quote from Ralph Waldo Emerson's "Heroism" essay, included with essays on topics such as "Prudence" and "Self-Reliance" in the collection *Essays* (1841).²³⁵ By not attributing this reference to her character—Honor does not read or reference Emerson in *Captain Desmond, V.C.*—Diver breaks the illusion Lennard Davis argues novels work to create when they encourage readers to forget a character is a "totally fabricated construct."²³⁶ Instead, Honor is framed as a device by which Diver may illustrate Emerson's theories about the formation of heroic individual character. Here and throughout her Raj novels, Diver intersperses depictions of dramatic incident with direct statements encouraging reader endorsement of her imperialist worldview. In this instance, the use of allusive material

²³⁵ This work was republished as *Essays (First Series)* in 1847 after the 1844 publication of *Essays (Second Series)*.

²³⁶ Lennard Davis, *Resisting Novels* (New York: Methuen, 1987). 102.

gives her novel a scholarly air: Diver validates her idealization of Honor's behavior with a quote echoing the traits promoted by her plot, resituating Emerson to endorse the ideality of Anglo-Indian character formed on India's Northwest Frontier.

Besides strength, Honor's most important character trait is her understanding of duty—again, an essential aspect of the Anglo-Indian character constructed in the Raj novel genre. Considering her Anglo-Indian family's legacy, Honor thinks that “[h]er character had been moulded by men—simple, upright men; and she had imbibed their hard-and-fast notions of honour, of right and wrong” (181). She cannot sleep “until she had considered her position dispassionately . . . and had settled, once for all, what honour and duty demanded” (182). Diver's repeated use of “honour and duty” underscores the importance of these terms in her construction of Honor's character. Honor does her duty in more domestic venues than Theo, but for Diver's largely female reading audience, such hearth battles would have been as striking as a military skirmish. Tracing how domestic fiction in the 1800s reified distributions of cultural authority along gendered lines, while giving women new forms of power, Nancy Armstrong writes that

these stories of courtship and marriage offered their readers a way of indulging, with a kind of impunity, in fantasies of political power that were the more acceptable because they were played out within a domestic framework where legitimate monogamy—and thus the subordination of female to male—would ultimately be affirmed.²³⁷

This is the operation performed by the domestic elements in Diver's Desmond trilogy. The Desmond novels make aspects of the Victorian narrative of domestic femininity (courtship, marriage, the running of a household) part of the structure of imperial power—and therefore inextricable from Diver's celebration of ongoing Raj rule. In addition to the agitation for Indian Independence, Diver wrote during a political moment in which the societal role of women was changing drastically. Alison Sainsbury lists “the growing success of both the Indian nationalist

²³⁷ Nancy Armstrong, *Desire and Domestic Fiction* (New York: Oxford UP, 1987). 29.

movement and the women's suffrage movement in England" as prominent among the "historical coincidences and pressures" reflected in Anglo-Indian domestic novels. Nancy Paxton's *Writing Under the Raj* describes the rise of the "New Woman," as the politicized, sexually-empowered woman at the turn of the century was called,²³⁸ as a potent threat in the Raj novel genre. Diver's emphasis on Honor's decision to perform her duties within the domestic realm is thus another point at which her Raj novels speak to contemporary political issues. Through Honor, Diver gives readers an opportunity to, in Armstrong's terms, "indulge" in a "fantasy" of imperial authority (the Anglo-Indian role) while continuing to emphasize the Victorian Era subordination "of female to male" Diver's hierarchical gender ordering endorses.

Honor's acquiescence to this positioning is dramatized in *The Great Amulet*, the second book in the Desmond trilogy, in which she instructs bohemian painter and New Woman stand-in Quita Lenox in the proper duties of a wife. At the end of the book, Quita names her daughter Honor and praises the lessons Honor has taught her about domestic virtue: "In my opinion this exquisite passion of yours for being 'simply a wife and a mother' is in itself a kind of genius: perhaps the highest there is" (296). The two women have this exchange while their husbands are away on the Northwest Frontier, a scenario which recalls Michael McKeon's claim in *Theory of the Novel* (2000) that "[t]he psychoanalytic division of narrative into male adventure romance versus female domestic realism must . . . be reconceived, in the nineteenth century context, as a unity" (438). That is, 1800s novels such as the Raj genre texts no longer deal exclusively with masculine or feminine tales; these previously separate spheres are brought together for similar dramatic or psychological effect upon the reader. Close on this nineteenth-century context, Diver's early twentieth-century Desmond trilogy synchs the "adventure romance" in which Theo

²³⁸ I draw upon definitions developed in the anthology *The New Woman in Fiction and in Fact*, ed. Angelique Richardson and Chris Willis (New York: Palgrave, 2001).

participates with Honor's "female domestic realism" to create a coherent space for the enactment of Anglo-Indian power, Diver's ideal form of British imperial rule. Again, this plot element is confirmed by direct address to the reader. Diver writes in *The Great Amulet*,

In this era of hotels, clubs, and motors, of days spent in sowing hurry and reaping shattered nerves, the type is growing rarer, and it will be an ill day for England's husbands and sons, nay, for her supremacy among nations, if it should ever become extinct. For it is no over-statement, but simple fact, that the women who follow, soon or late, in the track of her victorious arms, women of Honor Desmond's caliber[,] home-loving, home-making, skilled in the lore of heart and spirit have done fully as much to establish, strengthen, and settle her scattered Empire as shot, or steel, or the doubtful machinations of diplomacy. (59)

Honor enables Diver to dismiss modernity, contemporary social values in England, and the potential end of Raj rule by modeling a steady core of "home-loving" and "home-making." In this aside Diver accords Honor more respect than any persons at "Home"—male or female, a contrast seen in Honor's elevation over "shot, steel, or the doubtful machinations of diplomacy." The danger of neglecting the ideal of womanhood Honor embodies is made clear; it will be "an ill day for England's husbands and sons, nay, for her supremacy among nations" if misconstrued. Critic Loretta Mijares, referencing Sainsbury, writes that "in maintaining the domestic sphere women are playing their roles in the public sphere precisely by fostering and defending the growth of the empire."²³⁹ The feminine character modeled by Honor Desmond is, in Diver's construction, a matter of national and imperial necessity.

Through the character of Captain (later Major) Theo Desmond, V.C., Diver's ideological position within the Raj novel genre becomes yet more explicit. Theo is a moral giant in Diver's Anglo-Indian universe; he influences events in each of her novels, exerting a benevolent, life-saving influence so overt it is occasionally humorous, as in the trilogy's final book, *Candles in the Wind*. Here, young Sapper Alan Laurence works with *The Great Amulet's* male protagonist,

²³⁹ Loretta M. Mijares, "Distancing the Proximate Other: Hybridity and Maud Diver's *Candles in the Wind*," *Twentieth-Century Literature* 50:2 (Summer 2004). 114.

Col. Eldred Lenox, to develop Gilgit, a remote hill station in Kashmir. Beset by love for the married Lyndsay Videlle and exhausted by the rigors of Frontier life—a mudslide wipes out a section of road over which he has slaved for months—Laurence contemplates suicide. At that moment, his tent flap lifts, and Theo enters. In the space of a few paragraphs, Theo rescues Laurence from despair and lights a fire beneath the men of Gilgit, who immediately resume work and complete the bridge. “Theo Desmond had been better than his word,” Diver writes, “His magnetic vitality and manifest enjoyment of a new form of work had infected the whole camp, Laurence more than all” (233). In the wake of that “magnetic vitality,” Laurence himself earns the Victoria Cross for heroic action during a siege.

Explicitly confirming the claims implicit in Theo’s numerous acts of heroism, in *Captain Desmond, V.C.* Diver inserts a long monologue by Theo’s best friend, Paul Wyndham, also an officer on the Northwest Frontier. It is another example of Diver addressing the reader directly about proper behavior and the ways in which Anglo-Indian character—here, Diver uses the term “character” specifically—augments the metanarrative of British imperial identity by modeling an ideal form of British rule. “Theo’s genius is of the best kind,” Wyndham tells Honor. It is

. . . genius of character, of a wide sympathetic understanding of men and things. And on the Frontier, Miss Meredith, that sort of understanding counts for more than anywhere else in the country. We control our fellows here as much by love and respect as by mere discipline. Get a native to love you, and believe in you, and you are sure of him for good. That is why officers like Theo and your brother, who hold their men’s hearts in their hands, are, without exaggeration, the pillars on which the safety of India rests. It is when the cry of “Jehad” runs like fire along the Border, and the fidelity of our troops is being tampered with, that we get the clearest proof of this. At such times pay, pension, and Orders of Merit have no more power to restrain a Pathan than a thread of cotton round his ankle. But . . . he will not desert, in his hour of need, an officer whom he has found to be just, upright, and fearless. (50-51)

Even as Honor’s mastery of domesticity sustains empire, Theo’s “sympathetic understanding” forms one of “the pillars on which the safety of India rests”. By demonstrating repeatedly that he

is just, upright, and fearless, and ruling with “love and respect,” Theo delivers a form of service that operates in defiance of dire “Home” visions of Anglo-India. Diver’s gesture here is twofold. She exploits lurid visions of Indian insurgency that recall Mutiny novel imagery—“Jehad” cries running “like fire along the border,” ripping the loyalty of men from the “thread[s] of cotton” holding their ankles—and, as in the Mutiny novels, uses this threat of ongoing Indian resistance to show the necessity of British rule. Simultaneously, Diver responds to the political pressures of the contemporary moment, which questioned that necessity, by idealizing Anglo-Indians as the embodiment of power expressed through sympathy and “love,” an affectionate undertaking which is here construed as Theo’s duty.

Making the relationship of colonizer to colonized loving anticipates Alice Perrin’s portrayal in *The Anglo-Indians* of imperial service as filial duty.²⁴⁰ In each case, these late Raj novelists cast Anglo-Indians as persons who fulfill specific categorical roles in the service of imperialism. Their idealized characters justify the binary divisions (male/female; British/Indian; home/frontier) that duty to the Raj helps maintain. This is, again, akin to the pattern observed by Angelia Poon in Victorian imperial narratives, which utilize Englishness to

continually produc[e] and forc[e] into realization territorially-bound national subjects with bodies that “are”, not discounting other possibilities: white, hetero-normative, productive . . . Such bodies in turn legitimize colonial power and dominance by serving as a natural and regulatory ideal.²⁴¹

Diver and Perrin’s reiteration of a Victorian “white, hetero-normative, productive” model emblemizes the conservative attitude of many Raj novels—a conservatism the more obvious because it is so clearly at odds with the larger context of Edwardian Era cultural and political change in which Diver and Perrin wrote. Their books continue the genre’s attempt to, as Poon

²⁴⁰ As Chapters IV and V discuss, it also heavily influences Raj Revival portrayals, in novels such as Paul Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown*, of the relationship between India and Britain as a doomed love affair.

²⁴¹ Angelia Poon, *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period* (Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2008). 15.

puts it, instill a specific “natural and regulatory ideal” through the veneration of Anglo-India. In doing so, however, they must contain the social upheaval surrounding gender and race relations in this period. The extreme idealization with which Diver treats the Desmonds and the insistence with which Diver has Wyndham valorize specific, affectionate aspects of Theo’s leadership bespeak the effort of Diver’s texts to promote Anglo-Indian rule as so true, knowledgeable and pure that the “love” and loyalty of the colonized subject accrues to it.

Diver’s portrayal of Anglo-Indian ideality is strategically enacted upon the rocky lands of India’s Northwest Frontier. The name of this mountainous boundary area, located between contemporary Afghanistan and Pakistan, evokes in Diver a multitude of mythologies surrounding the idea of a frontier: unexplored space; the possibility of wealth; adventure. The Northwest Frontier receives special notice in Anglo-Indian recollections of life in India: in *Plain Tales from the Raj*, it is referred to as “full of romance and danger and deeds of derring-do” and editor Charles Allen writes that it “retained a powerful hold over the imagination of the British both at home and in India” (197). Another Anglo-Indian recalls, “[i]t was an adventure to go there and the British soldier was proud to go . . . Only good British regiments were sent to the Frontier and they went [with] a feeling of professional pride” (202). Diver’s use of the Frontier as the setting for her Desmond trilogy exploits this aspect of Anglo-Indian sentiment. She calls the Frontier

[a] pitiless country, where the line of duty smites the eye at every turn . . . A country that straightens the back, and strings up nerve and muscle; where men learn to endure hardness, and carry their lives in their hands with cheerful unconcern, expecting and receiving small credit for either from those whose safety they ensure.
(*Captain Desmond*, V.C. 9)

Diver’s diction recalls the personal traits the Raj novel genre makes essential to Anglo-Indian character: the “line of duty,” the straight back, the well-strung nerve and muscle; men learning to

“endure hardship” with “cheerful unconcern.” These ideals are acquired through service to the most difficult of India’s many imposing physical landscapes.

Contrasts to Britishness as developed at “Home” are also plentiful in Diver’s portrayals of Frontier service. In *Candles in the Wind*, seasoned Anglo-Indian Commissioner Rivers celebrates the area’s unique ability to develop the British masculine ideal common to the Raj novels:

The Staff Corps subaltern’s one of the finest products of the country; and on the Frontier you have him at his best. Nothing like hard work, active service and responsibility for making first-class men, and uprooting the amateurish pose of bored detachment that obtains among too many soldiers at home. Boys up here must be frankly keen — and versatile. Mere text-book formulae would never convert a handful of hard-bitten Border ruffians into the smart, reliable soldiers you saw to-day. It’s character that does it — character, and a sound working acquaintance with languages, ethnology, and human nature; to say nothing of a sense of humour! (126)

The emphasis on accurate knowledge, or a “sound working acquaintance,” with the area’s indigenous languages, ethnology, and the more inchoate category, “human nature,” accords with the Raj novel’s project of elevating Anglo-Indian authority by emphasizing the accuracy of knowledge gained through active duty to the country. In utilizing this recurrent device, Diver juxtaposes the Frontier Staff Corps subaltern’s virtues against “the amateurish pose of bored detachment” seen amongst British soldiers in England. Her repetition of the word “character” in differentiating the two groups (character “does it”) again sees Diver’s depictions of Anglo-Indian ideality following the Raj novel genre’s insertion of Anglo-Indians into the metanarrative of British imperial identity. In *Gilgit*, the “British officers . . . exercised, undismayed, their racial talent for ‘making riflemen from mud’” (*Candles in the Wind* 17). The final novel of Diver’s Desmond trilogy shifts development of character from a quality acquired through the rigors of life in India to an inherent British “racial talent”. That is, the ability to build civilization from the ground up is a mark of membership in what is portrayed as the British race, one possessed and finessed throughout the Desmond trilogy by that race’s Anglo-Indian members.

Far to Seek (1921), one of Diver's last novels of Anglo-India, centers on the questioning of such "civilizing" impulses by the increasingly powerful Indian independence movement. Writing in the aftermath of World War I, Diver acknowledges Mahatma Gandhi's campaign for Home Rule; his April 6, 1919 call for noncooperation with the Rowlatt Act is a key plot point. In Diver's novel, the resulting riots lead to the death of Lance Desmond, Honor and Theo's youngest son, thereby making Gandhi, hero of independence, indirectly responsible for the death of Diver's hero of colonial rule. In this scenario, Diver's reader is encouraged to sympathize with Lance and despise the rioting Indians, characterized as fanatical cultists who use violence and brainwashing to achieve their aims. When *Far to Seek*'s interracial hero, Roy Sinclair, spies on an independence protest, he witnesses the sacrifice of a white goat—a threat against the British: "The blood of white goats – meaning sahibs, *Hazur*" (226). Such staging recurs in M.M. Kaye's Raj Revival novel, *Shadow of the Moon* (1957; 1979), whose hero watches a white child sacrificed in the lead-up to the Mutiny. Diver thus models a new way in which the Raj novel genre may condemn Indian insurgency—while countering her visions of Indian perfidy²⁴² with Roy, an idealized picture of what imperial service might be were British and Indian to unite in the "affectionate" bond *Captain Desmond, V.C.* imagines. *Far to Seek* directly foreshadows the Raj Revival; like the 1980s authors who had witnessed the end of Empire, Diver writes in the Raj's dying days with angry nostalgia, and Lance's death takes on further symbolic meaning in this context: this is the last glimpse of a proud Anglo-Indian dynasty. The Desmonds' young, unmarried son will not continue their legacy; Theo Desmond's flame of purpose is extinguished.

²⁴² In *Delusions and Discoveries*, Benita Parry lists these cult scenarios amongst the recurrent elements in the Raj novel genre. Parry describes the Raj novel fascination with India's "meretricious interlocking of sex and worship" (79) on pages 79-91; her analysis of I.A.R. Wylie's novel *The Daughter of Brahma* (1912), published "shortly after a wave of agitation against British rule had expressed itself in what the alarmed British perceived as the revival of obsolescent religious practices" (88), is particularly salient. Wylie did not live in India and is thus excluded from my study; her work nonetheless mirrors *Far to Seek* in its portrayal of Independence agitation as a literal cult activity.

Revisiting her created Anglo-Indian dynasty in its moment of dissolution, Diver states in another moment of explicit political posturing that the Desmonds are not uncommon in India,

. . . [which] has laid her spell on certain families; and they have followed one another through the generations, as homing birds follow in line across the sunset sky. And their name becomes a legend that passes from father to son; because India does not forget. There is perhaps nothing quite like it in the tale of any other land. It makes for continuity; for a fine tradition of service and devotion; a tradition that will not be broken till agitators and theorists make an end of Britain in India. But that day is not yet; and the best elements of both races still believe it will never be. (139)

Roy and Lance embody “the best elements of both races”; it is their destiny to maintain that “fine tradition of service and devotion”. Diver’s diction recalls her claim in *The Great Amulet* that Indian servants embody “the grand old ideal of service” (95), and the parallel seems significant: the British serve India as their servants serve them. By making the relationship reciprocal, Diver makes it acceptable in the face of explicit Indian objection. Further, she presents it as heroic proof of imperialism’s greatness and uses it to justify her faith that imperial rule will survive.

Ultimately, Roy models the enlightened mode of being that Diver implies will ensure the Raj’s survival. Roy, his British father, Baronet Nevil Sinclair, and his Indian mother, Lilámani, discuss his prospects in this venue repeatedly – and this is Diver’s final major contribution to the Raj novel genre. In the face of its own dissolution and the loss of India, that land of antagonism, promise, frustration, and adventure, Diver breaks a taboo present from the earliest Raj stories of Rudyard Kipling against interracial romance. Now the blending of Indian and British is seen as imperialism’s saving grace. While the plot allows Diver to reject claims of Anglo-Indian racism, it also makes Britishness integral to a “better” Indianness.²⁴³ Considering his parents, Roy thinks,

. . . whatever might come later—he blessed them for his double heritage; for the perfect accord between them that inspired his hope of ultimate harmony between England and India, in spite of barriers and complexities and secret fomenters of discord; a harmony that could never arrive by veiled condescension out of servile

²⁴³ As I discuss in the next chapter, Diver’s open-mindedness has limits. For instance, Roy’s Indian mother will not allow Roy to marry an Indian woman, from a stated fear of too much racial mixing.

imitation . . . Each must honestly will to understand the other; each holding fast the essence of individuality, while respecting in the other precisely those baffling qualities that strengthen their union and make it vital to the welfare of both. (94)

Imperialism is again portrayed as a bond of affection; what was a filial relationship in Perrin is rewritten, in this late Raj novel, as a national love story. This plot recurs heavily in *Raj Revival* attempts to romanticize the exploitative colonial relationship. Anticipating their attempts, Diver uses Lilámani and Nevil's relationship to stage personally a desired political reality. The Raj novel genre sets forth an ideal of British character to which the traits formed and refined in Anglo-India are integral. Such formation, in Diver's novels, is repeatedly described as a labor of love. The embodiment of this love narrative in *Far to Seek* in 1921 represents a last minute attempt by Diver to forestall, in her fictions, the end of British rule in India.

Maud Diver's novels, then, offer a culmination of recurrent Raj novel genre themes: the delineation of traits portrayed as constituent to British national character along gender lines; the veneration of Anglo-India's domestic and military scenes as productive of an idealized British imperial identity; the celebration of the Indian landscape as a unique testing ground by which Anglo-Indians may prove what—in Diver's grandiloquent celebration of their virtue—reads as a limitless capacity for personal and national improvement. In this way, Diver's ideology accords with that of Winston Churchill—the man whom Margaret Thatcher, speaking during the 1982 Falkland Islands War, claimed as her ideological forerunner. Protesting Indian independence in 1931, ten years after *Far to Seek*'s release, Churchill praised Anglo-Indian service in terms that parallel the fictional campaigning of Diver's novels: “Here you have nearly three hundred and fifty millions of people, lifted to a civilisation and to a level of peace, order, sanitation and progress far above anything they could possibly have achieved themselves or could maintain.”²⁴⁴

The paternalistic dismissal of Indians, and the concurrent ennobling of Anglo-India, represents

²⁴⁴ Winston Churchill, “Our Duty in India,” *The Churchill Centre and Museum*, 18 March 1931. Web. 2 Dec. 2011.

one side of the heated debate surrounding Indian Independence, a debate enacted in the texts of the Raj novel genre. It is my claim that E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, published three years after *Far to Seek*, offers a contrasting point of view—one that uses Raj novel terms and tropes to turn the debate back upon itself, and undermine the genre's constituent principles.

“I really do know the truth about Indians. A most unsuitable position . . .”: E.M. Forster's rejection of Raj novel genre tropes in *A Passage to India*

E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924), considered for years an authoritative text on Anglo-India and made into an Academy-Award winning film by David Lean in 1984, offers a deconstruction of the Raj novel genre's stylistic tropes and ideological claims. In its 1924 review of *A Passage to India*, the *Guardian* elevated it to a realm of insight beyond the Anglo-Indian fictions upon which I argue Forster's novel's plot and themes draw. Where reviews of Maud Diver and Alice Perrin reflect the self-promotion of these authors as Anglo-Indian authorities, the *Guardian* attributes to Forster the personal, spiritual awakening through direct experience of India that Forster's own novel deconstructs:

We have had novels about India from the British point of view and from the native point of view, and in each case with sympathy for the other side; but the sympathy has been intended, and in this novel there is not the slightest suggestion of anything but a personal impression, with the prejudices and limitations of the writer frankly exposed. Mr. Forster, in fact, has reached the stage in his development as an artist when, in his own words about Miss Quested, he is “no longer examining life, but being examined by it.” He has been examined by India, and this is his confession.²⁴⁵

What is Forster “confessing”? A profound disenchantment with the concepts of imperial fidelity and Anglo-Indian authority, claims rendered specious by *A Passage to India*'s plot and the behavior of the novel's characters. Encounter with the “real India” mires Forster's protagonists in madness and death. By presenting this scenario, the novel gives a different sort of commentary on the Raj novels as a genre, and on the Anglo-Indian “species” the Raj writers present to the

²⁴⁵ “Review of *A Passage to India*,” *Guardian*, 20 June 1924.

British reading public. The novel's marked similarities to the works of Sara Jeannette Duncan, and its deconstruction of India as a transcendental landscape, bespeak Forster's engagement with plot and style elements common to the Raj novel genre. But where other Raj authors resolve the ideological dilemmas of imperial rule using the authority derived from authentic Anglo-Indian experience, Forster discards imperialism's ideals entirely in scenes of frustrated impossibility. Hence the famous ending to *A Passage to India*, in which the Indian Dr. Aziz and his white friend, Cecil Fielding, passionately wish to be friends "now" but

the horses didn't want it—they swerved apart; the earth didn't want it, sending up rocks through which riders must pass single file; the temples, the tank, the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion, the Guest House, that came into view as they issued from the gap and saw Mau beneath: they didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, "No, not yet," and the sky said, "No, not there." (362)

In Forster's Anglo-India, the land itself rejects the possibility of continued joint existence for British and Indian—an anthropomorphic projection that mirrors the historic actuality of the time in which Forster wrote. By exploring the ideas that upheld the Raj even as its end drew near, *A Passage to India* traces the narrative of Anglo-Indian ideality crafted in the Raj novel genre and exploits its loopholes, lacunae, and false assumptions. Forster portrays imperial promises as cheap and the ideals of Anglo-Indian personal character as false, but through the experiences of his characters, he also explores what made them so compelling to Raj novel readers.

Forster's other novels are not set in India, and do not participate in the Raj novel genre. His closest ties to these texts may thus be found partly through his friendship with Duncan. In 1912, Duncan and her husband hosted Forster while he made visits to Simla and Delhi;²⁴⁶ there is no record of Forster having read Duncan's novels, but Nancy Paxton writes that "[i]n his journal Forster notes that he was impressed by Duncan's knowledge of local Indian culture."²⁴⁷

²⁴⁶ Mary Lago and P.N. Furbank, *Selected Letters of E.M. Forster* (London: Arrow Books, 1983). 153; 159-60.

²⁴⁷ Nancy Paxton, *Writing Under the Raj* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999). 250.

Duncan's emphasis on the authoritative knowledge that accrues through Anglo-Indian service makes this homage from Forster notable, and perhaps explains why *A Passage to India* contains such similarities to Duncan's *Set in Authority* and *The Burnt Offering*. Based on his writing, Duncan offered to Forster some of the contrast she poses in her books between visitors from "Home" and the Anglo-Indians who commit years of their life to the Raj. Forster's particular incorporation of character traits and descriptive techniques seen in Duncan and other Raj novel genre authors illustrates the processes by which authors and audiences alike respond to elements that sediment within a genre. Susanne Günther sees evidence in empirical studies that "participants in formal as well as informal situations gravitate towards sedimented patterns on various levels. They do this in forms that range from grammatical constructions . . . to communicative genres."²⁴⁸ The comparisons I draw between Duncan and Forster situate Forster within the Raj novel genre by detailing how Forster uses the Raj novel genre's typical modes of communicative construction, while acknowledging that he approaches these modes and forms from a critical perspective.

In *A Passage to India*, the young female protagonist Adela Quested journeys from England with her potential mother-in-law, Mrs. Moore, to investigate marriage to Mrs. Moore's son, Ronny Heaslop. Adela shares a number of traits with *The Burnt Offering*'s Joan Mills. Adela is described as "theoretical" (Forster 129, 167) while Joan is a "creatur[e] of theory" (Duncan 199). This slant toward opinion based on ideology, Duncan and Forster imply, is aberrant; their negative portrayal accords with David Simpson's broad argument in *Romanticism, Nationalism, and the Revolt Against Theory* (1993) that "anglophone national traditions have constructed and perpetuated" a "phobia" against theory and theoretical understanding (3). The

²⁴⁸ Susanne Günther, "Grammatical constructions and communicative genres," *Syntactic Variation and Genre*, ed. Heidrun Dorgeloh and Anja Vanner (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2010). 195.

Raj novel genre works to interweave Anglo-Indian concerns with the metanarrative of British imperial identity; the accord between Duncan and Forster's negative portrayals of theoretical understanding and the larger project of articulating British national identity as level-headed and anti-theoretical is thus another instance of the discursive collusion the Raj novel genre carries out. Here, Joan and Adela's abstracted approaches cause them to develop sympathy for India, Indians, and Indian political causes. Hearing of a League that brings Indian and British women together: "It doesn't sound *real*," said Joan, who had no desire to find it real" (112). Joan opts to misinterpret the Anglo-Indian scene she observes in favor of her theoretical understanding. In *A Passage to India*, Adela reacts with distaste to the ongoing racial segregation at a "Bridge Party" meant to bring together Indian and British persons: "This party to-day makes me so angry and miserable . . . my countrymen out here must be mad. Fancy inviting guests and not treating them properly!" (47) Joan and Adela each waffle over (potential) marriages to British men in favor of romances (Joan) and friendship (Adela) with Indians, and each desires, in Adela's famous words, "to see the *real* India!" (22). In *The Burnt Offering*, written fifteen years prior, Joan speaks similarly: "it's the real Calcutta, you know, that I want to see" (39). The pursuit of a theoretical construct (the abstracted "real" India) leads Joan and Adela astray and destroys key players in their lives (John Game for Joan; Mrs. Moore for Adela). Neither Forster nor Duncan offers an overt chance at redemption, and both Joan and Adela are banished from the idealized spaces of Anglo-India to live presumably lonely lives at "Home" in England.

Further similarities abound in the scene-setting work done by Duncan's *Set in Authority* and Forster's *A Passage to India*. Again, these similarities highlight the strong presence of Raj novel genre elements in Forster's text. In the course of his plot, Forster explores how repetition of stylistic devices in the Raj novels consolidates idealized British male and female traits, while

disputing the genre's claims to "true" Anglo-Indian knowledge of India and Indians. In *Set in Authority*, Duncan introduces Pilaghur, capital of her fictional province of Ghoom, as follows:

Out there the multitudinous mud huts are like an eruption of the baked and liver-coloured earth, low and featureless; but in the narrow ways of the crowded city by the river the houses jostle each other to express themselves. The upper stories crane over the lower ones, and all resent their neighbours . . . They have the stamp of the racial, the inevitable, the desperately in earnest, which is the grim sign of cities; there is no vagueness, nothing superimposed, in Pilaghur-by-the-river. (78)

Similarly, when Forster situates us in Chandrapore, the spirit of his description reflects Duncan's characterization of the Indian settlement at the edges of the British cantonment:

The very wood seems made of mud, the inhabitants of mud moving. So abased, so monotonous is everything that meets the eye, that when the Ganges comes down it might be expected to wash the excrescence back into the soil. Houses do fall, people are drowned and left rotting, but the general outline of the town persists, swelling here, shrinking there, like some low but indestructible form of life. (4)

Forster and Duncan use similar vocabulary, emphasizing particularly the muddy resilience of the Indian settlements in their "inevitable" and "indestructible" realities. As with the ending of *A Passage to India*, the use of anthropomorphism is notable: Duncan's houses "crane" and "resent their neighbours," while in Forster the town itself is "some low but indestructible form of life," "swelling" and "shrinking". Evoking a sense of dirtiness and despair, both authors thrust their British characters into these grim landscapes, where they are sorely tested. Those of Duncan's characters who can conform to the ideals of Anglo-India character the Raj novel genre constructs emerge, elevated. Forster's are shattered. The similarity of orientation in Duncan's and Forster's novels thus positions *A Passage to India*, like *Set in Authority* and *The Burnt Offering*, as an examination of the British imperial project, in the Anglo-Indian specificity celebrated by Raj novel genre norms and attitudes. And when Paul Scott restages the plot of Forster's novel in his 1960s/1970s *Raj Quartet*, the influence of the genre visibly extends forward from Duncan's scene setting to Forster's plotting to nostalgic re-examination in the Raj Revival.

A Passage to India's plot is famous: Adela, out in India to visit Ronny, is invited with Mrs. Moore by Aziz to the "extraordinary" Marabar Caves (6). Fielding, meant to accompany them, is delayed. In the time before he arrives, Adela and Mrs. Moore, deeply affected by the all-encompassing, reductive "boom" of the caves' echo, are undone. Mrs. Moore experiences a spiritual crisis that drives her away from Christian faith toward death, while Adela, disoriented by the caves, accuses Aziz of attempted rape. The Anglo-Indian community rises to Adela's defense only to turn on her when she recants her testimony on the stand. Fielding's ensuing friendship with Adela impedes his bond with Aziz, but the two men reconnect late in life, when Fielding re-visits India with his new wife, the late Mrs. Moore's daughter, Stella.

Introducing the Marabar Caves, Forster writes: "no one could romanticize the Marabar because it robbed infinity and eternity of their vastness, the only quality that accommodates them to mankind" (165). As my analysis of Perrin and Diver notes, the Raj novels frequently attempt to figure India's landscape as a source of personal or spiritual inspiration. In Forster's text, by contrast, India becomes banal. Observing a sunrise, Adela and Mrs. Moore are struck by how unspectacular it is, how "at the supreme moment, when night should have died and day lived, nothing occurred. It was as if virtue had failed at the celestial fount" (151). Aziz's daytrip to the Marabar, an Indian fantasia complete with a lavishly decorated elephant (152-53), ends in the opposite of romantic adventure: racial hatred, violence, an accusation of rape. Most tellingly, Forster makes Adela's accusation of Aziz spring in part from her ongoing attempts to transform reality with fanciful visions of what a transcendent world should be. In her relationship with Ronny, Adela repeatedly desires more dramatic incident; she felt "that a profound and passionate speech ought to have been delivered by one or both of them" (90) and "there should have been another scene between her lover and herself at this point, something dramatic and lengthy" (101).

The first wish is rebutted by stolid Ronny—who in another Raj novel might be the hero. When Adela says “[w]e’ve been awfully British over it, but I suppose that’s all right” he replies, “[a]s we are British, I suppose it is” (90). This is Forster’s particular approach to the recitation of personal traits beneficial to Britishness and honed by Anglo-Indian service which takes place across the Raj novel genre. Diver, for instance, sees the work of Anglo-Indians on the Northwest Frontier as manifested “racial talent” (*Candles in the Wind* 17). Forster does not discount racial affinity, but he makes it dull, and for readers desiring a story of dramatic love, disappointing.

To Forster, Britishness, like the Marabar, cannot be uplifted by the imperial encounter. It is what it is: prosaic reality. *A Passage to India* strips down the Raj novels’ elevating narratives of Anglo-Indians and the picturesque landscape in which they move, showing the falsehoods, separation, and violence upon which the imagery of authors such as Perrin and Diver depends. The reaction of *A Passage to India*’s Anglo-Indian community to Adela’s rape accusation emblemizes the notion that scenes of violence underpin the heroic myths of empire. Again, Jenny Sharpe’s *Allegories of Empire* traces the threat of British women being raped by Indian men to the Mutiny novel (86); the circulation of the rape narrative sustains the formation of an ideal British character whose further propagation I highlight in the Raj novel genre. “Governed by benevolence, moral fortitude, and rationality, the civilizing mission cannot accommodate signs of violence except where they exhibit the native’s barbaric practices,”²⁴⁹ Sharpe writes. Adela’s purported attack allows Chandrapore’s Anglo-Indians to consciously display ideals of moral fortitude, benevolence, and rationality; their ferocious anger at her recanting of the rape charge reveals the hypocrisy and shallowness of those attitudes. Through the injury enacted upon Adela and Ronny, the Raj novel genre’s familiar ideal of Anglo-Indian communal participation is also examined; Forster casts its claims for ennobling solidarity as a form of mass hysteria.

²⁴⁹ Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire* (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993). 4, 6.

Midway through the novel, Fielding goes to the Collector of Chandrapore to defend Aziz. He encounters a stoic model of Britishness: “[The Collector’s] face was white, fanatical, and rather beautiful—the expression that all English faces were to wear at Chandrapore for many days. Always brave and unselfish, he was now fused with some white and generous heat; he would have killed himself, obviously, if he had thought it right to do so” (180). The repeated mentions of whiteness in Forster’s description are pointed, as is the twist on the idea that experience of daily life and unique difficulty in Anglo-India brings the Collector’s admirable qualities to the fore. This is a key message of the Raj novel genre. In Forster, it becomes false and repellent. Aziz’s “Indianness” threatens white British rule, meant to be as untouchable as the bodies of British women. The false consciousness, to return to Ernest Gellner’s description of inherent falseness in the national construct, produced by Adela’s rape charge consolidates what *Passage to India* sets forth as the traits defining Anglo-Indian ideality in the Raj novel genre. Forster shows the reader that such traits are based on a lie—here Adela’s, but in a larger sense the “lie” enacted by an Empire that claims to serve, to help instead of hurting.

In describing the Collector, Forster also upsets Anglo-Indian claims for longevity of service and the resultant authority over India which the Raj novel genre strenuously establishes:

“I have had twenty-five years’ experience of this country,” . . . “twenty-five years” seemed to fill the waiting-room with their staleness and ungenerosity— “and during those twenty-five years I have never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially . . . Newcomers set our traditions aside, and in an instant what you see happens, the work of years is undone and the good name of my District ruined for a generation.” (181-82)

By revealing the Collector’s hypocrisy in defending racial hierarchies and segregation as part of a pattern of twenty-five years of service, Forster upsets Anglo-Indian claims to superior authority based on true knowledge of India. Even the supposition that the District has a “good name” is undermined by the unhappiness of Chandrapore’s Indian and British residents. The Collector’s

“stale,” ungenerous sentiments are tired repetitions of the Anglo-Indian myths promulgated in the Raj novel genre, which are shown here to be based on fabricated tales of *noblesse oblige* overlaying violence and exploitation. In attacking the methods by which Raj novel genre texts advocate for Anglo-Indian ideality, Forster thus undermines the metanarrative of British imperial identity sustained by claims that wise, noble Britons sympathized with and knew their imperial subjects so as to better, more selflessly serve them. Such claims, in *A Passage to India*, are as empty as the stereotypes amassed during the Collector’s stale, ungenerous twenty-five years.

A Passage to India further interrogates Anglo-Indian stereotypes by examining the idea that life in India had a deleterious effect on British female character. This derogatory attitude, entering the Raj novel genre via what Teresa Hubel calls the “patriarchal assumptions that lie at the core of [Kipling’s] vision,”²⁵⁰ is echoed in the early novels of Perrin, rebutted generally in the Raj novel genre, and much critiqued by contemporary critics such as Nancy Paxton and Alison Sainsbury. Real-life Anglo-Indian John Morris, who served on the Northwest Frontier from 1916 to 1935, put it baldly: “‘Most [*memsahibs*] started out as perfectly reasonable, decent English girls . . . [but] developed into what I can only describe as the most awful old harridans. And I think they were very largely responsible for the break-up of relations between the British and the Indians.’”²⁵¹ Encountering this debated but sedimented concept in *A Passage to India*, Forster again manipulates discursive assumptions common to Raj ideology. Here, however, he accords with the negative stereotype but extends it slightly to encompass some Anglo-Indian men. Adela tells Aziz that she fears she will become “‘what is known as an Anglo-Indian,’” adding:

[It’s] inevitable . . . What I do hope to avoid is the mentality . . . Some women are so—well, ungenerous and snobby about Indians, and I should feel too ashamed for words if I turned like them, but—and here’s my difficulty—there’s nothing special

²⁵⁰ Teresa Hubel, “‘The Bride of His Country’: Love, Marriage, and the Imperialist Paradox in the Indian Fiction of Sara Jeannette Duncan and Rudyard Kipling,” *ARIEL* 21:1 (January 1990). 3.

²⁵¹ Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Futura, 1983). 212.

about me, nothing specially good or strong, which will help me to resist my environment and avoid becoming like them. I've most lamentable defects. (161)

Ironically, through her accusation of Aziz, which stems perhaps from those "lamentable defects," Adela becomes a model of Anglo-India outrage and invokes precisely what the British perceive to be the best aspects of their society and selves. Forster's general sense, expressed by Fielding, that Adela is right about Anglo-Indian women accords with the gendered stereotypes critiqued elsewhere in the Raj novel genre. But the ironic implication that Anglo-India can only be its ideal self when living out the effects of a racist lie incorporates subversion into Forster's tale.

Describing Adela's effect on Anglo-India, Forster twice mentions "character". For instance, "[a]lthough Miss Quested had not made herself popular with the English, she brought out all that was fine in their character" (199). Forster's word choice is meaningful in the face of Raj novel genre attempts to inscribe Anglo-Indians as embodying the best of British national character. The Chandrapore cantonment leaps to Adela's defense; the hypocritical, shallow Mrs. Turton, wife of the Collector, emerges from meeting her "ennobled by an unselfish sorrow . . . why had they not all been kinder to the stranger, more patient, given her not only hospitality but their hearts?" (199). Anglo-India's drive toward more idealized behavior emerges again with Ronny's arrival: "At the name of Heaslop a fine and beautiful expression was renewed on every face. Miss Quested was only a victim, but young Heaslop was a martyr; he was the recipient of all the evil intended against them by the country they had tried to serve; he was bearing the sahib's cross" (205). The repeated vocabulary in Forster's descriptions is striking; the rhetoric is again that of service, stoicism, and notably, beauty. (The use of Biblical phraseology, with "bearing the sahib's cross," also recalls Flora Annie Steel and Maud Diver's frequent use of Christian phrasing to venerate Anglo-Indians.) Ronny's expression, like the Collector's, is "beautiful". In portraying the aggrieved British thus, Forster touches on the appeal of the British

narrative of martyrdom. Again, this is why the embrace of Ronny is easier; Adela is a victim, but Ronny is a martyr; the British would prefer to be martyred to India than abused by it. To Anglo-India, the story of trust, hope, and fortitude threatened, yet resilient, is beautiful.

In the midst of this, of course, Adela herself is forgotten: “The issues Miss Quested had raised were so much more important than she was herself that people inevitably forgot her” (240). During one scene of frenetic Anglo-Indian hysteria, the wife of a railway official is even taken up as a more potent symbol: “with her abundant figure and masses of corn-gold hair . . . [she] symbolized all that is worth fighting and dying for; more permanent a symbol, perhaps, than poor Adela” (200). The battle Anglo-India fights is for the community’s honor. Here, as in the virulent hatred that greets Adela’s recanting, Forster satirizes the Raj novel genre’s emphasis on community over the individual. His novel implies that Anglo-India is so obsessed with its own mythology that persons who do not fit the dictates of the male and female roles set by that myth are discarded. What is truly at stake in the events of *A Passage to India* is the story Anglo-India scripts for itself in venues such as the Raj novel genre.

Awareness of this fact comes in Fielding and Adela’s acknowledgement that what she does in accusing Aziz is tell a story. Fielding wants Adela to speak to him directly, thereby lessening Anglo-India’s communal influence upon her narrative. He tells the Collector: “[s]he is among people who disbelieve in Indians.’ ‘Well, she tells her own story, doesn’t she?’ ‘I know, but she tells it to you’” (188). Audience is essential: if Adela tells her own story to Anglo-India, she becomes part of Anglo-India, enabling it to continue manufacturing its illusions of duty, knowledge, and proper rule. Later in the novel, Forster observes that “[t]ruly Anglo-India had caught [Adela] with a vengeance” (219). This feeling, of being “caught,” culminates as Adela takes the witness stand. At the beginning of her testimony, she participates in the narrative of

Britishness that has risen up around her. Speaking of herself as part of Anglo-India, Adela experiences the romanticized, ennobled land promised before her voyage and celebrated in the Raj novel genre:

The fatal day recurred, in every detail, but now she was of it and not of it at the same time, and this double relation gave it indescribable splendor. Why had she thought the expedition “dull”? Now the sun rose again, the elephant waited, the pale masses of the rock flowed round her and presented the first cave . . . all beautiful and significant, though she had been blind to it at the time. (253)

What at the time was banal is beautiful; what was dull, hot, and unpleasant becomes glorious when viewed through Anglo-India’s eyes. This is also the power of the Raj novel genre; the ability to script an India that is romantic, that holds the “beautiful and significant” truths cloaked by life in the urban centers of Britain. After Adela recants, in contrast, she feels “emptied, valueless; there was no more virtue in her” (258). No longer the heroine of a Raj novel, she is rendered “valueless.” From this point, Adela departs the Anglo-Indian narrative and does not figure in the conclusion of *A Passage to India*. She no longer fits within the genre’s story.

A Passage to India thus examines many of the same virtues promoted in the Raj novel genre, but Forster makes the Raj novel’s virtues the Anglo-Indian community’s flaws. A final comparison to Duncan’s *The Burnt Offering* offers a point of conclusion. Again, *The Burnt Offering* begins with a scene of racism by two British men against the educated Indian Bepin. An early scene in *A Passage to India* stages a similar scenario: Aziz’s *tonga* (carriage) is taken by two oblivious Anglo-Indian women. But where Duncan presents Joan as witness and devotes her novel to showing us, repeatedly, the fallibility of Joan’s accounts, Forster has Aziz confess the cruelties practiced against him to Mrs. Moore. In the canon of Raj narratives, Mrs. Moore might be subject to correction by Anglo-Indians. She is, Ronny muses, “just a globe-trotter . . . who could retire to England with what impressions she chose” (29). Where Raj novels more broadly

attempt to correct globe-trotters' mistaken impressions, Forster's novel bears them out. Through Mrs. Moore's disenchantment, he stages the breakdown of metanarrative which the Raj novel genre otherwise fervently upholds. The echo of the Marabar Caves convinces Mrs. Moore that "all [Christianity's] divine words from 'Let there be Light' to 'It is finished' only amounted to 'bom.' . . . She lost all interest, even in Aziz" (166). Rather than lifting her to new spiritual heights, as with Anne Crivener in Perrin's *Idolatry*, India strips Mrs. Moore of her ideals. She dies on the journey back to England, and her body is thrown into the Indian Ocean. Through her death, we see that for Forster, the Raj, Anglo-Indians, and the Indian landscape represented an end of idealism and a frustration of love or spiritual elevation.

As this chapter has discussed, the Raj novels of Alice Perrin and Maud Diver stage ideological and political interventions which attempt to quell the doubts upon which Forster plays. Yet, after *Far to Seek*, even Diver shifts to works that commemorate British service with an almost posthumous air. Not until the Raj Revival and the best-selling works of authors such as M.M. Kaye, J.G. Farrell, and Ruth Praver Jhabvala, and filmmakers such as David Lean, are the ideals of Anglo-Indian character promoted by the Raj novels fully acknowledged. The Raj Revival sets aside the pessimism of Forster's *A Passage to India*, embracing instead the concept of accurate knowledge and fair rule pursued by honest British men and women who desired only to serve India. But before examining how this carrying forth of Raj novel genre ideology impacted British politics and culture in 1970s and 1980s Britain, it is necessary to consider how the second part of the imperial relationship—the imperial subject—is depicted in the Raj novel genre. What do these works say about India, Indians, and the relation of Indian subjectivity to the construction of British imperial identity, which I argue is the Raj novels' primary goal? Upon which points do the Raj novel genre authors agree, and what is the significance of this accord in

the Raj novels' characterization of India and Indians? By analyzing the assumptions and exceptions of the Raj novel genre's depictions of race, a clearer picture of Raj novel genre uptake in the Raj Revival, and in the political rhetoric of Thatcherite Britain, emerges; description of this racial imagery is the project to which I turn in Chapter IV.

V. Raj Racism? – Depictions of India and “Indianness” in the Raj Novel Genre

In the first three chapters of this dissertation, I describe the Raj novelists’ focus on Anglo-Indian character, and argue that the works in which that character is described comprise a distinct genre within the literature of Britain’s imperial era. Close reading the work of authors living and writing in India between the 1858 institution of the British Raj and Indian independence in 1947 spotlights a list of character traits; I argue that the explication of these traits, and the claim that daily life in India develops Anglo-Indians as models of British national and personal character, is the goal of the Raj novel genre. That genre includes a range of works, from the sophisticated, often mocking tales of Rudyard Kipling and Sara Jeannette Duncan, to Flora Annie Steel’s Mutiny epics, to the bombastic love stories of Maud Diver. But for E.M. Forster’s *A Passage to India*, which stages Raj novel genre tropes so as to critique their underlying assumptions, the genre coheres around a profound belief in Anglo-Indian ideality, and endorses the “true” knowledge of India that justified British rule in the subcontinent.

It is to the question of this supposed truth—the claim that the Anglo-Indians deeply “knew” India—that I turn in this chapter. Throughout my dissertation, I have referred to a “metanarrative” of British imperial identity. That story, of Britain as a nation that goes into the world and assumes control of territories by virtue of its inherently superior “civilization,” is told across and through the person of the colonial subject. This is the argument of Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), which traces the recurrence of imperial narrative in canonical British texts which are supposedly separate from the colonial context, such as Jane Austen’s *Mansfield Park*. Authors, Said writes, are “very much in the history of their societies, shaping and shaped by that history and their social experience in different measure.”²⁵² Thus, imperialism exerts ideological force in even the most ostensibly domestic novels of the nineteenth and

²⁵² Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). xxii.

twentieth century. That force concentrates on two points, the colonizer and the colonized, working upon these subjects even when colonial narrative claims to repress or control the colonized presence. Describing the disruptive force exerted by supposedly “Anglicized” subjects, Homi Bhabha writes that these “mimic men,” who learn to imitate and play within the structures of colonial discourse, emerge as “the part-objects of a metonymy of colonial desire which alienates the modality and normality of those dominant discourses in which they emerge as ‘inappropriate’ colonial subjects.”²⁵³ That is, the presence of a colonized subject, who has learned the “values” which the colonizer claims justify the imperial mission, yet remains colonized, shows the break between discourse and reality. In his or her person, the “normality” claimed by the colonizer in the seizure of land, property, and power is cast into doubt. The mimic man embodies the lapses in the narratives of British identity and behavior that enable the actually mercantile and exploitative imperial effort.

In reading the Raj novel genre, then, I argue that these works’ primary focus is on the Anglo-Indian male and female actor, and secondarily, on British men and women at “Home”. However, that focus is achieved in part by dramatizing Anglo-Indian interactions with Indians. Part of the “rigor” of subcontinent life in the Raj novel genre is dealing with and exerting power (*en route* to rule) over Indian men and women. Much critical study on the Raj novels to date focuses on this interaction. For instance, Benita Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries* catalogues the array of Indian stereotypes disseminated by the Raj novels (what Parry calls “the cesspool of British feelings” on India²⁵⁴), while Nancy Paxton’s *Writing Under the Raj* examines how female British subjectivity is constituted in these works at the expense of Indians and Indian bodies. Up until this chapter, I have departed from studies such as Parry’s and Paxton’s by reading in detail

²⁵³ Homi Bhabha, “Of Mimicry and Man,” in *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge). 88.

²⁵⁴ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 72.

images of male and female Britishness in the Raj novel genre, and arguing that the Raj novels propagate these images in response to the genre's exigence. However, to fully develop the Anglo-Indian subject, the Raj novels imply, there must be an Indian object. To explore how the Raj novel genre variously empowers the Anglo-Indian actor, and to forecast the influence Raj novel portrayals of Anglo-India and India have on the Raj Revival, an examination of how the genre's Anglo-Indian ideals relate to Indians is essential. In addition to the ways in which the Raj novel genre openly incorporates Indian characters, an examination of the ways in which discourses of the colonized more subtly impact upon these works is also necessary. "Imperialism is a system," Said writes. "Life in one subordinate realm of experience is imprinted by the fictions and follies of the dominant realm. But the reverse is true too, as experience in the dominant society comes to depend uncritically on natives and their territories perceived as in need of *la mission civilisatrice*"²⁵⁵. The Raj novel genre exploits this dialectical relationship with "natives and their territories": the idealization of the Anglo-Indian actor emerges in part via the sensibility of his or her duty as inextricable from the desire for service the Raj novel genre assigns the Indian subject. The reciprocal nature of imperial power relations is examined in this chapter to show another method by which the Raj novel genre galvanizes British national character, and further, how that galvanization retains its appeal in the Raj Revival, decades after imperialism's practical end.

In addition, analyzing depictions of Indians and how relations with Indians, particularly interracial romances, are portrayed in the Raj novel genre casts further light on the Raj Revival's ideological project, which I detail in Chapter V. The Raj novelists, by and large, were assured of imperialism's fundamental rightness. Their policing of Indian subjectivity is thus more brash and

²⁵⁵ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). xix.

self-assured; the inclusion of racist stereotyping in their texts more overt. Describing the reception of the Raj novels, Benita Parry writes that

. . . colonial discourses were transmitted to and received by two audiences. On the one hand, they were directed at confounding critics, reassuring doubters, and soliciting the solidarity of the metropolitan population with the imperial mission. On the other, they were delivered as both homily and warning to the colonies in an effort to pre-empt disobedience and convince the colonized that they were willing if subordinate participants in a foreign rule. (*Delusions and Discoveries* 4)

The 1970s and 1980s Raj Revival texts, I argue in Chapter V, relate to the first of these audiences (the metropolitan population) in a manner similar to that of the Raj novel genre. They use the same tropes of Anglo-Indian ideality, cloaked beneath a veneer of postcolonial acceptability, to “reassure doubters” that the imperial grandeur of the British Empire lingers as a politically potent fact into the post-imperial era. However, the second of Parry’s audiences, the then-colonies, are dealt with differently. I argue that a post-imperial (in the sense of “after” empire) recognition of the failures of empire leads to a more nuanced portrayal of India and Indians in the Raj Revival. While the Raj novel genre, particularly more complex works by Kipling, Duncan, and Forster, allows ambivalence in its rhetorical “control” of the imperial subject, a general feeling of assurance about the “*mission civilisatrice*” defuses the subversive potential of this ambivalence. By contrast, the Raj Revival uses increasingly nuanced Indian characters to aid its project of reconstituting and redeeming British imperialism. As I discuss in the next chapter, the effect is recuperative but insidious; where once imperial rule was carried out “over” the colonial subject, in many Raj Revival texts it is carried out through him or her.

In this chapter, I begin my examination with a survey of how India and Indians are portrayed generally in the Raj genre novels, represented, as in Chapter III, by Diver and Alice Perrin. Here I add Steel and B.M. Croker, with the understanding that their works use Mutiny novel and Raj novel stereotypes of Indians to construct an intermittently insurgent but always

containable Indian subject. Throughout, I look particularly at interracial romance, as this topic is especially contentious within the Raj novel genre. Next, Bhabha's theories of hybridity and mimicry are used to describe more complex portrayals of Indian subjectivity by Kipling, Forster, and Duncan. Having explored in detail how the Raj novel genre portrays India and Indians, and having articulated how these portrayals allow the further idealization of the Anglo-Indian actor, I summarize the image of Britishness emergent in this aspect of the Raj novel genre. I then turn in Chapter V to the Raj Revival—which sees the advocacy for Anglo-India as a nascent national player within the British metanarrative of imperial identity come to belated, nostalgic fruition.

Servants, Princes, Zealots: Visions of India in the Raj Novel Genre

Alice Perrin, B.M. Croker, Flora Annie Steel, and Maud Diver's works, which I argue are typical of most offerings in the Raj novel genre,²⁵⁶ portray India, Indians, and relations between British and Indian persons with an attitude of fascinated horror, disapproval, and/or salacious disavowal. To justify the righteous duty performed by Anglo-Indians, these novels imply, a subject Indian populace must be maintained. However, in dealing with that populace, strict physical and mental boundaries are set and policed to safeguard Anglo-Indian health and power. Benita Parry argues that these Raj authors, whom she dubs "The Romancers," cast India as cultishly spiritual, deeply but perversely sensual, violent, and inscrutable. Images of brutal sacrifice (animal and human), death (skulls; bones; altars drenched in blood), and depravity (Parry refers to "moral and emotional anarchy"²⁵⁷) are common. India, in Parry's reading of these authors, emerges as something akin to Sigmund Freud's "id," harboring the repressed

²⁵⁶ As noted in my introduction, Benita Parry adds F.E. Penny and I.A.R. Wylie to this list, and does not include Steel with Perrin, Croker, and Diver amongst the "Romancers". Parry reconsiders the latter decision in her preface to the 1998 reissue of *Delusions and Discoveries*: "it is immediately obvious that [Steel's] fabrications of India, and those of the romancers, come from the same stratum of the Anglo-Indian mind" (33). This is the logic I follow here.

²⁵⁷ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 79. In Chapter II, Parry deals in close detail with examples of the imagery summarized here.

darkness of the civilized, genteel British superego which the majority of the authors in the Raj novel genre ascribe to their Anglo-Indian protagonists. Summarizing her argument, Parry writes:

India is little more than an exotic backdrop to tales of passion and improbable adventures; in some the disastrous consequences of interracial unions are exposed. . . . The themes they repeatedly use point up the writer's obsessive interest in Indian sensuality and spirituality. Confronting an India of inscrutable and unthinkable possibilities is upright, uncomplicated Anglo-India, its members doing a grand job and doing it well, and if . . . they know little of the hidden secrets of the land over which they rule, this is as well for their mental health and spiritual cleanliness. (78)

I concur with Parry, particularly her claim that the focus in the Raj novel genre remains fixed, even when portraying Indians, on the books' Anglo-Indian protagonists. Here, however, I explore how subversive or ambivalent moments in Steel, Croker, Perrin, and Diver stage more complicated relationships between Indians and Anglo-Indians as a means of further elevating Anglo-Indian character. That is, I question how Anglo-Indians are enhanced by contact with, rather than the more frequently depicted withdrawal from, India and Indians.

Further, I use the variance between Steel and Croker's nineteenth-century, Mutiny novel-influenced works, and Perrin and Diver's books, written in the early twentieth century as Indian Independence neared, to show how the shifting political context of the Raj altered portrayals of Indians in the Raj novel genre. This distinction is particularly salient in anticipation of my Chapter V reading of the Raj Revival; changes in portrayals of Indians within the Raj novel genre anticipate the further manipulation of generic tropes which I postulate takes place in the 1970s and 1980s novels and films. That is, attempts to reconstitute Britain's imperial grandeur in a post-imperial context parallels attempts, in the later Raj novel genre works, to accommodate the ever more powerful independence movement. The impact of the Raj novels' portrayals of India is similar: in *Allegories of Empire*, Jenny Sharpe argues that images of white women raped by Indian men, initially deployed to stem Mutiny insurgency, reappeared in Anglo-Indian

cultural productions in the 1920s to curtail Indian resistance to the 1919 Rowlatt Act (and the subsequent Amritsar Massacre). With this idea of shared political aims in mind, analysis of the moments at which Steel, Croker, Perrin, and Diver depart from such symbolically potent images of Indian sensual threat reveals further elements of the Anglo-Indian literary imagination, as manifested in the Raj novel genre. Specifically, it shows the various ways images of Indians are used to establish Anglo-Indian characters' ideality in these novels. This is not to say that racist depictions of subordinate Indians and mysterious, dangerous India do not exist; such jingoistic portrayals have been excellently catalogued in scholarly work on the Raj novel genre from the 1970s forward. But by examining more ambivalent moments in the genre, and in exploring how the broader portrayal of India and Indians contributes to the Raj novel genre's vision of Anglo-Indian ideality, I seek to expand the range of scholarship in this area, and to link extant descriptions of Raj novel racism to the arguments about Britishness in my preceding chapters.

Among the most intricate images of Indians in the broader Raj novel genre are Steel and Diver's depictions of Rajputs, or Indians from the province of Rajasthan, which during the Raj was largely comprised of princely Native States. This authorial interest seems to stem from a mishmash of impressions of Rajputs as beautiful, fiery warriors related in myth to India's gods. Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* (1896) features "Rajpoot" twins Tara Devi and Soma Chund, who serve the British with intermittent loyalty. Tara, a rescued *suttee* widow,²⁵⁸ is in unrequited love with the novel's hero, Jim Douglas; Soma, a sepoy who struggles with the decision to mutiny, is driven to madness by drug addiction. Yet, Steel writes, it "would have been difficult to give the palm to either for superior height or beauty; and in their perfection of form they might

²⁵⁸ Tara attempted to immolate herself on her husband's funeral pyre, but was prevented by Douglas. This plot is revisited in the Bollywood film *The Rising: Ballad of Mangal Pandey* (2005), which is also about the 1857 Mutiny and incorporates numerous elements familiar from the Mutiny novels. However, *The Rising* celebrates the titular sepoy, who popular Indian mythology credits with starting the rebellion against the British.

have stood as models of the mythical race-founders whose names they bore” (34). Tara and Soma are treated as children by Steel’s characters for much of the book, as when Douglas prevents Tara from drowning herself in the Ganges by stealing a lock of her hair and putting it in a locket (88-89). The twins are prone to emotional rants, illogical decisions, and moral weakness; their lives end in tragedy. But Steel does grant Tara and Soma instances of heroism. Tara saves Kate Erlton’s life; Soma, a “hero-worshiper by birth” (434) recognizes Anglo-Indian superiority and is thus allowed partial redemption. As the Mutiny rages in *On the Face of the Waters*, Soma realizes that the “*Huzoors* were the true masters; they had men who could lead men. Not Princes in Cashmere shawls who couldn’t understand a word of what you said, and mere soubadars cocked up, but real Colonels and Generals” (442). This “revelation” lends credence to the British imperial mission while showing that loyalty, presented in the Raj novel genre as among the most important qualities Indians can possess, is displayed best by Rajputs who, themselves superior to other Indians, recognize Britain’s yet greater superiority.

In contrast to Steel’s ambivalent portrayal, Maud Diver’s Rajput heroine, Lilámani, is perfection embodied. Diver pairs Lilámani with English Baronet Nevil Sinclair in her novel, *Lilámani: A Study in Possibilities* (1911). She endows Lilámani and her father, Sir Lakshman Singh, with a conglomerate Indian identity that allows “Indianness” to take on a nonspecific, non-regional gloss which sets aside political or racial difference in favor of wholehearted support for British imperialism. In *Far to Seek* (1921), whose protagonist, Roy, is Lilámani and Nevil’s mixed-race son, Diver claims Sir Lakshman is “steeped in the threefold culture of his country—Vedantic, Islamic, and European—he came very near the prevailing idea of composite Indian nationality” (188). Diver adds that Sir Lakshman, as a progressive man, hoped for his Indian wife to be educated in Europe. However, his traditional bride balked at the suggestion, a refusal

which led to the couple's gradual estrangement; Lilámani, meanwhile, enjoyed the education her mother refused. Here, Diver implicitly blames ill treatment of Indian woman on the women themselves, and sets Lilámani as a forward-thinking ideal who “represents what's best in the Indian spirit: the spirit that people over here [in Britain] might take more pains to understand” (91). Lilámani's union with Nevil is only permissible, however, because she is the “descendent of Rajput chiefs” (4). Roy himself is barred from romance with an Indian woman: Lilámani tells him “that kind of marriage—for you—*must not be*,” adding, “have you not sense to see that for an old English family like [Nevil's], with roots down deep in English soil and history, it is not good that mixture of race should come twice over in two generations?” (101, 102; emphasis Diver's).²⁵⁹ Diver thus maintains a vision of British “racial” purity, with the idealized Lilámani an exception that allows Diver to guardedly celebrate Anglo-India's open-mindedness.

Further, in *Far to Seek* Diver obsessively undoes whatever progressiveness emerged in her romantic pairing of an Englishman and an Indian woman. This is especially visible in her portrayal of the Rajput twins Arúna and Dyán Singh, who fall in love with Roy and Roy's future wife, the white British woman Tara. Dyán's overtures to Tara are instantly rejected; rather, this plot works to minimize Indian desire for Independence by casting it as thwarted Indian (male sexual) desire for union with a British woman.²⁶⁰ To Dyán, England is “an unconscious symbol of Tara”; India is the “fervent adoration of his country visualized as woman” (235). Dyán turns

²⁵⁹ Paxton's brief citation of the Sinclair novels in *Writing Under the Raj* (after *Far to Seek*, Diver penned *The Singer Passes: An Indian Tapestry* [1931] and *The Dream Prevails* [1934]) elides this complexity. Paxton argues that Diver “explicitly recognizes how cross-cultural love and marriage challenge the very foundations of imperial discourse about India” (194). While Diver does challenge cultural stereotypes about the possibility of a functional interracial marriage, she does so in the service of preserving British imperial control of India. Roy is presented as an ideal new ruler—provided he does not fall in love with an Indian woman, and provided he represses the “Indian” aspects of his character. Rather than challenging the “foundations of imperial discourse,” as Paxton suggests, I argue that the Sinclair novels use interracial romance as a blind by which those foundations may be shored up—imperial rule, in Diver's late works, is more necessary than ever—while simultaneously praising Anglo-Indian openness.

²⁶⁰ Dyán does not verbally or physically threaten Tara. However, the general heft of this plotline, which portrays Indian male sexuality as aberrant and uses that aberrance to suggest particular aspects of British rule are superior to Indian alternatives, accords with the pattern of representation Sharpe describes in *Allegories of Empire*.

to the latter when Tara kindly but firmly rejects him. Independence agitation in Diver's novel is thus the indirect result of Indian inability to comprehend how British "morality" properly polices separation and marriage, when it occurs, between races. Dyán's desire for 'freedom' is portrayed as the petty spite of a spurned lover, a reactive attempt to negotiate the pitfalls of "union" with Great Britain. Such political deployment of interracial romance accords with the argument in Sharpe's *Allegories of Empire* and Paxton's *Writing Under the Raj* that a continual tension plagues the idea of sexual contact between Indian men and British women.²⁶¹ Again, Sharpe traces the politically-mobilized fear of this occurrence forward from British propaganda about the Mutiny; Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* and Croker's *Mr. Jervis* (1894) manipulate the rape and/or forced marriage tropes Sharpe describes to salacious effect.

Sharpe and Paxton do acknowledge the ambivalence of Steel's novel, noting that Steel depicts Indians with a degree of sensitivity, and that British heroine Kate Erlton offers a model of female agency unusual amongst Raj novel heroines. However, critic Pamela Lothspeich troubles these warmer readings, arguing that "allusions to the rape of *memsahibs* . . . reinforce myths of Indian barbarity and British nobility," while "Kate Erlton is not only a victim in the colonial tropology of rape, she is also very much complicit with empire."²⁶² As I contend that Steel and Croker are mainly interested in issues of Anglo-Indian identity, my argument accords more clearly with Sharpe and Paxton's. But Lothspeich's caution about the pitfalls of positive portrayals of British female agency in the Raj novels is a useful reminder that, again, the Raj novel genre deploys images of Indians, violent or otherwise, in an instrumental manner. Indians,

²⁶¹ Alice Perrin also uses sexual contact between Indian men and British women to punish and enforce correct (British) behavior in *The Woman in the Bazaar* (1914). Spoiled, self-centered Rafella Forte abandons her husband for another man; later, it is revealed that she has become a prostitute in an Indian bazaar brothel. Her downfall, while not directly depicted, pushes the hero and heroine to fulfill the dictates of a Christian marriage.

²⁶² Pamela Lothspeich, "Unspeakable Outrages and Unbearable Defilements: Rape Narratives in the Literature of Colonial India," *Postcolonial Text* 3:1 (2007). 17, 7.

even heroic ones such as Diver's Sir Lakshman and Lilámani, often serve a purpose in the Raj texts akin to that Anglo-Indians supposed actual Indians served in relation to the Raj: they facilitate the process of imperial rule with their presence, even as that presence is stripped of subjectivity and denied equal treatment—as here, in the continual dismissal of Indians as viable romantic partners for British men and women.

For instance, Maud Diver's *Far to Seek* allows Arúna and Roy a brief romantic interval before they are gently led apart by Lance and Thea Desmond, son and daughter of Diver's heroic Anglo-Indian archetypes Honor and Theo Desmond. Lance and Thea are *Far to Seek*'s avatars of British moral authority, and their parental role in Arúna and Roy's relationship reframes the nature of Anglo-Indian knowledge and authority, moving British control over Indians to the interpersonal level. Lance and Thea "know" Roy, and therefore know it is best for him to wed a white woman. Gender is at play in this dynamic: Arúna's Indian femininity, like Lilámani's or Tara Devi's in *On the Face of the Waters*, is more acceptable than Dyán's or Soma's violent but impotent masculinity. This depiction reflects contemporary political trends, with Diver offering Rajput women as a corrective to the "New Woman" concept sweeping Britain and Europe in the early twentieth century. Nancy Paxton writes that the "English New Woman challenged Victorian gender norms by taking advantage of changes in Englishwomen's relation to the social contract that feminists helped negotiate in the 1890s"; in contrast to their forebears, these New Women "more frankly expres[s] female erotic desires and . . . asser[t] their sexual independence."²⁶³ In contrast, Diver's graceful, obedient Indian princesses, who are deeply loyal to their husbands, offer a model of diffident femininity opposed to that of British women at "Home". This is a more convoluted vision of ideal character traits forming in the Indian milieu, as I describe in Chapters I, II, and III. *Far to Seek* imagines some Indian women, like Anglo-

²⁶³ Nancy Paxton, *Writing Under the Raj* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999). 195, 196.

Indian women, embodying qualities superior to those of British women unexposed to India. Lilámani's "Eastern birthright of service, her joy in waiting on those she loved, had survived ten years of English marriage, and would survive ten more" (24). Diver places so many restrictions on the possibility of interracial romance as to nearly foreclose the possibility, but to achieve her aims with regards to gender role definition, she does celebrate Indian femininity. This is what draws Roy to Arúna: "If she lacked his mother's high, sustained courage, her flashes of spirit shone out the brighter for her lapses into womanly weakness" (220). As in much of the Raj novel genre, the proper colonial subject, like the proper woman, is portrayed as joyfully accepting a secondary position, embracing a "womanly weakness" that allows colonial, male intervention.

Alice Perrin's *The Anglo-Indians* (1912) uses interracial romance similarly in a subplot about the Rajah of Rotah's infatuation with Fay Fleetwood, daughter of a model Anglo-Indian family. Among the four authors read here, Perrin (with B.M. Croker) portrays Indians the least frequently and most cautiously. In *The Anglo-Indians*, she strives to "whiten" the Rajah:

the warm brown of his skin might easily have been the bronze of sunburn — indeed he was no darker than many an Irishman or Cornishman . . . A handsome deer-like creature, having the blood of generations and generations of aristocratic ancestors in his veins, linked back and back till it touched the pure fount of his Aryan progenitors, whose racial stamp was still apparent despite periodical admixtures of lower blood, and the influence of the soil on form and character. (24-25)

This description damns the Rajah with faint praise. Perrin uses then-current stereotypes of the Irish as racially "other"²⁶⁴ to ameliorate the Rajah's race (he is "no darker" than "many" an Irish or Cornishman), compares him to an animal and a "creature," and makes India itself degrading by noting the negative "influence of the soil" on the Rajah's "Aryan" "form and character". This idea of degradation through contact with India also appears in Perrin's *The Waters of Destruction*

²⁶⁴ Edward Said describes this form of prejudice in *Culture and Imperialism*: "'White' colonies like Ireland and Australia too were considered made up of inferior humans; a famous Daumier drawing, for instance, explicitly connects Irish whites and Jamaican blacks" (134). Hugh Kearney's *Ireland: Contested Ideas of Nationalism and History* (2007) explicates these stereotypes in tracing the history of Irish nationalism (33-56).

(1905), the main plot of which is, again, a failed interracial romance. British hero Stephen Dare marries Indian temptress Sunia, who descends into gluttony and Kali-worship after bearing him a son, Maru (“worthless”). The novel, which rehearses stereotypes of India as sensual, depraved, and toxic to Britishness, again uses Indians as tools to test and prove Anglo-Indian worth. Paxton describes Dare’s “belated recognition of the power and reasonableness of the social and moral codes prohibiting mixed marriage and miscegenation in Anglo-Indian culture”²⁶⁵; this revelation typifies the aim of interracial romance in the Raj novel genre, and is also seen in the Rajah of Rotah, who, like Dare, must relinquish even the idea of desire for a person of another race.

That Perrin presents Indians and British persons as equally in need of correction is a flash of ambiguity defused by the fact that the corrective influence is British, and the attitude that must be changed is the desire for sexual or romantic contact between the races. The Rajah is finally paired with Munia, a model of Indian womanhood whose “charming” passivity and adoration for Britain recalls Diver’s Lilámani. In contrast to the squalid, dissipated Rani of Rotah, Munia has “exquisite teeth, sound and perfect and milky white, not stained . . . with disfiguring betel-nut juice. Intelligence, refinement, character were apparent in the oval face, firm little features and brilliant eyes” (242). Perrin’s use of the word “character” in describing Munia repeats the terms by which she venerates specific Anglo-Indian behavioral and personality traits in her other Raj novels. Acceptable Indians display lesser versions of the qualities that make Anglo-Indians superior. This fictionalized verisimilitude, in more complex Raj novel genre works, evolves into a subversive, ambivalent subtext which questions racial hierarchies. In contrast, such depictions in Perrin’s novels merely stratify the colonial subject into “more” or “less” acceptable categories.

But in neither case is an Indian an appropriate mate for a British man or woman; *The Anglo-Indians*’ hero, Capt. Clive Somerton, reprimands the Rajah for even entertaining the idea

²⁶⁵ Nancy Paxton, *Writing Under the Raj* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999). 194.

(273). Perrin justifies this total rejection of miscegenation with a gloss of evolutionary theory redolent of Social Darwinism.²⁶⁶ Somerton experiences “that primitive sense of repulsion innate in white-skinned humanity towards the notion of race admixture with a dark-skinned people—a repulsion arising from Nature’s tendency to breed upwards, not downwards” (271). Following this statement is an invocation of Indian history that justifies the separation of British and Indian as a mode of rule inherited from the subcontinent itself: “It was this instinct that impelled the Aryan to preserve his caste, otherwise colour, that he, the fair-complexioned invader of higher type and ‘perfect’ language, might avoid complete absorption into the dark, aboriginal races of the country he had colonized” (271). The Raj novel genre often claims the Raj continues in the spirit of the Muslim Mogul Empire from the north, which ruled India prior to the East India Company.²⁶⁷ Such manufactured history establishes Hindu Indians as perpetually colonized, and naturalizes British rule of India. J.R. Seeley argues in this vein in *The Expansion of England* (1883): “The idea of nationality seems in India to be thoroughly confused . . . Not only has a tide of Mussulman invasion covered the country ever since the eleventh century, but even if we go back to the earliest times we still find a mixture of races, a domination of race by race.”²⁶⁸ India is stripped of the right to a national identity; the historical formation of “Indianness,” in Seeley, comes via “domination” and racial hierarchy, with Indians united not by common culture or history but by a legacy of subservience. Perrin invokes this mode of thinking in the context of interracial romance. Claiming the rejection of such unions by British and “fair-complexioned”

²⁶⁶ A movement in the late Victorian period that appropriated the ideas of biologist Charles Darwin and applied them to issues of race. Darwin proposed the theory of scientific evolution and the “survival of the fittest” in the evolution of animal species. To justify racism, Social Darwinists used this model to argue that white races were more “evolved” or fit than members of other races. See Mike Hawkins’ *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945* (1997) and Greta Jones’ *Social Darwinism and English Thought* (1980) for further explications of Social Darwinism and its influence on contemporaneous thought.

²⁶⁷ Gayatri Spivak traces a similar process in British codification of Hindu law during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; she argues that “the Brahmans were shown to have the same intentions as (thus providing the legitimation for) the codifying British” (“Can the Subaltern Speak?” 77).

²⁶⁸ J.R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England*, (Boston: Roberts Bros., 1883). 205.

Aryan “invaders” alike, she sets romantic division between the races as an element of good rule borne out by India’s indigenous history.

A final notable twist on interracial romance in the Raj novels of Steel, Croker, Perrin, and Diver comes in Steel’s novel, *Voices in the Night* (1900). Steel’s depiction of Chris Davenant (Krishn Davenund), a high-caste Brahmin educated in Great Britain as a lawyer, and his wife, Genevieve, explores class and race divisions: the relationship is only allowed, the novel implies, by Genevieve’s lower-class background and crass financial interests. She married Chris for his professional future, and her assessment of the marriage’s failure is cold: “It had been a hideous mistake, of course; but she was shrewd enough to see that the shock of finding, on his return to India, that there was literally no place for him in it had been quite as painful to her husband as to herself. So she exonerated him . . . [with] contemptuous pity and an absolute lack of sympathy” (73). Professionally thwarted, caught in an untenable space between Britain and India materially, spiritually, and mentally (a recurrent theme in Raj novel genre depictions of Anglicized Indians), Chris sinks into depression and self-alienation. A “tragic hybrid” figure whose abjection earns a degree of authorial sympathy from Steel,²⁶⁹ Chris is allowed an emotional appeal to the reader. In contrast, Steel denigrates Genevieve as a “curious product of latter-day London, a vulgar girl of good taste” (72). Yet, despite this authorial distaste, Steel depicts Genevieve as the holder of power in her relationship with Chris—an implicit contrast of class and race which ranks even the lowest of Britain’s economic and social groups above the highest (Chris is highly educated, as

²⁶⁹ My reference leans on the “tragic mulatto” figure, theorized particularly as a component of American novels from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and epitomized by characters such as the heroine of Nella Larsen’s *Passing* (1929). In *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (1995), Robert J.C. Young traces the origin of the terms mulatto (7-8) and hybrid (4-22). In colonial discourse “both language and sex . . . produced what were regarded as ‘hybrid’ forms (creole, pidgin, and miscegenated children), which were seen to embody threatening forms of perversion and degeneration” (5). Young’s reading of Joseph Arthur Comte de Gobineau’s *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1853-1855), which champions the Aryans as a master race, is also relevant; this understanding of racial hierarchies enjoys occasional airing in the Raj novel genre.

well as being of the highest caste) Indians. Steel's staging also elevates British femininity above Indian masculinity, extending the feminization of the colonial subject common to imperial discourse. Analyzing intersections of gender, race, and nation, Anne McClintock writes that "[n]ations are contested systems of cultural representation that limit and legitimize people's access to the resources of the nation state . . . [They] have historically amounted to the sanctioned institutionalization of gender *difference*."²⁷⁰ I argue in the preceding chapters that the Raj novel genre sets the Anglo-Indian community as essentially constitutive to British national character. The Raj texts thus participate in the "contested systems of cultural representation" McClintock cites, attempting to expand Anglo-Indian access to the practical and imaginative resources of the British nation. In Steel, this is accomplished via a hierarchical ranking that sees race trumping gender in the consideration of personal empowerment, and which institutes static gender roles as yet another border policing British and Indian relations.

Complicating the dismissal of women as national actors McClintock discusses in her article (89-90), Anglo-Indian women achieve national participation to the extent that they can dismiss Indians. In *Voices in the Night*, Genevieve openly carries on affairs, runs the household, and verbally dominates Chris, mocking his attempts at Anglicization and personal authority:

"I am not a fool. Not as a rule, I mean, though I was one, of course, when I married you. But you were a greater fool in marrying me; for you knew you were a bit of a prig, and I didn't! . . ." "Will you hold your tongue," he burst out, almost as an Englishman might have done, and she raised her eyebrows and nodded approvingly. "Bravo, Chris! that was very nearly right . . . If you marry a civilised woman, you must behave *as sich*." (291-92)

Where Chris' imitation of what an Englishman might do is only "nearly right," Genevieve's mockery of the mixed Hindi and English (spoken in the Raj novels generally by Eurasians) is exact. Her control of the dialogue, her verbal parody of Chris' mixing of British and Indian

²⁷⁰ Anne McClintock, "'No Longer in a Future Heaven': Gender, Race, and Nationalism," in *Dangerous Liaisons*, ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997). 89.

‘elements,’ and her relationship with Chris all preserve a dynamic of Anglo-Indian authority at a seemingly transgressive site. Steel describes Genevieve maintaining a “cheap empire” (72) in her daily existence; her union with Chris thus offers a microcosm of distorted British rule, with the British controlling even an admitted travesty. Race is thus once more prioritized over gender as a topic of concern and discursive control. In Chapter V, I note the continuation of this sensibility in the Raj Revival: the 1970s/1980s authors utilize the lesser weight assigned gender in the Raj novel genre to overthrow stereotypes of masculinity and femininity while retaining racial hierarchies that elevate Anglo-Indians over Indians.

In both instances, Anglo-Indian authority is established by the manipulation of objectified Indians. Like Dare in *The Waters of Destruction* or Roy in *Far to Seek*, Steel stages an interracial romance as a means of contrasting British and Indian identities and more precisely articulating correct tactics of British rule. Genevieve and Chris’s failed marriage, and Chris’s tragic death, confirms separation between races as best for both. Further, Steel’s depiction sees Anglicization as harmful to Indians as well as the British—a theme revisited in Sara Jeannette Duncan’s *The Burnt Offering* (1909) and heavily emphasized in the Raj Revival novels. The inevitably tragic protagonists of interracial unions do represent the most humanistic portrayals of Indians in the Raj novel genre, but whatever sympathy they are accorded finally serves to elevate the Anglo-Indians with whom these Indian characters interact and upon whom the Raj narratives focus.

Outside the arena of interracial romance, Croker and Perrin’s novels focus on Anglo-Indian characters or British persons from “Home”; often, long sections of their books take place in England. When these authors include Indians, they rely on stereotypes of ‘good’ servants and loyal soldiers in juxtaposition to ‘bad’ Indians who resist British authority. In Croker’s *Mr. Jervis*, for example, Sikh warrior Osman shows his worth by unquestioning allegiance to British

rule. Major Jervis, Osman's master, describes Osman in a way that encapsulates the tropes of the heroic Indian soldier type in the Raj novel genre:

“[H]e was more to me than a brother . . . He gave up home, country, people, and followed my fortunes, and died in my arms last week . . . We had braved heat and snow, fire and water, together, and in the long evenings here, whilst I smoked my pipe, he would talk to me by the hour of the old regiment; such talk is better than any book . . . He stayed with me till death took him.” (280)

Osman's role is to abnegate himself in service of Britain. In old age, he offers entertainment (“better than any book”); during his days of martial service he forsakes personal connections (“home, country, people”) to live out an ideal of service to the Raj. Perrin's *The Anglo-Indians* contains a similar exemplar of the servant type, Gunga.²⁷¹ Perrin writes that Gunga “was of the order of Indian servant now almost extinct — loyal, devoted, jealously tenacious of the honour of his master's house and name, never doubting but that his own rights, traditions, customs would also be considered, understood, and respected” (13). The last line nods toward reciprocal exchange between British and Indian, but such mutual consideration, understanding, and respect is earned, as with Osman, by Gunga's self-abnegation. Similarly loyal servants and soldiers recur throughout Diver's Desmond trilogy; while Diver devotes more time to characterizing these figures than Perrin or Croker, these efforts are channeled back to her Anglo-Indian ideals, as the nuanced Indians she depicts fiercely venerate the heroic Desmonds.

The difference between idealized Indians, seen here, and the ideals of British character produced in the Raj novel genre through Anglo-Indian duty to the Raj, is striking. Anglo-Indian duty is portrayed as individual self-determination in service of a national or communal ideal. The Indian bearers and soldiers of the Raj novel genre also serve the British metanarrative of imperial identity, but that identity is embodied in the persons of Anglo-Indians—persons who require the

²⁷¹ Gunga's name presumably refers to Rudyard Kipling's 1892 poem, “Gunga Din,” which also celebrates the heroic Indian servant. Kipling's Gunga Din is a water-bearer who gives his life for the soldier he serves.

total subjugation of the colonized subject. If the Raj novel genre imagines British reading audiences at “Home” following its Anglo-Indian model, Indians are meant to erase themselves as individual actors and by that abnegation uplift the British.²⁷² The bulk of the novels in the Raj novel genre stifle the autonomy of Indian characters as a mode of containing Indian insurgency. In Steel’s *The Hosts of the Lord* (1900), *risaldar* (Native officer) Roshan Khan is drawn astray by what Steel portrays as his overly keen desire to acquire British habits. Roshan equals the British with whom he comports: “A first-class polo player, a fair cricketer, able to handle cue and racket, and without equal at the foils, he had for years met Englishmen on equal terms in sporting matters” (39). Rather than benefiting him, this exchange leads the Anglicized Roshan to a deadly middle ground. Disgusted by Indian life but unable to mix with the British, he falls in love with mixed-race heiress Laila, whose lover is the British Capt. Dering.²⁷³ When Roshan discovers Laila and Dering’s affair, he goes mad and kills Laila. Discussing Roshan, the novel’s hero, Lance Carlyon, and Dering note: “‘Poor devil . . . I’m always a bit sorry for Roshan. He would be a fine fellow — if — if he wasn’t so — so civilized.’ ‘Civilized . . . You haven’t seen him fight. I have. Talk of devils; he has got one in him’” (216). While Lance diagnoses Roshan’s dilemma as an excess of civility (pretended Britishness), Dering sees the trouble arising from primal impulses, an animalistic, even demonic, undercurrent that cannot be dissociated from Roshan’s “Indianness”. By casting civility and barbarity as equal handicaps, Steel hamstringing the

²⁷² Croker’s contrast of Anglo-Indian duty (agented) versus Indian obedience (abject) is a subplot in *Mr. Jervis*. Major Jervis uses Osman’s story to force his son Mark to give up life in the outside world and dwell with the Major in the Indian wilderness. He tells Mark, “‘Osman’s burthen has fallen on you; and will my own son do less for me than an alien in blood, a Mahommedan in faith, a poor, unenlightened, faithful *sowar*?’” (286) Mark thinks: “it was his turn now; and would he be behind Osman, the Mahommedan, who had done from love what he should do from duty?” (287). The exchange reduces Osman’s service to a form of slavish obedience and reiterates “Mahommedan” as a lesser category which prohibits Osman making the active choices demonstrated by Mark.

²⁷³ Steel excuses this contact by making Dering himself of mixed ancestry, though his heritage is not pronounced. The “touch of the tar-brush” (108) renders him—following the Orientalist paradigm that predetermines Steel’s characterization of Indians—an avid sensualist and lover of fine things, and perhaps hastens Dering’s tragic death as a means of foreclosing ambiguity. However, Dering is strongly masculine and dies in heroic discharge of his duty as a British officer, a staging which upsets the typical stereotyped portrayal of Eurasians in the Raj novels.

ostensibly mobile servant/soldier type, making obedience the only recourse for Indian success within the hierarchies of the Raj.

The Raj is also counterpoised in the works of Croker, Steel, Perrin, and Diver to the menace of Indians as a mass (a bulk, a country). India's multitudes, in the Raj novel genre, are a threat so insidious even the most loyal servant or fiercest Rajput cannot counterbalance it. *Mr. Jervis* sees Croker's hero, Mark Jervis, trapped with his father in the hellish Indian wilds. There, Indian retainer Fuzzil ("a gambling, drunken, insolent ruffian") assumes control of the Jervis' perfect English dwelling and allows it to descend into squalor (323). The building is full of vermin and Fuzzil's Indian relatives—whom Croker makes equivalent, writing, "Some old women in the compound . . . had to be carried out bodily, shrieking vociferously, with their beds and cooking things . . . the collection of years of thieving—like so many magpies' nests" (324). Indians are an infestation, pests to be removed from British spaces.

Perrin's *Idolatry* (1909) sets similar horrors in a gaudy Indian court, where missionary Oliver Wray befriends Ramanund, the Rajah's son. Ramanund is a likely Christian convert; his room "differed subtly from that of his father, for it was pervaded by an atmosphere of cleanliness and order. A highly coloured oleograph of the late Queen-Empress hung on the wall in somewhat ludicrous contrast with a scarlet painting, or rather poster, on flimsy paper, of Lachmi [sic]" (190). This description sets Ramanund as teachable, and reiterates the tropes of ideal Britishness catalogued in the Raj novel genre ("order"; the strength of British items versus "flimsy" Indian ones; respect for the Queen). Perrin attributes a desire for these traits to Ramanund: the young man has a "craving for Western progress, for modern education" and is "restive[e] beneath the tyranny of Caste, and certain ancient customs that revolted his common sense" (181, 182). Again, the Raj novel genre broadly approves of Indians whose desire confirms the "civilizing"

tenets of Britain's imperial mission. Ramanund's rejection of "ancient customs" as antithetical to common sense is set by Perrin as a first step to redemption—and the word has a double meaning, for Wray is a missionary trying to spiritually and practically "save" Ramanund from India.

In her novel, Perrin ignores the paradox of Ramanund's desire: to be "civilized," when being civilized would make being colonized unnecessary. The yearning for Britishness, like the history of colonial rule in India, is instead naturalized. Like Steel's Chris Devenant and Roshan Khan, desire for Anglicization is admirable but tragic in its impossibility. That the Anglo-Indians strive to provide what the Indians want is further proof of the group's willingness to take on impossible duties in a good spirit. Wray frames his efforts with an attitude of *noblesse oblige* that recalls the model authority celebrated in the Raj novel genre: "it is the hope of every Englishman of the right sort in India that having, as a nation, established peace and order out here, a higher standard of morality may develop generally in the native mind" (*Idolatry* 120). Perrin's emphasis on "the right sort" evidences the continual formation of hierarchies in the Raj novel genre, between better and lesser Anglo-Indians, and between Anglo-Indians and their colonial subjects. In the end, Wray—whose own ambivalence I discuss in Chapter III—cannot stop Ramanund from taking a second wife; he is foiled by the evil, shadowy Indians massed in the court. This subplot resonates with the political sensibilities of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj administrators noted in Chapter I; under the Raj, Indians were seen as unteachable and always ready to return to the primal impulses revealed by the Mutiny.²⁷⁴

The bulk of the Raj novelists, then, continually deploy Indians as instruments by which the Anglo-Indian character upon which these writers fixate can be refined and celebrated. India

²⁷⁴ Perrin recalls this trend in her depiction of Ramanund's father, whose seeming ineptitude masks a history of Mutiny violence: "Rampal Singh was a reviler of all things Western with the exception of such objects as mechanical toys, musical boxes, chandeliers, mirrors, and carriages, the possession of which filled him with a childish pride. At the time of the Mutiny the family had been covertly disloyal" (183-84). Here Perrin confirms the idea, demonstrated by "covert" Mutiny disloyalty such as Rampal Singh's, of Indians as inherently irredeemable.

is a setting, not a fully realized location. Its history is relevant only for the ways in which it confirms the inevitability of British rule; its inhabitants are useful only for their willingness to serve the imperial project. The enactment of white male and female British personhood reigns, literally, with the dynamic of power and rule acknowledged in the portrayal of happy servants and loyal soldiers. Moments of Indian insurgency are rejected by “good” Indians, as when Maud Diver bespeaks resistance to the independence movement in *Far to Seek* through the idealized Rajput Sir Lakshman Singh. Sir Lakshman sadly tells Roy, “I am known to believe that loyal allegiance to British Government gives India the best chance for peaceful progress she is likely to have for many generations. And from everyone comes the same cry, begging to be saved from this crazy nightmare of Home Rule” (192). Benita Parry, citing Diver’s tendency to “preach and proclaim” Raj glory to her readers, notes that Diver often “pour[s] such praise from the lips of her good Indian characters.”²⁷⁵ Here and elsewhere, Indians are tools to the Raj novel writers, just as India itself is a glamorous backdrop. Indians’ role in the bulk of the genre’s productions is instrumental, with the deployment of Indian bodies coming at strategic instances when they can bespeak or enact the necessity of British rule. Acceptable Indians share Anglo-Indian qualities in a lesser form; they acquire an appropriate measure of Anglicization without desiring more. Anglo-Indian quality is thus rendered so admirable even the colonized subject craves it, but simultaneously, that quality is kept firmly within the spaces and bodies of white British men and women. In the Raj novel genre, it is right that Indians should ‘love’ British persons—but, again, not too much. Interracial romance crosses this line, and thus is consistently and firmly rejected.

Having established a general norm for portrayals of Indians in the genre, it is useful to consider how more complex works amongst the Raj novels alter these sedimented attitudes—and

²⁷⁵ Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 93.

to question why the complexity of genre father Rudyard Kipling's portrayals of Indians did not have more impact on the novelists who eagerly take up his ideals of Anglo-Indian character.

Reading Indian-ness in Rudyard Kipling, E.M. Forster, Sara Jeannette Duncan

The most complex portrayals of Indian characters in the nineteenth and early twentieth-century texts of the British Raj are found in the novels and short stories of Rudyard Kipling, in *A Passage to India* (1924) by E.M. Forster, and in Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Burnt Offering* (1909). Each of these texts can be usefully read through postcolonial theories of textual resistance, particularly Homi Bhabha's conceptualization of the hybrid colonial subject. It is necessary, however, to bear in mind the efficacy of Duncan's and Kipling's texts in promoting the imperial project. Despite the ambiguity they contain, these novels helped assert Anglo-Indian authority, born from "true" knowledge of Indians and India, which the Raj novel genre uses to justify Raj rule. In her preface to the reissue of *Delusions and Discoveries* (1998), Benita Parry questions postcolonial theory's drive to view uncertainty in imperial texts as proof of imperialism's inefficacy as an institution. To Parry, such moves undermine the reality of 250 years of British colonial control, and allow fiction to "repress historical conditions by fabricating an alternative scenario" (10). This critique echoes that made by Gayatri Spivak in her famous essay, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Spivak writes of a 1928 imperial text that "[n]owhere in [t]his book, written by someone who avowedly 'loves India', is there any question of the 'beneficial ruthlessness' of the British in India as motivated by territorial expansion or management of industrial capital" (101). It is dangerous, Parry adds, to view uncertainty in colonial discourse as evincing a wider failing in the material conditions that upheld colonial rule. In reading Kipling, Forster, and Duncan, Parry's and Spivak's caution that colonial texts assist colonialism's discursive containment of the Indian subject, while effacing colonial rule's mercantile impulses,

must be held in mind. The powerful ambivalence the complex Raj novels display is not, finally, a tool for undoing Raj rule.

Kipling's portrayal of India and Indians is much studied by literary critics. Edward Said writes of *Kim* (1901) that the novel "is a work of great aesthetic merit; it cannot be dismissed simply as the racist imagining of one fairly disturbed and ultra-reactionary imperialist."²⁷⁶ Yet, as noted in Chapter II, the "racist imaginings" of Kipling's fiction did lead to his practical dismissal from the literary canon between the 1930s and the 1990s. Calling Kipling a "jingo imperialist," George Orwell derided his failure to "grasp the economic forces underlying imperial expansion . . . Kipling does not seem to realize, any more than the average soldier or colonial administrator, that an empire is primarily a money-making concern."²⁷⁷ Forty-two years later, Parry echoes Orwell, reminding readers that the disavowal of imperialism's practical concerns in Kipling had real negative results for India:

When Kipling is recruited to validate prominent tenets of postcolonial literary theory, what is necessarily banished is the coarse figure who virtually invented the Anglo-Indian rhetoric of fortitude and self-sacrifice, and reiterated its rancor against India's mimic men, the poet of empire's awesome burden and the author . . . [who] commended authoritarianism in matters both domestic and imperial.²⁷⁸

Parry's observation that Kipling, as "poet of empire's awesome burden," "virtually invented the Anglo-Indian rhetoric of fortitude and self-sacrifice," accords with my argument in Chapter II about his formative role in the Raj novel genre.²⁷⁹ Simultaneously, her critique exposes the basic

²⁷⁶ Edward Said, "Introduction," in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*, ed. Edward Said (New York: Penguin, 1989). 30. Said discusses Kipling as "appreciated but never fully canonized" in *Culture and Imperialism* (134).

²⁷⁷ George Orwell, "Rudyard Kipling," 1946, in *Kipling's Mind and Art*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1964). 70, 72.

²⁷⁸ Benita Parry, "Preface," in *Delusions and Discoveries*, 2nd ed. (London: Verso, 1998). 17.

²⁷⁹ Orwell charges Kipling similarly, and adds that "[a]ll his confidence, his bouncing vulgar vitality, sprang out of limitations which no Fascist or near-Fascist shares" (72). Orwell's locating of Kipling and his ideological horizon of expectations in the context of World War II anticipates Gilroy's theory of postcolonial melancholia and Britain's nostalgic obsession with World War II. Kipling recalls a world in which the British Empire did not fear threats from Fascism; World War II recalls a moment in which Britain's national character defeated those threats. The recursive impulse to better days is the same—a nostalgic longing for the lost confidence and power which enabled British

disconnect in Kipling's portrayal of race and British/Indian relations in his fiction. Kipling does depict imperialism as a difficult, morally fraught enterprise, and the slippage by which Indian characters in his works resist racial stereotypes allows readings in line with the "tenets of postcolonial theory" to which Parry refers. Yet, Kipling's texts are finally produced in service of the Raj novel's generic exigence: the promotion of ideal British character formed via the rigors of Anglo-Indian duty, so as to resolve Anglo-Indians into Britain's metanarrative of imperial identity. Reflecting these tensions, *Plain Tales from the Hills* (1888), the short story collection that brought Kipling to fame, is notably discordant in its racial views. It is further distinct from the more nuanced portrayals of Indians and fraternal relations between Indian and British persons Kipling crafts thirteen years later in *Kim*.

In *Plain Tales from the Hills*, Kipling's greatest scorn is reserved for Eurasians, whom he treats with mockery and disdain. A Eurasian governess, Miss Vezzis, is "black as a boot, and, to our standard of taste, hideously ugly" ("His Chance in Life" 79). Divisions between Anglo-Indian and Eurasian are enforced along lines of taste, with "our standard," implicitly superior, conscripting the reader to its dictates through usage of the pronoun "our". "Kidnapped" suggests that taking a British man who wants to wed a Eurasian woman hostage is a viable strategy for quelling such aberrant impulses. Concurrently, interracial romance is treated in Kipling's short stories as perhaps beautiful but necessarily tragic. In "Lispeth," an Indian woman falls in love with a British soldier. His flippant promise to marry her ruins Lispeth's life, undoes the good work wrought in her by missionaries, and turns her against the British as a race; they are "all liars" (7). Kipling thus implies that miscegenation's negative effects go beyond the personal to the political, pedagogical realms. Such affairs undermine the imperial edifice, undoing the work

victories. I address these similarities in Chapter V, when analyzing the Raj Revival's—and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's—particular reliance on Kipling.

of civilizing institutions such as the missionary project. “Beyond the Pale” adds an air of violent menace: Indian widow Basesa has an affair with a white man, Christopher Trejago; when they are discovered, Basesa’s hands are cut off and Trejago is stabbed. Brutal reprisal against racial boundary crossings sets the transgressive act, as the titular phrase would have it, “beyond the pale” for British and Indian alike. Kipling lends Basesa and Trejago’s affair an air of tragedy, but here again he portrays Indian and British worlds as implacably divided. This theme, echoed throughout the Raj novel genre, is thus consistent with imagery in *Plain Tales from the Hills*.

Kipling also portrays Indian spaces in these short stories as sites of intense moral decay, imagining a rogue’s gallery of iniquitous characters dwelling “In the House of Suddhoo,” and a squalid opium den in “The Gate of a Hundred Sorrows”. The latter story, Kipling stipulates, is told to the narrator by a “half-caste” friend (269), and this authorial gesture carefully dissociates the dissipation on display from Britishness. The Indian world is unknowable, even unspeakable. The narrator cannot describe it in English, and Kipling uses pronouns (we, our) to separate Britain and India linguistically as well as physically: “We used to call the gully, ‘The Gully of the Black Smoke,’ but its native name is altogether different of course” (269). The general message of *Plain Tales from the Hills* is best summarized in the much-cited introduction to “Beyond the Pale”: “A man should, whatever happens, keep to his own caste, race and breed. Let the White go to the White and the Black to the Black. Then, whatever trouble falls is in the ordinary course of things — neither sudden, alien nor unexpected” (173). Racial separation is naturalized in this quotation and in the text largely as the “ordinary course of things”; moments of border crossing, in contrast, are “alien”. Chapters II and III argue that, as Kipling is the forerunner of the Raj novel genre, his formulation of the traits that elevate Anglo-Indian

character recurs in plots and specific images throughout the Raj novel genre. His early work suggests his portrayal of interracial romance enjoyed similar influence.

Against this background, however, the depiction of Indians in *Kim* is markedly complex but shows less influence on subsequent Raj novel genre texts, perhaps due to the rapidly altering political circumstances—World War I, Indian independence agitation—shaping later Raj novel production. Though Kipling definitively asserts his Britishness from the novel's first page, *Kim*'s hero, Kimball O'Hara, grows up thinking he is Indian. His early role models include the Pathan horse trader Mahbub Ali and a wise Buddhist lama. Care is taken to police the border between Kim's Indian and British worlds, but Kim's affection for India makes the maintenance of strict racial separation difficult. Kim must be continually reminded of his Britishness, as when he asks Mahbub Ali if a character is “‘one of us?’ ‘What talk is this of *us*, Sahib?’ Mahbub Ali returned, in the tone he used towards Europeans. ‘I am a Pathan; thou art a Sahib and the son of a Sahib’” (144). Edward Said's reading of *Kim* calls attention to the fact of continual delineation between “Sahib” and “Indian” in Kipling's novel, linking these insistent divisions to scientific, organizational impulses common in the late Victorian period (*Culture and Imperialism* 154-55). I would argue further that the necessity of such reminders introduces to the novel an ongoing concern about the tenability of set racial distinctions. Kim's troubling of his identity (British or Indian?) shows the work that must be done by Anglo-Indian discourse to maintain hierarchies of race in the imperial space. Kipling does not reject racial divides, but as noted in Chapter II, by showing them to be manufactured he engages with the paradox of imperial rule which many Raj authors elide. The Raj novel genre's vision of Anglo-Indian selfhood relies on ideals which, postcolonial critics note, are betrayed by the practical operation of Anglo-Indian rule. This is the paradox Gauri Viswanathan observes in the British educational agenda set forth by men such as

Thomas Macaulay, who argued in 1835 that Britain should deploy English literary instruction to “form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals.”²⁸⁰ Viswanathan argues that teaching Indians about British virtues introduced the possibility of questioning that virtue. The “interpreter class” became leaders in the Independence movement, speaking back to the Raj with its own elevating diction. This is the unsettling Kim himself performs, exposing the seams of the imperial project even as Kipling’s novel more generally celebrates its functioning.

Later in the novel, Kim is recruited by the British as a spy. He works with Bengali Babu Hurree Chunder Mookerjee, whose aptitude and enthusiasm for Western knowledge and behaviors evokes postcolonial theories of mimicry as a site of resistance. Homi Bhabha’s “Of Mimicry and Man” describes the “*menace* of mimicry . . . its *double* vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority” (88). The colonial subject, “looking” back at the colonial authority whose discourse and administrative systems constitute that subject as “not quite / not white” (92), shows in its partiality the failure of the European enlightenment ideals that ostensibly justified colonialism’s civilizing impulses. Bhabha cites Kipling in describing the “line of descent of the mimic man . . . [who] is the effect of a flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicized is *emphatically* not to be English” (87). While this is an incisive description of Anglicization in the broader Raj novel genre, also seen in characters such as Roshan Khan in Flora Annie Steel’s *The Hosts of the Lord*, Kipling’s more complex portrayal of Anglicization and colonial mimesis in *Kim* accords with Bhabha’s formulation of hybridity in “Signs Taken for Wonders,” which views mimicry as indicative of the ruptures in colonial discourse through which insurgent, disavowed identities make themselves known.

²⁸⁰ Thomas Macaulay, “Minute by the Hon’ble T. B. Macaulay, dated the 2nd February 1835,” 2 Feb. 1835. Columbia University, Web. 29 Nov. 2011.

In this essay Bhabha writes, “Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects” (112). The hybrid repeats stereotypes placed upon it by colonial identity schematics; in that repetition, these stereotypes are destabilized and revealed to be “effects” rather than realities. The Indian characters in *Kim*, such as Hurree and Mahbub Ali, are spies; their work requires constant shifts between consciously-chosen identities and knowing repetition (performance, assumption) of different racial traits assigned by imperial rule. Self-aware deployment of “identity effects” highlights the constructed nature of all identity in colonial discourse. Bhabha’s “Of Mimicry and Man” sets mimicry as an enterprise promoted by the colonizer, at which the colonial subject fails. In that failure, Bhabha locates resistance. Kipling’s text, like “Signs Taken for Wonders,” suggests that the success of mimicry, even mimicry encouraged by the British establishment, is yet more resistant. “The hybrid object,” Bhabha writes, can “so disturb the systematic (and systemic) construction of discriminatory knowledges that the cultural, once recognized as the medium of authority, becomes virtually unrecognizable” (115). When Said argues that Hurree’s actions, including his performances of various identities, “guarantee[s] the success of Kim’s exploits,”²⁸¹ he bespeaks a power relation in which Indian “authority” over self facilitates, even allows, the Great Game of British rule. The “discriminatory knowledges” which the Great Game converts into disciplining authority tools become unrecognizable, disproved by the activity of the hybrid colonial subject, who embodies colonial rule and the denial of that rule in a strategic, subversive doubling.

Undeniably, there is an element of satire in Kipling’s portrayal. The Babu speaks without pause for “an hour and a half,” has a penchant for malapropism, “giggle[s],” and “smile[s] ingratiatingly” (*Kim* 159, 179, 178). But while Kipling makes the Babu humorous—a tactic, Said

²⁸¹ Edward Said, “Introduction,” in Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim*, ed. Edward Said (New York: Penguin, 1989). 17.

notes, that is not applied to the lama²⁸²—he does not make him ridiculous. While neither option is positive, the distinction lends ambivalence to Kipling’s novel by endowing the Babu with a degree of authority. That is, Hurree embodies Orientalist stereotypes; for example, that Bengalis are superstitious (177) and fearful (216-18); he claims he is ““unfortunately Asiatic, which is serious detriment in some respects. And *all*—so I am Bengali—a fearful man”” (217). Yet Kipling’s portrayal of Hurree’s actions in *Kim* allows the interpretation of such verbal self-stereotyping as mocking, almost arch. Hurree articulates the negative traits assigned to Bengalis by British discourses (such as the Raj novel genre), yet acts on Britain’s behalf in a way that implicitly shows the fallibility of such designations. His identity claims thus emerge as aspects of performance—a fact to which Kipling draws the reader’s attention. Watching Hurree speak to the lama, Kim thinks that the “Hurree Babu of his knowledge—oily, effusive, nervous—was gone; gone, too, was the brazen drug-vendor of overnight. There remained—polished, polite, attentive—a sober, learned son of experience and adversity” (220). Kipling augments Kim’s observation of the Babu’s fluid identity assumption with a plotline in which Hurree foils a team of Russian spies by performing the abased behavior which the Russians assume characterizes the British colonial subject. Pretending drunkenness, Hurree

. . . became thickly treasonous, and spoke in terms of sweeping indecency of a Government which had forced upon him a white man’s education and neglected to supply him with a white man’s salary. He babbled tales of oppression and wrong till the tears ran down his cheeks for the miseries of his land. Then he staggered off, singing love-songs of Lower Bengal . . . Never was so unfortunate a product of English rule in India more unhappily thrust upon aliens. (230)

²⁸² Said writes of Hurree: “The native anthropologist, clearly a bright man whose reiterated ambitions to belong to the Royal Society are not unfounded, is almost always funny, or gauche, or somehow caricatural, not because he is incompetent or inept—on the contrary—but because he is not white; that is, he can never be a Creighton” (153). This reiteration of ideal Britishness, in the form of Creighton, supports my argument in Chapter II that, while Kipling’s text entertains ambiguity about Indians, it is finally centered on the Anglo-Indian ideal.

Kipling's gesture here is layered. By showing the Babu's awareness of how the colonial subject is felt to think and behave, he admits insurgency to his text. Descriptions of British malfeasance implicitly allow the argument that British imperialism is misguided. Yet, Kipling foils such insurgency by making it a ruse: the Babu performs parody in this speech. Or does he? The question goes unanswered as the focus of Kipling's text turns back to Kim.

In the ambiguity of this plot, Kipling suggests a reflexive awareness of stereotypes about Indians. Hurree engages in identity performances to serve a larger goal: the perpetuation of British rule over India. His complicity with imperialism thus bears out my claim, following Orwell and Parry, that Kipling's fictions finally promote British rule by virtue of Anglo-Indian ideality. But to return to Bhabha's description of discursive resistance, the re-situation of racist stereotypes in *Kim* hybridizes those images, creating a new form of expression that "reimplicates [colonial power's] identifications in strategies of subversion."²⁸³ Through Hurree, negative images of Indians offer a tool for resisting foreign (albeit Russian) incursions into India. Kipling thus implies the viability—even the rightness—of resistance to foreign rule in specific circumstances; perhaps unintentionally, he thereby allows for the possibility of expanding such resistance outward to the larger situation of British rule over India. This scenario recalls Bhabha's description of an "area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double."²⁸⁴ Hurree is most authoritative when he claims displacement from mechanisms of British control; he parodies an image of the disciplined subject even as he actively disciplines the Russians.

This slippage between abnegation and action occurs at multiple instances in Kipling's text. When Kim fears he and Hurree will be overheard speaking English, Hurree's reply reflects

²⁸³ Homi Bhabha, "Signs Taken For Wonders," in *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). 112.

²⁸⁴ Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man," *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994). 86.

an awareness of misapprehensions about the cultural identity of educated Indians, and an ability to manipulate those assumptions in performance: ““That is all raight. I am only Babu showing off my English to you. All we Babus talk English to show off”” (179). Or again, Kipling has Hurree describe the Russians in phrasing that replicates the colonial discourse directed, in the Raj novel genre broadly, at Indians: ““Consider the moral effect upon these ignorant peoples! No treaties—no papers—no written documents at all—and *me* to interpret for them. How I shall laugh with the Colonel!”” (242). This reference to the Russians’ lack of textual authority resonates with Benedict Anderson’s argument in *Imagined Communities* (1983) that colonialism assesses the success of a nation by its possession of written language.²⁸⁵ Hurree’s mockery of the Russians for their failure in this area again shows Kipling temporarily figuring him as an authority, here within the realm of competing nationalisms.

But despite Hurree’s ability to unsettle the discursive assumptions of colonial power, readings which figure him as a manifestation of insurgent authority are limited by the overall ambiguity of *Kim*, and by Kipling’s championing of the Raj and Anglo-Indians. “Kipling,” Said writes, “assumes a basically uncontested empire.”²⁸⁶ In Kipling’s early stories, Britain and India are discrete unities that cannot be reconciled. *Kim*, in contrast, makes the Indian sphere cohesive, and endows Indian agents with potentially subversive power. However, the novel does not suggest that India shares the authoritative status granted to the Raj and its “Great Game” of rule. That game, and Col. Creighton, its idealized Anglo-Indian overseer, is the authority behind Hurree’s actions. This hierarchical arrangement—which keeps the Anglo-Indian ascendant and selects a white man, Kim, who plays at being Indian but chooses to be British, as protagonist—forecloses the more ambiguous possibilities of Kipling’s text. As with the Raj novelists who

²⁸⁵ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 3rd ed. (London: Verso, 2006). Anderson discusses this idea repeatedly, particularly in the “Old Languages, New Models” chapter.

²⁸⁶ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1994). 134.

follow him, Kipling's primary contribution to the genre of Anglo-Indian writing is to venerate the Anglo-Indian ideals that control even the most complex Indian actors. And essentially, this is how *Kim* was read upon release in 1901. In an emblematic review, *Atlantic Magazine* wrote that Kipling's novel "contains the human soul, also, of that Orient which we have all now become bound to study,—a cunning, piercing, elusive soul, patient and proud; stayed in supernatural quiet on the sanctions of a secular faith."²⁸⁷ The diction of this praise is unintentionally revealing; Kipling is credited with "contain[ing]" the Orient, which "we," the *Atlantic's* implicit white reading audience, are "bound to study". Each of the varied strands of Raj novel discourse that elevate the Anglo-Indian actor (accurate knowledge gained by practical experience; the power of the West to rule; an eager British audience consuming Raj fictions) are rehearsed, and Kipling is again celebrated as the source of insight and authority into and over India.

In *A Passage to India*, E.M. Forster also casts Indians as complex beings with an interior life and a vibrant community that functions smoothly apart from the British. Further, Forster makes Indians sources of narrative authority and objects of sympathy. The latter gesture, which begins with Dr. Aziz's confession of injustice to Mrs. Moore (17-22), finds fruition after Adela Quested falsely accuses Aziz of sexual assault. However, Forster develops this sympathy most in the friendship of Aziz and Cyril Fielding. Their multifaceted, touching relationship is contrasted to displays of British racism, which Forster denigrates throughout the novel. Willful British misunderstandings of Indian civility are particularly mocked. A recurrent example involves Aziz's collar-stud. Dressed for tea with Adela, Fielding, the Indian Professor Godbole, and Mrs. Moore, mother of Adela's potential fiancé, Ronnie, Aziz gives Fielding his back collar-stud. Ronnie, arriving late, notices Aziz's collar has ridden up and sets this *faux pas* as a metonym for Indian failings: "Aziz was exquisitely dressed, from tie-pin to spats, but he had forgotten his

²⁸⁷ "Kim, by Rudyard Kipling: A Review," *Atlantic Magazine*, December 1901. Web. 17 July 2012.

back collar-stud, and there you have the Indian all over: inattention to detail, the fundamental slackness that reveals the race” (87). Forster’s text calls the reader to critique Ronnie’s flawed judgment, which is exacerbated by Ronnie’s unrepentant tardiness. Later, Ronnie uses similarly flawed logic to denigrate the local Nawab, who has generously given Ronnie and Adela a lift. Dubbing him a “show Indian,” Ronnie adds, “[i]ncredible, aren’t they, even the best of them? They’re all—they all forget their back collar studs sooner or later” (103). The basic miscomprehension underlying these interactions epitomizes an Anglo-Indian disregard for Indian subjectivity which Forster portrays as endemic and debilitating. Such misunderstanding recurs in Adela’s false rape accusation, which also follows an act of generosity, as Aziz plans a picnic for Adela and Mrs. Moore. The subtext is that Britain’s failure to see Indians as equal, human actors cripples Anglo-Indian rule. However, the gestures made by Aziz are still subservient ones; Aziz is willing to appear unkempt to please Fielding, and the hierarchy of Anglo-Indian over Indian importance is thus unsettled but ultimately maintained.

Further, the fact that British persons such as Ronnie view Aziz’s overtures of friendship as insidious acts requiring the disciplining intervention of imperial authority recalls the dilemma of Bhabha’s mimic man. Aziz’s desire for Anglicization alienates and displaces him from British persons discomfited by his lack of exactitude (what Ronnie incorrectly dubs “inattention to detail”). In actuality, it is Aziz’s agonizing attention to detail, his over-planning of the lavish picnic and too-eager relinquishing of his collar stud, which exposes the gap in his attempts at “civility” and the lack of same in the British who receive it. The ignoring of Aziz’s presence drives home recognition of that presence for the reader. In much of *A Passage to India* Aziz is a rounded character, a man experiencing frustration and insulted pride. Yet, this portrayal is also undercut by descriptions which reiterate stereotypes of Indians common to the Raj novel genre,

and forego the ambivalence registered in reader awareness of Aziz's subjectivity. For example, Forster frequently uses feminizing adjectives such as "little" and "dainty" (15) to describe Aziz; he writes that Aziz "possessed a soul that could suffer but not stifle, and led a steady life beneath his mutability" (63), but Aziz's behavior belies this claim. Unlike Kipling's Babu, the paradox of description versus action, seen in Bhabha's mimic man, is not consciously performed in Forster. Aziz "grapple[s] beneath . . . shifting tides of emotion" that send his thoughts ricocheting. He is "sensitive rather than responsive. In every remark he found a meaning, but not always the true meaning, and his life though vivid was largely a dream" (70). With Aziz's Indian friends, there is flamboyant drama and elaborate social machination; Forster plays these scenes for comedy, and adds comments such as "the comparatively simple mind of the Mohammedan was encountering Ancient Night" (80-81), which seem ironic but are received seriously in the text.²⁸⁸ Even the end of *A Passage to India* centers on a misapprehension by Aziz: sure Fielding has married Adela after the trial, Aziz retreats to the Himalayas to produce "[i]llogical poems—like their writer" (329) about Oriental womanhood, a topic that again feminizes and others Aziz.

Forster's portrayal of interracial romance also recalls Raj novel genre stereotypes. In particular, Adela's rape accusation against Aziz reifies the gender and race hierarchies so strenuously policed by nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj novelists. Nancy Paxton's reading of the rape plot brilliantly articulates the reductiveness of Forster's gender portrayal; by refusing to say what happened to Adela in the Marabar Caves, Paxton argues, Forster makes "Englishwomen's sexual experiences unspeakable. One of the effects of this choice is that he reassigns rape and its victims to the zone of abjection" (240). That zone is one shared, Paxton argues in *Writing Under the Raj*, by the racialized colonial subject. In this context, what attitudes does *A Passage to India* reflect about romance between Indian and British persons? Forster

²⁸⁸ Edward Said's reading of *A Passage to India* in *Culture and Imperialism* concurs on this point (202).

frames the prospect as unappealing. Aziz is not attracted to Adela, considering her “stupid” and physically unattractive: “Beauty would have troubled him . . . but Mrs. Moore was so old and Miss Quested so plain that he was spared this anxiety. Adela’s angular body and the freckles on her face were terrible defects in his eyes, and he wondered how God could have been so unkind to any female form” (79, 71). Adela sees Aziz as a stand-in for India, a symbolic collapse Forster ascribes to her “ignorance” (76). While she considers him, diminutively, a “handsome little Oriental,” she does “not admire him with any personal warmth, for there was nothing of the vagrant in her blood” (169). Forster’s use of the term “vagrant,” which echoes descriptions of interracial romance by Raj authors such as Alice Perrin and B.M. Croker, is not treated with irony or sarcasm. Rather, in dismissing the possibility of sensual appeal between Adela and Aziz, Forster follows the Raj novel genre trend of negatively portraying interracial romance. Following my claim in Chapter III that Forster’s main focus in *A Passage to India* is on upsetting Anglo-Indian valorizations of their idealized community, the Adela/Aziz pairing seems to stem from an understanding of what will most outrage Anglo-Indian social norms. In contrast, Fielding and Aziz’s friendship, and Aziz’s high-spiritual connection with Mrs. Moore, are acceptable forms of interracial contact.

In the end, *A Passage to India*’s treatment of interracial romance accords with the statements of the fussy Anglo-Indian Collector, who tells Fielding, “I have never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially. Intercourse, yes. Courtesy, by all means. Intimacy—never, never” (182). It is a point the novel’s ending confirms, as the Indian landscape drives Fielding and Aziz’s horses apart. These larger statements on interracial contact in *A Passage to India*, and the reductive portraits of Indian characters as flighty and comical, uphold Raj novel genre expectations about race. The basic

message of Forster's novel is that imperial rule will fail, but this failure is due to Anglo-India's inability to fulfill its own ideals, not because Indian existence outside British racial designations upsets the necessity of outside authority. Focus remains, even here, on the Anglo-Indian actor.

Published fifteen years before *A Passage to India*, Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Burnt Offering* is a prescient critique of imperialism that—at certain points—goes beyond that seen in Kipling and Forster. Villainous Indians, who recall stereotypes common to the Raj novel genre, do appear in Duncan's text. British female protagonist Joan Mills is paired romantically with sly Bengali clerk Bepin Behari Dey, a disciple of deceitful ascetic Ganendra Thakore. In Ganendra's plots against the British, and in Bepin's assassination attempt, which kills idealized Anglo-Indian hero John Game, Duncan melds Raj novel fears of brutal Indian violence with the spectre of cultish Indian spirituality. But Bepin and Ganendra's villainy is no more perfidious than Joan or her father Vulcan's, and it is condemned by Indian characters with fervor equal to that expressed by the British, a gesture that displaces the British as exclusive moral authorities. In addition, Duncan's "good" Indian characters (Anglicized Brahmin judge Kristodas Mukerji; his widowed daughter, the Rani Janaki; their spiritual advisor, Swami Yadava) break new ground among Raj novel depictions of Indian wisdom and humanity. However, while *The Burnt Offering* unsettles assumed hierarchies of power between British and Indian, it finally resorts to racist stereotypes, particularly of Janaki, to quell its own ambivalence—a move that again affirms my claims about the Raj novel genre's consuming focus on Anglo-Indian ideality and right rule at the expense of the Raj novels' Indian characters.

Yadava's commentary on British/Indian relations opens the discussion staged by Duncan on a typically insightful note: "Fewer tutors we want, and more friends. But it is my grief that [the British] as a people seem to have little affection for us as a people. For some of us, yes for

our peasants and our princes . . . But men like themselves—no” (164). In critiquing the policy of separation that kept upper-class Indians and the Anglo-Indians with whom they dealt strangers, Duncan specifically rejects Anglo-India’s pedagogical program. Raj educational efforts made a pretense of “civilizing” Indians, while implying Indians were so lacking in qualities of civility that continued imperial rule was essential. The “Eurocentric literary curriculum of the nineteenth century,” Gauri Viswanathan argues, “was . . . a vital, active instrument of Western hegemony in concert with commercial expansion and military action.”²⁸⁹ Britain ruled by the book as much as by the sword, situating its colonial actors as what Yadava calls “tutors”. Yadava’s awareness of this dynamic’s constructedness allows him to point out that, with the inherent power differential between educator and educated, genuine connection (what Duncan dubs “friendship” and “affection”) is impossible. As Yadava puts it, the British do not want “men like themselves” in India. Such men would not need to be ruled. The Raj prefers subservient “peasants” or glamorous “princes” who respectively necessitate and glamorize Anglo-Indian duty in India.

Duncan’s portrayal of informed Indian characters is expanded in a scene during which Anglo-Indian women at a Lady’s League meeting entreat a Bengali woman, Mrs. Das, to sing:

[F]rom her immobile little person, where it sat, the song began to issue, rather a cry than a song, harsh and plaintive. Two or three of her sister-guests exchanged half-frightened glances; the rest looked with covert smiles at the floor, the lips of one or two moved in unison . . . When it was over, something like a sigh lifted the bosoms that had understood, but it was lost in the complacent applause of the Anglo-Indian ladies. (*The Burnt Offering* 116-17)

The song, Rani Janaki informs Joan, ““was a patriotic song . . . An impossible song”” (117).

Duncan’s emphasis on Indian knowledge, in specific contrast to the “complacent” and oblivious Anglo-Indian response, upsets genre constructions of Anglo-Indians as possessing “true” insight into India. Here, that insight belongs to the Bengali women, who exchange “covert smiles” of

²⁸⁹ Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest* (New York: Columbia UP, 1989). 166-67.

recognition as Mrs. Das sings. This empowerment is not total; Duncan strips Mrs. Das' identity with diction that emphasizes impersonal pronouns ("where it sat") and focuses on the song as agential actor ("the song began to issue," rather than "Mrs. Das began to sing"). Rather than a conscious presence, Mrs. Das functions as a vessel by which Indian resistance is consolidated. Yet, Duncan's uncritical insertion of such resistance is a powerful gesture. By making an Indian woman perform, the Anglo-Indians seemingly confirm their authority; by singing a patriotic song, Mrs. Das and her audience upset that presumption, introducing an insurgency the Anglo-Indians cannot grasp, and which *The Burnt Offering* makes no move to discursively contain.

In its ambivalence, Duncan's staging prefigures Professor Godbole's enigmatic song in Forster's *A Passage to India*, which summons forth an image of a primal male body: "The man who was gathering water chestnut came naked out of the tank, his lips parted with delight, disclosing his scarlet tongue" (Forster 84-85). Forster and Duncan each present an Indian singing a song to uncomprehending British listeners. Forster, however, lessens the potential of an India beyond the British power to "know" by locating understanding in a scarlet-tongued, naked Indian man emerging from water. The description hints at an evolutionary state (emergence from the sea), and at sexual knowledge, ironically achieving an effect akin to that of David Lean's new scene in the 1984 Raj Revival film of *A Passage to India*. Lean has Adela seek the "real" India among ancient, sexual statues in a wood; wild monkeys emerge from the trees and chase her away. In each case, India is inscrutable, sensual, and in Lean, violent—Raj novel genre stereotypes which Duncan's scene, in contrast to Forster and Lean's staging, rejects.

Rather, Duncan's portrayal of Mrs. Das' song recalls Spivak's exploration of subaltern resistance in "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988). Spivak writes that "[i]n the semioses of the social text, elaborations of insurgency stand in the place of 'the utterance.' The sender . . . is

marked only as a pointer to an irretrievable consciousness” (82). As noted, Duncan downplays Mrs. Das’ individuality and focuses on audience response, locating Mrs. Das as the “pointer” Spivak describes. Mrs. Das’ song is comprehensible, but only to those with access—persons who speak Bengali, who are part of the “irretrievable consciousness” into which the Raj novel genre claims insight. In this scene, Duncan rejects that claim; the Anglo-Indian women do not speak any languages common to the province in which they live, a fact Janaki wryly observes: ““Not an Englishwoman in the room understands Bengali . . . and their Hindustani—poor dear ladies—it is of the kitchen”” (116). By unsettling Raj novel claims that authentic Anglo-Indian knowledge validated British imperial rule, Duncan shows a grasp of imperialism’s strategies of exclusion which is revelatory within the Raj novel genre. Spivak writes that in receiving insurgent gestures, “postcolonial intellectuals learn that their privilege is their loss” (82). By depicting Anglo-India’s lack of access, Duncan shows such loss even in a moment of presumptive imperial domination. In this respect, *The Burnt Offering* stands out amongst the Raj novels; the ambivalence of Mrs. Das’ song is left to trouble the reader’s sense of Anglo-Indian empowerment.

Joan and Bepin’s relationship also stands out among depictions of interracial love in the Raj novel genre, in large part because Joan avidly desires the union. She believes it is “in its way consummate and beautiful that her Oriental experience should burn into this esoteric jewel of an Oriental passion, so mysteriously different from any other. It made no demand upon her—probably would never make any—and as it waxed before her eyes she dwelt upon it with a charmed smile” (184). Read, however, in the context of Joan’s predatory wish to “take on” India, shorn of sexual *frisson* (it “made no demand upon her”), and recalling Orientalist stereotypes of the “mysterious” East, the subversive potential of Joan’s desire is limited. In making this claim, I depart from Paxton, who champions Joan and Bepin’s relationship as a high-water mark of racial

openness in the Raj novels. Though I concur with Paxton that seeing a British woman actively pursuing an Indian man is revelatory, the crucial difference lies in my reading of Joan's motives. Joan does not pursue Bepin as an equal, a situation which would alter racial hierarchies as well as gender stereotypes. Instead, Joan pursues an "esoteric jewel of an Oriental passion"; she wants an object, not Bepin. Moreover, she wants an object India, and Bepin is as close as she can get.

Duncan's portrayal of interracial romance also follows my argument with regards to Flora Annie Steel's *Voices in the Night*: in the Raj novel genre, race hierarchies trump those of gender. This scenario accords with that observed in the imperial context generally by Anne McClintock. In *Imperial Leather* (1995),²⁹⁰ McClintock deconstructs "neocolonial nostalgia" that sees "European women in brisk white shirts and safari green [who] supposedly found freedom in empire" (14). As I discuss in Chapter V, propagating such imagery is a major achievement of the 1970s/1980s Raj Revival. Duncan and Steel's depictions of interracial love show this idea already at work in nineteenth and early twentieth-century Raj novels. In *The Burnt Offering*, Joan, a British woman, participates in the metanarrative of British imperial identity by elevating herself above Bepin, an Indian man, to whom Duncan ascribes aspects of "femininity" (weakness, sensuality, duplicity) which the Raj novel genre seeks to evacuate from the British national character. As Bepin waits to assassinate the Viceroy, for example, the difference between his character and that of the British impresses itself upon him: "A world of simple purpose and resolution sounded in the beat of the horses' hoofs . . . England's honour flashed even plainer into the eyes of Bepin Behari Dey as he lay in wait" (306). The phrase "lay in wait," contrasted with Britain's "honour," purpose, and resolution, casts Bepin as insidious and sly. Unlike Mrs. Das' song, which allows a space of uncontained ambivalence, Joan and Bepin's

²⁹⁰ Pamela Lothspeich's article "Unspeakable Outrages and Unbearable Defilements" (2007) also analyzes this idea of white female agency masking the continued subjugation of the Indian actor. Lothspeich focuses specifically on the use of rape imagery in early Raj novels, including those of Flora Annie Steel.

romance undoes both characters—and reflects poorly on the possibilities of interracial love in Duncan’s Anglo-India.

Such containment also occurs in the narrative of Sir Kristodas, and Rani Janaki, whose happy, Anglicized life falls apart in the course of the novel. Sir Kristodas, after being knighted by the Crown, drifts away from Hindu tradition: “He still, it was said, bathed in Ganges water, but it was brought to his bathroom; he no longer walked every morning at sunrise to the *ghat* at the river . . . the *shalgram* gradually found its way to an upper shelf in his library, where it was flanked by Spencer on one side and Mill on the other” (42). The literal figuring of a hybrid or ‘in between’ identity, with the marker of Sir Kristodas’ Indianness tucked between textual giants of European intellectual thought, is mirrored in Rani Janaki’s attempt to anglicize the family home. “The house . . . grew green and white and Jacobean, embellished by reproductions of Italian art Kristodas had never seen, and portraits of distinguished professors he had never met” (46). In pursuing Britishness, Sir Kristodas and Janaki construct spaces foreign to themselves. Their interpersonal relations with the British alienate them further: Janaki’s unrequited love for Game leads to heartbreak; the trial of Ganendra, which Sir Kristodas oversees for the Raj, leads to his rejection by Calcutta’s Indian community and a crippling crisis of self-doubt. This deeply negative portrayal of Anglicization, akin to those in Flora Annie Steel and Alice Perrin, recalls claims of “basic” Indian incivility deployed after the Mutiny by Raj administrators to promote British rule. For example, Duncan’s depiction of Janaki’s grief over Game re-stages the Raj novel genre’s racist assumptions of a base state to which Indians regress in times of crisis. Janaki crouches upon the floor, weeping hysterically:

[It] was the daughter of a Brahmin family of Mukerjis who sat there, and no by-product [sic] of Oxford and Mrs. Sidney Gray. Deeper and deeper she sank into self-abnegation—there was nothing now that she would not fling away to stay that

terrible arm of the Mother, the arm with the dagger, lifted when it pleased the Mother that her lotuses should be red. “*O Kali-mai! . . . O mother Kali—*” (297-98)

Recalling the Goddess Kali, a recurrent image of Indian savagery and vulgar religious practices in the Raj novel genre and the Raj Revival,²⁹¹ Duncan transmutes the idea of maternal India into a violent threat. It is a significant gesture,²⁹² as Ganendra uses images of “India the mother” to justify Independence agitation: “Having found my own soul I looked, my Lord, with the eyes of my soul, for the soul of the Mother . . . from that moment to this I have never ceased to deliver the message” (243-44). In moments such as Mrs. Das’ song, *The Burnt Offering* admits valid, complex resistance to British rule. But Janaki’s breakdown, like Joan and Bepin’s abortive affair, contains such ambivalence, casting it as a temporary eruption rather than as concrete evidence of Indian alterity or authority. While Duncan goes further than many Raj novel genre writers in exploring India as a discrete, empowered community, she finally anticipates Forster’s subtle accession to Raj novel genre stereotypes and containment of ambivalence in *A Passage to India*.

Ultimately, Forster, Kipling, and Duncan each manipulate Raj novel genre tropes by which India and Indians are represented, adding moments of nuance that anticipate the post-imperial offerings of the Raj Revival. The Revivalists resurrect the presumptive ideality of Anglo-India even as they mourn the loss of the Indian territories upon which Britain exercised what Maud Diver calls its “racial talent” for rule. These recuperative efforts are leant urgency by

²⁹¹ Numerous examples occur in the Raj novel genre and the Raj Revival. In Alice Perrin’s *The Waters of Destruction* (1905), Sunia, an Indian widow who tempts a British man into marriage, takes up Kali worship after her son dies (194-95; 283-84). Her previous rejection of Kali worship made her a more viable wife (75-77); Perrin thus sets acceptance or rejection of Kali as a tool for assessing Indian civility. For a more lurid vision of Kali worship, M.M. Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions* (1979) imagines a shrine to “the frightful goddess in whose honour the Thugs had strangled thousands of victims . . . The nightmare deity, with her multiplicity of arms, her glaring eyeballs, protruding tongue, and long necklace of human skulls . . . A strong stench of corruption and a buzzing cloud of flies showed that her devotees were not backward in satisfying her thirst for blood” (401).

²⁹² This moment is particularly interesting when Paxton’s claim that “the figure of Mother India acted to authorize [Bepin’s] desire for Joan” (*Writing Under the Raj* 252) is considered. The violence of Janaki’s vision of maternal India, and the way this image crushes her Oxford-acquired modernity, is another way in which Duncan’s text contains the transgressive possibilities of Bepin and Joan’s romance.

the political atmosphere of 1970s and 1980s Thatcherite Britain. A stagnant economy, Britain's diminished global precedence, and growing uncertainty about immigration to the British Isles from former imperial territories produced an era of unrest oddly similar to that in which late Raj novelists such as Diver, Duncan, and Forster wrote. I argue that in response, the Raj Revivalists conjured images of India that struck notes of strength, fidelity and service—while ignoring the question of whether such service was ever desired by Britain's Indian subjects. Like Roy in *Far to Seek*, the Raj Revivalists strove to see in Anglo-India “the little concentrated world of British men and women, pursuing their own ends; magnificently unmindful of alien eyes watching, speculating, misunderstanding at every turn,” a group held together by “the spirit of competition without strife that is the cornerstone of British character and the British Empire” (328). To the Raj novelists of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, Anglo-India was that cornerstone, its absence unthinkable—a mindset upon which 1980s writers and politicians were eager to play in recreating an imperial identity for the post-imperial British actor. The intersections of race, gender, national character, and the question of Anglo-India's relationship to Britain, as set out variously in the rhetoric of Margaret Thatcher and the fictions of the Raj Revival, is the focus of my final chapter, which examines in detail the afterlife of the Raj novel genre ideals I have articulated here, and in the preceding chapters.

VI. Emotional Imperialism, Postcolonial Nostalgia – Reconfigurations of the Raj Novel Genre in the Age of Thatcher

At midnight on August 15, 1947, the reign of the British over India ended. “A moment comes, which comes but rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new,” incoming president Jawaharlal Nehru proclaimed in his speech pledging dedication to the new Dominion of India, “when an age ends, and the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance” (Mosley 241). As India’s soul found utterance, an age in Britain did indeed end. The empire that provided grist to the imaginative mills of the Raj novelists discussed in Chapters I, II, III, and IV—Flora Annie Steel, B.M. Croker, Rudyard Kipling, Sara Jeannette Duncan, Alice Perrin, Maud Diver, and E.M. Forster—and to the numerous other writers working in the Raj novel genre, was gone. What came next for Britain? What did the end of the Raj, and the imminent decline of Britain’s imperial holdings around the world, mean for Britain’s perception of itself as a nation? What did it signify for its citizens’ ideas of themselves as participants in the national project? How did the popular imagination of Great Britain cope with the loss of the jewel in its crown?

Following Paul Gilroy’s arguments in *Postcolonial Melancholia* (2005; published in Britain as *After Empire*), this chapter argues that Great Britain did not cope with that loss. During the swing towards Conservatism in 1970s and 1980s Britain, the Raj novel genre’s narrative of ideal British selfhood formed through Anglo-Indian experience re-circulated as part of a larger process of cultural mourning and denial. In particular, the return to the Raj novel genre served the implicit purpose of winning support for the foreign policy agenda of Margaret Thatcher’s Tory government (1979-1990), which celebrated a revived imperial spirit in conflicts such as the Falklands War. “Empires come and go,” Stuart Hall wrote in *The Hard Road to Renewal*, his blistering 1988 critique of Thatcherism. “But the imagery of the British Empire seems destined to go on forever” (68). My analysis of the ways in which the Raj novel genre’s images, tropes,

and modes of characterization were revisited in 1970s and 1980s British popular and political culture questions why, as Hall puts it, “the imperial flag” was “still flying in the collective unconscious,” and why particular aspects of the Raj novel genre’s “imagery” retained potent ideological power. Gilroy writes that analyses of post-imperial nations must confront the

obvious difficulties in acknowledging the pains and the gains that were involved in imperial adventures . . . the problems that have arisen from [the] inability to disentangle the disruptive results supposedly produced by the immigrant presence from the residual but potent effects of lingering but usually unspoken colonial relationships and imperial fantasies. (*Postcolonial Melancholia* 100)

The previous chapters analyzed the nuances of the Raj novels’ “imperial fantasies”; this chapter explores how the difficulty of facing the “pains and the gains” of imperialism was obviated by 1970s and 1980s British authors, filmmakers, and politicians alike. In compulsively revisiting the plots, tropes, and character traits developed by the Raj novel genre, the themes of unquestioned adherence to duty, humility, self-sacrifice and sublimation of individual good for communal benefit are revived in the practical and emotional vacuum left by the end of the British Raj.

The thrusting forward of Thatcher’s Conservative juggernaut by a fictional apparatus of overtly imperialist texts has been noted by prominent cultural critics such as Hall and the author Salman Rushdie. Rushdie wrote in 1983 that “[a]nyone who has switched on a television set, been to the cinema, or entered a bookshop in the last few months will be aware that the British Raj, after three and a half decades in retirement, has been making a sort of comeback.” Rushdie explicitly links this “comeback” to the aims of Thatcher’s government: “For every text, a context; and the rise of Raj revisionism, exemplified by the huge success of these fictions, is the artistic counterpart of the rise of conservative ideologies in modern Britain.”²⁹³ In his 1987 work of cultural criticism, *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*, which prefigures the theme of British cultural malaise described in *Postcolonial Melancholia*, Gilroy writes that correlations

²⁹³ Salman Rushdie, “Outside the Whale,” in *Imaginary Homelands* (London: Granta, 1992). 87, 92.

between nationalism and racism in 1980s Britain, and “the types of subjectivity” produced by nationalisms generally, were areas of pressing significance excluded from discussions of British identity in the 1980s. He pins this omission on “[t]wo anachronistic images of Britain,” the idea of Britain as “homogenous and cohesive,” an even cultural playing field upon which variously-assigned social identities compete equally; and more tellingly, a second image “attached to the idea that this country is, and must continue to be, a major world power” (53). Gilroy, Hall, and Rushdie all argue that imperialism’s afterlife in the popular imagination reified hierarchies of race, class, and gender in 1970s and 1980s Britain, compelling adherence to political ideologies by intertwining those ideologies with nostalgic images of continued imperial might. Here, I trace the production of these images to the specific work done by the Raj novel genre in crafting an idealized image of Anglo-Indian selves and community. By examining the political rhetoric of Margaret Thatcher during the Falkland Islands conflict, the commentary of 1970s/1980s political and cultural critics on that rhetoric, and by closely reading the portrait of Anglo-Indian ideality developed in major Raj Revival texts, this chapter details the recurrence of the Raj novel genre’s vision of British imperial identity in British popular and political culture alike.

The popularity of new versions of old visions during the 1970s and 1980s speaks to the power such ideas continued to exert on Britain’s metanarrative of identity formed via imperial adventure. Novels relating to the British experience in India won the Booker Prize, one of Britain’s most prestigious literary awards,²⁹⁴ in 1973, 1975, 1977, and 1981,²⁹⁵ a phenomenon

²⁹⁴ The Booker Prize was instituted in 1969, with the award going to P.H. Newby’s *Something to Answer For*, set in Egypt during the Suez Crisis. Critic Richard Todd argues that the Booker developed partly out of the British literati’s sense of inferiority toward a much-feted postmodern literary fiction scene in 1970s America (*Consuming Fictions* 78-79). Indeed, Newby’s novel is a hazy fantasia of postmodern and postcolonial confusion. The Booker was an immediate financial success. Winning novels often became runaway bestsellers. The prize also functioned as a tool of canon formation, confirming the status of major British authors (e.g. early Booker recipients William Golding [*Rites of Passage*, 1980], Kingsley Amis [*These Old Devils*; 1986], and Scott) while introducing talented new authors such as Rushdie to British reading audiences. Today, the Booker is a major institution. The short and long-listing of nominees is a media event, and receipt of the award has the power to “make” an author’s career.

that led some critics to jokingly observe that “you had to write about India to win the prize.”²⁹⁶ Raj Revival novels were bestsellers for years at a time,²⁹⁷ and were adapted into Academy Award, BAFTA-award, and Emmy Award-winning films and television series. Such avid consumption of Raj Revivalism across a multitude of genres necessitates a reconsideration of the ideal Britishness described in the Raj novel genre of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Raj authors living and writing in India between 1858 and 1947 claimed British character could be perfected through the rigors of Anglo-Indian service, with the support of the Anglo-Indian community, utilizing the authoritative knowledge gained by going “beneath the skin” of India. This claim, renewed by some artists and politicians in 1970s and 1980s Britain, resonated powerfully with British reading audiences although, by the end of the 1960s, the British Empire had all but vanished. A brief sketch of the decades between Indian independence in 1947 and Thatcher’s election as Prime Minister in 1979²⁹⁸ illuminates various factors contributing to the huge increase in racial and political tensions in Great Britain—tensions which produced an atmosphere where a “revival” of Raj novel ideals could enjoy new political efficacy.

The end of World War II saw a severe downturn in British fortunes. Losses suffered on the European battlefields from 1940 to 1942, and the devastation caused in the British Isles by German air bombardments, left the country and its economic infrastructure in shambles. In the 1945 election, Winston Churchill’s Conservative party, which had championed imperialism as

²⁹⁵ *Midnight’s Children*, one of the biggest Booker Prize successes, is set at the stroke of midnight on August 15, 1947 and follows the fate of several Indian children born at the moment of Independence. While Rushdie does not perform the neurotic examination of empire’s aftereffects on the British national psyche (seen in Ruth Praver Jhabvala, J.G. Farrell, and Paul Scott), *Midnight’s Children’s* instigating event (Independence) and its highly-critical caricature of colonial gentleman William Methwold lead me to include it on this list. However, I note that when Rushdie engages the Raj Revival’s enthusiastic nostalgia, it is to deconstruct and critique its revisionist impulses.

²⁹⁶ Malcolm Bradbury, *The Modern British Novel* (London: Penguin, 1994). 381.

²⁹⁷ For instance, the promotional information for HBO’s 1984 television adaptation of M.M. Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions* notes that the novel sold 15 million copies in two years.

²⁹⁸ In tracing a history of the years 1947 to 1968, I draw upon the BBC’s timeline of British history after WWII, William Burns’ *A Brief History of Great Britain* (2009) and Anne Rodrick’s *The History of Great Britain* (2004).

constituent to British identity, was defeated in a landslide by Clement Atlee's Labour Party. In hopes of securing an economic recovery through focus on "white" Dominions (Australia, South Africa, New Zealand) which used the pound sterling currency, Labour accelerated the process of Indian independence. After the 1949 London Declaration, the Commonwealth was reinvented, and "British" was dropped from the name of all Dominions, among which India now numbered. Simultaneously, anti-colonial agitation spread across the remainder of the British Empire. In the 1950s, its army operating at reduced efficiency post-WWII, Britain confronted uprisings in Kenya, Malaya, and Cyprus. With increasing speed, more and more British colonies (such as Ghana and Malaya in 1957) gained independence. The 1956 Suez Crisis, in which Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal and Britain, with its French allies, failed to remove Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser from power, was another blow to Britain's international standing. By this time, global political influence had shifted to the United States and the then-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which by the 1950s were locked in the Cold War conflict.

The British economy continued to mangle, with Britain failing in multiple attempts to enter the European Economic Council (EEC). Simultaneously, nationalist movements in the remaining British colonies gained strength. Between 1960 and 1963, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika (now part of Tanzania, with the former Zanzibar) gained independence. In 1965, white settlers in Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) revolted; the ensuing civil war dragged on until 1980, when Britain briefly regained control and granted the area independence. Britain's inability to intervene decisively in the Rhodesian conflict further demonstrated the former Empire's lack of international influence. In 1967, the pound was devalued—a blow to the already moribund economy—and the Labour government decided to withdraw all military forces east of Suez. Britain was finally granted admittance to the EEC in 1973, but this did little for the

nation's dire financial situation. Strikes raged in Britain as trade union negotiations with the government repeatedly broke down; with the 1973 oil crisis, the British work week in 1973-1974 shortened to three days.²⁹⁹ At this time, immigration to the United Kingdom from the former colonies was surging; between 1972 and 1979, Britain admitted 83,000 persons, including 28,000 African-Asians expelled in 1972 by Ugandan dictator General Idi Amin.³⁰⁰ Measures were hastily implemented to strengthen entry controls while also protecting immigrant rights.

By 1979, then, Great Britain had entered a period of marked economic, political, and cultural malaise. Literary critic Luke Strongman notes "a sense of entropy or centrelessness"³⁰¹ in British popular culture of this time. Economically, Marxist critic Eric Hobsbawm describes the "visible acceleration of the crisis of British capitalism" that began "in the late 1960s" and was exacerbated by "the slump of the late 70s and early 80s."³⁰² In this environment, Britain elected Margaret Thatcher Prime Minister, rejecting Labour in favor of the Conservative party of Churchill. During Thatcher's regime (1979-1990), Great Britain saw a return to action, albeit in an often symbolic form. Thatcher's "new" imperialism, literalized in the 1982 Falkland Islands conflict, was echoed and expanded creatively by Booker Award-winning authors Paul Scott, Ruth Praver Jhabvala, and J.G. Farrell, worldwide bestselling author M.M. Kaye, and a select group of filmmakers (including David Lean, Ismail Merchant, James Ivory) who produced *A Passage to India* (1984), *Heat and Dust*, *The Far Pavilions* and *The Jewel in the Crown* TV miniseries. Hand in hand with what critic Robert Gray calls Thatcher's "backward-looking,

²⁹⁹ Clive Howard Lee, *The British Economy Since 1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986); Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (London: Hutchinson, 1987).

³⁰⁰ I draw on Gilroy's *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (1987), and the BBC's "Short History of Immigration".

³⁰¹ Luke Strongman, *The Booker Prize and the Legacy of Empire* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002). 143.

³⁰² Eric Hobsbawm, "Falklands Fallout," in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 259.

atavistic rhetoric, the motif of imperial nostalgia,”³⁰³ the Raj Revival deployed the Raj novel genre’s vision of Anglo-Indian character as a still relevant ideal that might sustain British national identity even in the absence of empire.

Introducing the 1998 reissue of Benita Parry’s *Delusions and Discoveries*, Michael Sprinker calls Raj Revivalism: “Arguably an abreaction to the increasingly visible crisis of race relations in Britain . . . nostalgia for the era of British rule in India increased in inverse proportion to the empire’s actual territorial reach” (vii). Jenny Sharpe’s description in *Allegories of Empire* (1993) is similar: “The perceived threat of black immigration demanded a historical memory, and the entertainment industry manufactured one of epic proportions . . . Yet the [R]aj [R]evival does not revive a dead past so much as weave the living tapestry of a forgetting” (143). The Raj Revival represents an attempt by select 1970s/1980s artists to reassert the colonial hierarchies of race undermined by the end of empire and the subsequent increase in diasporic immigration to the former imperial center. As its economy floundered and its political precedence shrank, the vanished empire’s nostalgic hold on Britain’s citizens grew. In demonstrating the continued prevalence of the Raj novel genre’s model of British national character in the cultural and political rhetoric of 1970s/1980s Britain, I expand on observations such as Sprinker and Sharpe’s, articulating in detail how this nostalgic desire assisted the Thatcher administration’s renewed imperialist agenda. The project of Raj Revivalism³⁰⁴ turned a

³⁰³ Robert Gray, “The Falklands Factor,” in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 275.

³⁰⁴ The Raj Revival is productively contrasted to the vibrant wave of novels, plays, films, and essays by diasporic or postcolonial artists, many of whom were born or lived in former British imperial holdings, who were also publishing during the 1970s/1980s. Diametrically opposed in style and ideology to much of the Raj Revival, figures like Kenyan novelist/essayist Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1938-), Nigerian writer/essayist Chinua Achebe (1930-), Nigerian playwright/poet Wole Soyinka (1934-), Indian novelist Anita Desai (1937-), and Nobel Prize-winning Australian novelist Patrick White (1912-1990), are among the many postcolonial intellectuals who wrote back to the ongoing perpetuation of mythologies about Britain’s “glorious” imperial era. They are joined by diasporic figures such as Rushdie and Hanif Kureishi (1954-). Born in South London to a Pakistani father and English mother, Kureishi wrote the screenplay for *My Beautiful Laundrette* (1985), a film about a gay British man of Pakistani descent growing up

blind eye to conditions in Britain—beset in the 1970s and 1980s by crime, strikes, and vicious debates over immigration—in favor of a rosy view of the sun never setting on the country’s lost imperial holdings.

Throughout this chapter, Gilroy’s “postcolonial melancholia” forms the primary lens for my analysis. Gilroy posits that contemporary multicultural societies, the portrayal of those societies in media, and the response to media portrayals by citizens can be better understood by an open discussion of imperial legacies and aftereffects. Nations such as Britain, in this model, habitually disavow both the positive and negative emotions produced by imperial rule. Such systemic repression of cultural memory leads to violent, virulent eruptions of racism as racialized bodies make their presence felt in the metropole. Significantly, Gilroy adds, repression also leads to melancholic fixation on historical moments and narratives thought to embody a “better” nation lost with the end of empire. It is my argument that the Raj Revivalists, some of whom, like the Raj writers, were born or spent part of their adulthood in India, produce ideals of male and female Anglo-Indian character akin to those imbibed from authors such as Rudyard Kipling, whose fiction sets the template for the Raj novel genre. Kipling’s images of Anglo-India and the Raj are painfully present in 1970s and 1980s debates over British identity after empire. As I will discuss, in multiple speeches to Conservative groups during the height of the Falklands conflict, Margaret Thatcher references and quotes Kipling’s poetry. On the opposite end of the political spectrum, a chapter of Gilroy’s *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* is entitled “Lesser breeds without the law,” quoting Kipling’s imperial ode, “Recessional.”³⁰⁵ Anglo-Indians who served the Raj and who are quoted in the 1970s BBC radio series and subsequent book anthology *Plain*

in 1980s Britain, offers a representative counter to verdant, nostalgic Merchant-Ivory renderings of Britishness in the late twentieth century. Intriguingly, the huge financial success enjoyed by Raj Revivalists such as M.M. Kaye often surpassed that of these more critical visions of Britain’s imperial legacy, despite the latter’s global intellectual impact; nostalgia, in 1970s and 1980s Britain, was a lucrative business.

³⁰⁵ “Recessional” was written in 1897 on the occasion of Queen Victoria’s Diamond Jubilee.

Tales from the Raj (1975)—the title a homage to Kipling’s *Plain Tales from the Hills* (1888)—repeatedly refer to Kipling, Maud Diver, and other Raj writers who made Anglo-Indian life comprehensible to “Home” audiences. Each citation assists the process of sublimation and neurotic re-visitation Gilroy sees lingering in Great Britain’s relationship to its lost empire in the late twentieth century.

Describing “melancholia’s signature combination of manic elation with misery, self-loathing, and ambivalence” (104), Gilroy encapsulates the new fictions and subtly-politicized nonfiction accounts of the Raj Revival: “[R]etelling these colonial stories projects the imperial nation as the primary victim rather than the principal beneficiary of its vanished colonial dominance” (105).³⁰⁶ Indeed, in *The Last Days of the British Raj* (1961),³⁰⁷ Leonard Mosley bids a bitter farewell to the “British Raj, which had ruled the country, unified the country, brought it justice, medicine, good government—and had also exploited its wealth and patronized its people” (241). Mosley’s unwillingness to cede the moral high ground is haunted, in the form of his sentence, by the need to acknowledge British malfeasance, which comes as an unwelcome break in thought punctuated by a dash. This fractured pattern of thinking and writing about the Raj dictates the moments at which Raj novel genre elements are reconfigured in 1970s and 1980s cultural productions. Describing public reactions to the Falklands crisis, Stuart Hall refers to “the

³⁰⁶ Rushdie makes a similar point in “Outside the Whale” (*Imaginary Homelands* 90).

³⁰⁷ The 1960s produced several works of Raj Revivalism that were reissued during the height of the movement in the late 1970s/early 1980s. The most obvious example is Paul Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown*, published in 1966; this novel’s uptake into the political arena came most powerfully in the late 1970s with the publication of three subsequent novels in Scott’s *Raj Quartet*, the unofficial coda, Booker Prize-winning *Staying On* (1977), a TV adaptation of *Staying On* (1980), a BBC TV adaptation of *The Jewel in the Crown* (1984), and Scott’s work as agent to M.M. Kaye, which produced blockbuster international bestseller *The Far Pavilions*. Mosley’s text prefigures other “nonfiction” works about the end of the Raj, such as Larry Collins and Dominique LaPierre’s *Freedom at Midnight* (1975), though Mosley’s is a more strict historical account. Sprinker’s description of the Raj Revival in his introduction to *Delusions and Discoveries* provides a similar temporal location for the movement, noting that “its premonitory signs were legible enough in the 1960s” (vii).

return of the repressed,³⁰⁸ a Freudian description³⁰⁹ that evokes imperial Britain, in all its lost majesty, as a site of sublimated desire for the British nation. In literary studies, critic Jason Mezey argues that Paul Scott's *Raj Quartet* "embod[ies] melancholia as its chief means of engagement," an attitude visible in the four books' "symptoms of guilt, self-punishment, and over-identification with the lost object."³¹⁰ In the fervor of Thatcher's renewed imperialist mission, the fictions of the Raj novel genre offer recourse to a once more "Great" Britishness, lost, repressed—and suddenly found. The afterlife of the Raj novel genre's imperial dream, the political and fictional attempts of a battered nation to reap the reward of its supposed sovereign sympathy, played out across the tableaux of Thatcherite Britain. The results were remarkable.

"Britain has found a role": Margaret Thatcher and the Rhetoric of the Falklands Crisis

On April 2, 1982, Argentina made military incursions on the Falkland Islands, a chain of rocky outcroppings in the Pacific Ocean under British colonial control since 1833, four years before Queen Victoria took the throne. While Argentina's landing of troops on the Falklands (or the *Islas Malvinas*, as they are known in Spanish) escalated an immediate conflict that had been brewing since late February 1982, Argentina and Britain had been engaged in debate over the sovereignty of the Falklands for decades. On April 1, 1982, the United Nations Security Council, at Britain's urging, called for all Argentine forces to withdraw; when this did not occur in the next three weeks, the British launched military maneuvers in the Falklands. By late April, they had won several small pitched battles against Argentine forces, including an engagement on the island of South Georgia, and had sunk several Argentinean navy ships. On June 15, Britain's

³⁰⁸ Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal* (London: Verso, 1988). 70.

³⁰⁹ Freud uses the term repeatedly; my citation draws on his description of "Unpleasure – Pleasure – Repression" in "Katarina," *The Freud Reader*, ed. Peter Gay (New York: Norton, 1989). 92.

³¹⁰ 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 (Fall 2006). 328.

General Moore accepted the surrender of all Argentine forces in East and West Falkland. Addressing the House of Commons, PM Thatcher repeated Gen. Moore's statement: "The Falkland Islands are once more under the Government desired by their inhabitants. God Save the Queen."³¹¹ Here Thatcher (through Moore) encapsulates two themes that recur in her statements on the Falklands: ostensibly benevolent attention to the desires of the island's inhabitants; and sustenance of Britain's imperial glory, evoked in the anthemic statement, "God save the Queen." Thatcher's speeches during this seventy-four day period also emphasize the rightness of Britain's actions, the resurrection of Britain's imperial glory, and the resumption of Britain's role as a model of character and moral uprightness for other nations around the world.

Addressing the nation in the wake of victory, Thatcher spoke boldly and proudly:

When we started out there were the waverers and the faint-hearts, the people who thought we could no longer do the great things we once did, those who believed our decline was irreversible, that we could never again be what we were, that Britain was no longer the nation that had built an empire and ruled a quarter of the world. Well they were wrong.³¹²

In this section of Chapter V, I set the image of British national character espoused by the Raj novel genre as an ideological antecedent for these claims, and for the diction Thatcher uses to express them. Thatcher's speeches to the Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives and the Scottish Conservative Party, and her statements in the House of Commons and in interviews about the Falklands, are emblematic of this exchange. I also analyze commentary from 1980s critics on Thatcher's imperialist agenda to show the contemporary consensus that Thatcher sought to revive Britain's imperial ethos at any cost. In "Britain's Living Legacy," Tom Nairn (author of *The Break-Up of Britain* [1977]) writes:

³¹¹ Margaret Thatcher, "HC S: [Falkland Islands]," *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 15 June 1982. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.

³¹² Margaret Thatcher, "Speech to Conservative Rally at Cheltenham," *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 3 July 1982. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.

Other parts of Europe have shown signs of emergence from the decade of retrogression; Great Britain will now inaugurate a new one. This last act of empire is intended to rewrite our history, by decreeing *which* birthright will take us into the next century: the dark one of the gentlemen, monarchs and parasites, of the “officer class” and its massive social retinue.³¹³

Nairn specifically cites the “officer class” as one of the “birthrights” utilized by the Tory party in determining the ideological course of Britain’s post-imperial existence. The rhetoric of Britain’s “last act of empire” is deeply indebted to the carefully-policed ideologies which the Raj novel genre attributes to actors of empire, particularly Anglo-Indians, who set themselves forth as consolidating a legacy of British character idealized and reinvented by Thatcher.³¹⁴

Thatcher’s imperialist tenor and the political efficacy of her Falkland Islands rhetoric is a major topic of discussion in critical studies of the Thatcherite regime. In 1983, Salman Rushdie cited Anthony Barnett’s claim in “Let’s Take the ‘Great’ out of Britain” that the titular adjective “bedevilled the actions of all post-war governments,” driving them to unrealistic acts of national aspiration in an attempt to perform what was meant to be a geographic descriptor. Stuart Hall argues similarly: “As the country drifts deeper into recession, we seem to possess no other viable vocabulary in which to cast our sense of who the British people are and where they are going, except one drawn from the inventory of a lost imperial greatness.”³¹⁵ Hall’s focus on a “viable vocabulary” for articulating Britishness evokes the idea of narrative as ideology-bearing vessel explored in the first four chapters of my study. By consolidating within the Raj novel genre a

³¹³ Tom Nairn, “Britain’s Living Legacy,” in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 286. Emphasis Nairn’s.

³¹⁴ Thatcher mirrored this image of British character in the crafting of her public persona, emphasizing her rise from modest middle-class beginnings through hard work, thriftiness, and dedication to community and nation. Typical statements include: “People from my sort of background needed Grammar schools to compete with children from privileged homes” (*Speech to the Conservative Party Conference*; 14 Oct. 1977); “Pennies don’t fall from heaven[;] they have to be earned here on earth” (*Speech at Lord Mayor’s Banquet*; 12 Nov. 1979); and “[m]y policies are based not on some economics theory, but on things I and millions like me were brought up with: an honest day’s work for an honest day’s pay; live within your means; put by a nest egg for a rainy day; pay your bills on time; support the police” (*The News of the World*; 20 Sept. 1981).

³¹⁵ Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal* (London: Verso, 1988). 68.

specific vocabulary to describe Anglo-Indian ideality, the Raj novelists provide a salient way of “reading” the British back to themselves in this later moment of cultural crisis. Exploring how postcolonial melancholia manifests in Britain through continual citation of British heroism in World War II (1939-1945), Gilroy describes the Falklands as part of a series of wars whose discourse evokes “the pleasures that result from the experience of being happy, glorious, and victorious in a setting where the nation’s characteristic ethnic blend of luck, pluck, and resilience can be identified and affirmed” (*Postcolonial Melancholia* 88). Here, I argue, Thatcher uses a rhetoric of “luck, pluck, and resilience” tied specifically to the Anglo-Indian character idealized in the Raj novels. This blend is “characteristic[ally] ethnic” in that Thatcher claims the battle for the Falklands shows an ideal of national character which is made native to the British Isles by a process of historical revisionism.

In *Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy* (2002), Heather Nunn argues that Thatcher exploited ideas of national loss and the concurrent psychic tragedy as points of entry into Britain’s national psyche: “Conservatism’s ‘systematic appeal to a providential past’ taps into ‘an imagined loss’ which accompanies the dislocation of modern identity” (51).³¹⁶ Nunn’s view of modernity as an incubator for revisionist impulses, and the motivation provided by the unresolved trauma of national loss and forgetting, is exemplified by Thatcher’s speeches during the Falklands conflict. Addressing the Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives on April 30, Thatcher praised group president, Alan Boyd, as instrumental in facilitating the formation of the Commonwealth,³¹⁷ which was “built on ideals. British ideals. And we know that what people fight for isn’t merely a standard of living or an income tax bracket or a lesser interest mortgage. It is for *ideals* . . . the ideals which

³¹⁶ See Ch. 5, “The Nation Rampant”; see also 50-53.

³¹⁷ Ironically; as Eric Evans points out in *Thatcher and Thatcherism*, Thatcher disliked the Commonwealth (102)—an attitude perhaps explained by her own nostalgic fixation on Empire and Victorian values more generally.

this country has taken all over the world.”³¹⁸ Dismissing domestic issues such as taxes and mortgages (then in dire straits) and emphasizing an abstracted vision of “British ideals” spread across the globe by empire, Thatcher locates the Falklands within a specific trajectory of past imperial success. Expanding on this idea, she states:

We were a country of might, oh yes, a very very powerful nation, recognised the world over. But even more important than being a country of might, we were a country of right and we were a country of majesty. Might, right and majesty. Might, oh great might. We were after all a very great Empire and Commonwealth . . . one of the Labour backbenchers got up [yesterday] and said to me: “Wasn’t really peace more important than anything and wasn’t it terrible that there might be bloodshed and would I not think therefore of having peace immediately so that there is no bloodshed?” And I was bound to get up and say to him: “Look, there is one thing in the world more important even than peace. It is liberty and justice and duty.”³¹⁹

Thatcher lists a series of character traits that elevates her summation of British traits (might, right, majesty; liberty, justice, duty) to an idealized level that simultaneously downplays Labour attempts to script an alternate narrative. Stuart Hall sees Thatcher’s characteristic “essentialist” approach in defining Great Britain as fundamental to her agenda: “the project, central to the politics of Thatcherism, to ground neo-liberal policies directly in an appeal to ‘the people’; to root them in the essentialist categories of commonsense experience and practical moralism – and thus to construct, not simply to awaken, classes, groups and interests into a particular definition of ‘the people.’”³²⁰ It is notable that the ideological consolidation Hall observes under Thatcher parallels that which I argue takes place in the Raj novel genre: the construction of specific classes, groups, and interests within the larger British nation. For the Raj novel genre, the constructed entity is Anglo-India, inserted into a metanarrative of imperial identity. Here, Thatcher constructs Britishness along similar lines, empowering her list of character traits by

³¹⁸ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.*

³²⁰ Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal* (London: Verso, 1988). 71.

recourse to imperial history. The rhetorical affirmation, “Might, oh great might,” is followed by a description of the empire’s legacy; the pronoun “we” binds Britain’s “great” might to its “great” Empire in a manner reminiscent of Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain’s 1897 invocation of Britain’s imperial duty: ““Great is the task, great is the responsibility, but great is the honour.””³²¹ While Thatcher speaks in the past tense, the mention of the Commonwealth situates British imperial influence as a matter of contemporary concern.

The nod to duty in Thatcher’s speech also evokes the sense, seen throughout the Raj novel genre, that adherence to duty is one of the great Anglo-Indian qualities. Recall Maud Diver’s Theo and Honor Desmond or Sara Jeannette Duncan’s Dr. Ruth Pierce, characters whose sense of national duty is so great it dictates their romantic lives. Noting her own duty in her diction—she is “bound” to reply to her critic—Thatcher then ties duty (and by extension, might, right, and majesty) to the Raj specifically via direct citation of Rudyard Kipling, used as an avatar for a prior generation of British education and moral uprightness, and for the duty of Britons to continue passing imperial virtues on to their children. Nunn writes in *Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy* that Thatcher “idolized” Kipling (135). Her 1982 speech, a celebration of the Conservative military program and the use of force in the Falklands, takes his poetry as a metonym for a model of British national character honed by service to the Raj. “I’m a great Kipling fan. I always have been,” Thatcher says, recalling how at the age of ten, her class was asked to write an essay,

. . . on just how much [Kipling] had meant, his poetry meant and how much he had meant to Britain . . . And from that time I became extremely fascinated with all his poetry and the way in which this extraordinary person had managed to capture the spirit of the age. And as I say to you, so we have the liberties for which our ancestors fought [sic] I remember he did write the most marvelous poem. It is called “Heritage”. The last four lines of it run like this: “Dear bought and clear / A thousand years our fathers’ title runs / Make we likewise their sacrifice / Defrauding not our

³²¹ Joseph Chamberlain, *Mr. Chamberlain’s Speeches*, ed. Charles Boyd (London: Constable & Co., 1914). 5.

sons”. That, of course, was the heritage which we had. When I said to that Labour Member that liberty, justice and duty are even more important than peace, I meant that we have a duty to see that those things are perpetuated not only in our own generation but to see that those of us who have inherited them pass them on to future generations and if possible try to enlarge the area of the world which enjoys it.³²²

Thatcher’s discussion of Kipling yokes the Raj poet and her statement to “that” Labour Member; she reiterates her lionization of liberty, justice, and duty, encourages the dissemination of these virtues, and locates the Falklands conflict as a symbolic moment in which British history serves as a model for comprehending contemporary British political events. Kipling, an “extraordinary person,” captured in his poetry “the spirit of the age.” Elsewhere in her speech Thatcher does acknowledge Britain’s reduced international role. Yet, she claims that if Britain did not resist Argentine incursions on the Falklands, it would tell the world dictatorships were acceptable—a statement that emphasizes Great Britain as a continuing moral (if not practical) influence in international policy-making. A sense of duty, specifically a duty to carry out moral education, and the idea that Kipling exemplified a concept of British character which indelibly characterized his time, follows the form of moralizing performed by the Raj writers.

Even the title of the Kipling poem Thatcher quotes is significant. The issue at stake is “Heritage” and how best to perpetuate the imperial virtues inherited from servants of Britain’s lost empire. This project intersects with the goals of the so-called “heritage industry,” also championed by Thatcher and legislated in the National Heritage Acts of 1980 and 1983. These acts allowed British properties to be handed over to the new Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission (1983), and placed major British museums under the oversight of non-departmental public bodies. The ensuing shift in access to Britain’s artifacts and landmarks “reworked concepts of public access and use in terms of commodification, exhibition, and display,” Alex

³²² Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

Higson writes in “Re-Presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film” (1993; 95). The heritage industry was another means by which Thatcher’s Conservative agenda mobilized Britain’s past as part of a narrative of ongoing British glory. Like the Falklands War, images drawn from the heritage industry facilitated Thatcher’s legislative agenda, which was situated as continuing the illustrious past enshrined in museums and palatial country estates.

My argument here evokes the approach taken by Salman Rushdie in his critique of Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet*, which turns on a question of *form* (Rushdie’s emphasis). Rushdie argues that the form used by 1980s Raj Revivalists makes the experience of empire solely British, rendering the legacies of imperialism insular ones that reflect British greatness even in defeat. Scott, Rushdie writes, “tells us, in effect, that the history of the end of the Raj was largely composed of the doings of the officer class and its wife” (IH 90). The pattern of representation which makes Indian characters, in Rushdie’s reading of Scott, “bit-players in their own history,” is that which I argue develops in the Raj novel genre, whose constituent texts precede Scott in insisting “*that they [the British] are the ones whose stories matter*” (IH 90; emphasis Rushdie’s). The Raj novel genre offers a template of character construction, dictating the ways Britishness can be perfected through adherence to its Anglo-Indian manifestation. The form with which Rushdie is concerned is not solely or originally Scott’s. It is a legacy of Scott’s literary forebears. The ways in which Scott and his fellow Raj Revivalists accord with the Raj novel genre’s vision of British character, and the ways in which they reconfigure that vision, evidence their debt to the patterns of thought that achieved cultural currency in the writing of Kipling and others.

When Margaret Thatcher claims, then, that Kipling captured the “spirit” of Britain’s imperial “age,” she follows the form taken by the Raj novel genre, a form that saw Britishness best embodied in the Anglo-Indian civil servants who portrayed themselves as daily modeling

might, right, and majesty in execution of their duties. Further, by praising the imperial virtues exemplified by Britain's performance in the Falklands, Thatcher tracks a model of British self-comprehension and symbolism pioneered by the Raj writers. Describing the pageantry with which Thatcher staged what he dubs a "symbolic" war, Eric Hobsbawm writes, "The forces sent to the Falklands were a mini-museum of everything which could give the Union Jack particular resonance . . . all were represented down to those little old Gurkhas. They weren't necessarily needed, but you had to have them just because this was, as it were, a recreation of something like the old Imperial durbars."³²³ What Hobsbawm points to is, in different particulars, the repetition of form which I argue underscores Thatcher's revived imperialist rhetoric. Raj imagery such as the "Gurkhas," a predominantly Nepali regiment in the Indian Army, and "Imperial durbars," at which Raj rulers were feted by Indian monarchs, reappears in the staging of the Falklands War and in discussions of that staging. These potent imperial symbols enable Thatcher's government to cast a strategically minor victory as something far more powerful. Quoting Kipling, similarly, mobilizes an arbitrary list of character traits through recourse to a deeply effective symbolic register. In each instance, the invocation of lost imperial authority appeals to what Stuart Hall calls "the deep and unrequited traces of the past"³²⁴ in 1970s and 1980s Britain. The nostalgic appeal of Thatcher's speech uses Raj novel genre form (symbols, modes of expression) to expertly exploit the melancholia of the postcolonial moment described by Paul Gilroy.

This imperial Victorian legacy recurs throughout her speech. Thatcher sets the service of fellow Conservatives alongside that of Churchill, who famously lamented the loss of Britain's Indian empire: "What spectacle could be more sorrowful than that of this powerful country casting away with both hands . . . the great inheritance which centuries have gathered? . . . It is a

³²³ Eric Hobsbawm, "Falklands Fallout," in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 262.

³²⁴ Stuart Hall, *The Hard Road to Renewal* (London: Verso, 1988). 73.

hideous act of self-mutilation, astounding to every nation in the world.”³²⁵ Churchill, Thatcher notes, served “not only our Queen but Queen Victoria. Disraeli served Queen Victoria. Peel served Queen Victoria. What I am saying is that this is the way the thread of history runs.”³²⁶ Thatcher places herself and her fellow Conservatives in a chain of imperial inheritance. They are the recipients of the imperial virtues exemplified by Kipling—and Disraeli, the Viceroy who made Queen Victoria, through the Royal Titles Bill, Empress of India. The inheritance being passed down (and lived out in the Falklands) is ideological and enforces a specific version of British national character. Thatcher emphasizes the term: “the character of Britain grew, because her people whatever their background, were prepared to take personal responsibility, had personal initiative, personal enterprise . . . We were the sort of people who could . . . decide in difficult times what we would do and carry it out. And this was the great character and great feature of Britain.”³²⁷ Thatcher uses the word “character” twice in this brief description. Such a “characteristic ethnic blend,” Gilroy’s term in *Postcolonial Melancholia*, includes for Thatcher the ability to “decide in difficult times what we would do and carry it out,” a trait upon which every Raj adventure hangs. A recurrent feature of British visions of self writ widely, it is yet notable that having evoked Kipling, Thatcher cites a list of traits (responsibility, initiative, enterprise) repeatedly emphasized in novels ranging from Flora Annie Steel’s *On the Face of the Waters* (1896) to Alice Perrin’s *The Anglo-Indians* (1912). The Raj novel genre establishes its Anglo-Indian heroes and heroines as epitomizing the qualities Thatcher references in her ideological address. Having located Kipling as the “spirit of the age,” Thatcher implicitly echoes

³²⁵ Winston Churchill, “Our Duty in India,” *The Churchill Centre and Museum*, 18 March 1931. Web. 2 Dec. 2011. Churchill’s rhetoric of duty bespeaks the larger importance of this quality in the reckoning of British national identity, and recalls the importance of the Raj novelists’ claim that duty was best performed by Anglo-Indians.

³²⁶ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*

the Raj novelists' reasoning by describing that spirit as best achieved through imperial undertaking in the remaining spaces of British overseas power.

In a subsequent speech on May 14, 1982 to the Scottish Conservative Party Conference, Thatcher takes a similar approach—and again uses Kipling to frame her ideal of Britishness. Thatcher's rhetoric about the Falklands is even more provoking in this instance, with her claim that the conflict is part of a larger imperial narrative. Argentina's actions are "coldly calculated," "unlawful," and "unprovoked," while Britain's response is "spontaneous and clear." The British and the world, Thatcher states, "knew that this invasion was one of those insidious tests, which throughout history evil has used to undermine the resolve of the good, and the world wondered would the good and the true respond? And the good and the true did."³²⁸ Again, the British traits Thatcher celebrates recall the ideals assigned to the Anglo-Indian heroes and heroines of the Raj novel genre. Roy, hero of Maud Diver's *Far to Seek* (1921), longs for British company in which men "shot remarks at each other in 'straight-flung words and true'" (224). Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* describes a lone Indian sepoy who refuses to mutiny:

Last appeal to honor and good faith, to memory and confidence. But they had passed with the day. Yet not quite . . . a solitary figure, trim and smart in the uniform of the loyal 74th, fell in and saluted. In all that wide plain one man true to his salt, heroic utterly, standing alone in the dusk. A nameless figure, like many another hero. (305)

Steel's ideal Britishness, performable even by Indians subject to colonial rule, recalls Thatcher's model of Britishness under pressure in the Falklands. The call to the British flag in Steel evokes, like Thatcher's call to her Conservative stalwarts, "honor and good faith . . . memory and confidence." The sepoy who stands up is "true" to his salt. Britishness, perfected by Anglo-Indians under the Raj, becomes good and true again in the Falklands. Once more, Thatcher forges a connection between the two in referencing Kipling; she quotes "Heritage" at the end of

³²⁸ Margaret Thatcher, "Speech to the Scottish Conservative Party Conference," *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 14 May 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

her speech after proudly claiming, “[T]he springs of pride in Britain flow again. And one of our poets said, and I finish with his words, ‘Dear bought and clear, a thousand years our fathers’ title runs. Make we likewise their sacrifice, defrauding not our sons.’”³²⁹ There is irony in justifying renewed imperial enterprise by citation of a failed “civilizing” mission, but Thatcher’s speech does not register that fact. Nor does Thatcher acknowledge the irony of situating Kipling, a frequent traveler who disliked much of his time in Britain, as the quintessential British writer.

Rather, beyond direct citation, Thatcher’s imperial rhetoric and her debt to the model of British character developed via the rigors of Anglo-Indian service are negotiated rhetorically, a process that also occurs in the artistic productions of the Raj Revival. Thatcher acknowledges the end of Britain’s Empire while claiming a new imperial role for Britain as moral authority.³³⁰ Such morality, again, depends on a vision of character and integrity upheld by memories of what is construed as British service to India, a service implicitly repeated in the rescue of the Falkland Islands residents. Argentina is cast by Thatcher as the cruel colonizer history would have Britain be—a tactic used in fiction by M.M. Kaye, whose *The Far Pavilions* follows Kipling’s *Kim* in assigning the villainous imperialist role to the Russians. Thatcher evokes the tradition of both authors (and their many counterparts) when she claims intervention in the Falklands is essential. Her speech sees Britain virtually forced to resume an imperial role: “No nation in the world has a longer or prouder record of bringing colonies to true independence than our own.”³³¹ Thatcher’s emphasis on true independence reintroduces the adjective, used previously to cast the British as “good and true,” which recurs throughout her speeches in reference to British behavior.

³²⁹ Ibid.

³³⁰ As I discuss momentarily, the Raj Revival texts often locate moral authority in their secondary characters, many of whom model a sympathetic form of ideal British character and rule traceable to the Raj novels but presented by the Revivalists as a “new race,” to use Paul Scott’s term, of ideal Anglo-Indian rulers (*The Jewel in the Crown* 283).

³³¹ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to the Scottish Conservative Party Conference,” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 14 May 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

In contrast, “What Argentina wants is not to decolonise the Falklands but in fact to put them again under a different colonial control, and one which has not had the respect for liberty and democracy which the Islanders have come to love.”³³² The Falklands residents are taken once more under Britain’s wing even while Thatcher reconfigures British imperialism as an institution that respects liberty and democracy. The refrain of “character” is again notable: Thatcher claims the Falklands conflict surprised “those who have proclaimed themselves expert at analysing our national character.”³³³ One of Thatcher’s essential contributions to the revisitation of Empire in the 1970s/1980s is to make the essentials of British national character a point of near-neurotic interest. Her speeches do not provide coherent details about who the residents of the Falkland Islands are, and aside from policy statements to the House of Commons, she does not explore in detail either the history of Argentine/British tensions or the history of United Nations and International Court of Justice interventions in the Falklands conflict. Instead, Thatcher repeatedly declaims character traits ostensibly reawakened (Hall’s critique that Thatcher constructs when she claims to awaken is salient here) in the British nation through experiences abroad. Again, this is the aim of the Raj novel genre, and once more a “form” of understanding British character pioneered by the Raj authors emerges.

Before the Falklands, Thatcher claims, some in Britain believed that “the words of the familiar Naval prayer which speaks of our fleet as the defence of all those who pass across the seas upon their lawful occasions, that these things . . . belong to the scrapbooks of nostalgia.”³³⁴ But Empire is nostalgia no longer. After the Falklands, through conscription in a new imperial project which recalls the glory days of empire, Thatcher now sees great British liners

³³² Ibid.

³³³ Ibid.

³³⁴ Ibid.

called back into service and turned round to take our reinforcements. And all this done in what has sometimes seemed an impossible schedule. Perhaps we have surprised even ourselves. And I know we have surprised all those who didn't think we had it in us. But in these things Britain still leads the world. The love of liberty in the rule of law and in the character of our people.³³⁵

Thatcher “spins” the Falkland Islands conflict to resituate Britain at the top of the global heap. Again, at points in her speech to the Scottish Conservatives, Thatcher acknowledges the setbacks of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. But simultaneously, she blurs chronology and historic actuality by using the word “still” to claim “Britain still leads the world.” The phrase establishes implicit continuity between Britain’s actual empire and Thatcher’s new moral juggernaut; Thatcher links the heyday of imperialism and the historical moment of the 1980s through shared “love of liberty in the rule of law” and “the character of our people,” confirming Thatcher’s new imperialism as character-based. The character which provides its root is an image of Britishness perfected in the rigors of service abroad—the Falkland Islands here, India in the Raj novel genre.

The idea that an aggressively renewed imperial ethos was necessary for Britain to reclaim its place among the global powers was not original to Thatcher. A sensibility of Britain under siege is visible as early as 1955, when Winston Churchill “rather maliciously” prompted a Conservative cabinet to discuss “Keep Britain White” as an electoral slogan.³³⁶ Such xenophobic sentiments were famously revisited by MP J. Enoch Powell in an April 20, 1968 speech to a Conservative association meeting in Birmingham. Powell was an admirer of British India, telling *The Times* on Feb. 12, 1968: “I fell head over heels in love with India. If I’d gone there 100 years ago, I’d have left my bones there.” Nostalgia for Britain’s lost imperial status melds in Powell’s speech with an outpouring of virulent anti-immigrant racism. The nation Powell implicitly addressed was on the verge of a massive recession; partly in response to these economic woes,

³³⁵ Ibid.

³³⁶ Harold MacMillan, *At the End of the Day, 1961-1963* (London: Macmillan, 1973). 73.

violent class and race riots had begun to break out. Decrying a recent surge in immigration, Powell mounted a defense of the British nation, and by extension the British national character, which anticipates the new imperial Britain around which Thatcher works to form consensus in her Falklands rhetoric. Deploying archetypes of Britishness such as “a middle-aged, quite ordinary working man employed in one of our nationalized industries,” Powell usurps the voice of “ordinary” citizens to rhetorically construct Britain as primarily white and working class, and willfully ignores the fact that many black persons were native-born Britons whose families had been in the United Kingdom for generations. Gilroy, making a similar point, writes that Powell’s “careful choice of symbols and metaphors suggests precise calculation”; the speech establishes Britain as racially pure before dramatically envisioning the sully of that purity.

Powell’s “quite ordinary” man grimly prognosticates that “[i]n this country in fifteen or twenty years’ time the black man will have the whip hand over the white man.” Setting “black man” and “white man” violently against one another delineates British citizens (white) from Commonwealth immigrants (black) and makes the latter emblematic of all non-white persons in Great Britain. “Like the Roman,” Powell says in the famous conclusion to his speech, “I seem to see ‘the River Tiber foaming with much blood’”³³⁷—a reference to prophecies of “wars, terrible wars” in Virgil’s *Aeneid*. With this quotation, Powell implicitly threatens violent bloodshed and the undoing of a civilization—here, Britain’s. Discussing 1970s immigration debates, into which Powell’s speech was an early, notorious intervention, Gilroy writes that the “process of national decline is presented as coinciding with the dilution of once homogenous and continuous national stock by alien strains.”³³⁸ This is the idea of Powell’s speech: Britishness, a precious “national stock” composed of “quite ordinary” white men and women, is under attack, the threat at their

³³⁷ J. Enoch Powell, *Reflections of a Statesman* (London: Bellew, 1991). 378, 379.

³³⁸ Paul Gilroy, *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* (London: Hutchison, 1987). 46.

very gates—a metaphor literalized in Powell’s image of dog excrement pushed through an old woman’s front door mail slot by “wide-grinning piccaninnies.”³³⁹ Powell ties this metaphorical forcing in of excrement to the “forcing in” of immigrant bodies across Britain’s borders. Here and in Thatcher’s speeches about the Falklands, threats to British sovereignty lead to the resurrection and reconstruction of what Britishness means in the face of imminent degradation.

By the time of Powell’s speech in 1968, Paul Scott’s 1966 novel, *The Jewel in the Crown*, had unofficially begun the Raj Revival. Five years later, J.G. Farrell’s Mutiny novel, *The Siege of Krishnapur*, was the first Raj Revival text to win the Booker. Ideological ground is thus laid for the conscription of readers within a new national project of emotional imperialism, one that uses aspects of the ideal British character embodied by Anglo-Indians in the Raj novel genre to restore the injured Britishness Powell describes. Powell’s vision of race relations in Britain as a binary struggle between incompatible entities (black/white; British/not) is less complex than Thatcher’s rhetorical constructions, which portray Britishness as a (national) character model to which others may aspire and possibly belong if they acquire the necessary traits. Yet, there is a clear trajectory³⁴⁰ between the two modes of Conservative discourse. In *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*, Paul Gilroy notes how the “reconstitution of Powellism as Thatcherism” (47) spread a ““one nation”” message that sheds the “shadows of paternalism” while retaining that paternalist attitude inasmuch as the new imperialism called for by Thatcher requires it.

The links between this rhetorical analysis and the following reading of Raj Revival texts and films is not meant to claim that Powell or Thatcher explicitly intends to reference the Raj novel genre in shaping a political atmosphere conducive to Conservative party aims, fiscal and

³³⁹ J. Enoch Powell, *Reflections of a Statesman* (London: Bellew, 1991). 379. The tie between immigration and blackness is assumed, Paul Gilroy writes in *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*, via an “ideological operation” that saw “[r]ace’ . . . bounded on all sides by the sea” in the 1970s (46).

³⁴⁰ Anthony Barnett’s articles “Fortress Thatcher,” “The dangerous dream,” and “Iron Britannia” (all 1984), and Sir Peregrine Worsthorne’s column for the *Sunday Telegraph* (Dec. 6, 1983), all cited by Gilroy, argue similarly.

domestic, in the late 1970s and 1980s. Rather, it bespeaks the political moment in which the Raj Revival fictions intervened, and makes an argument for why they were salient ideological devices at the time of issue. In his “Rivers of Blood” speech, Powell develops an image of Britain as sacrosanct, an impermeable entity threatened from without by vengeful hordes of former colonial subjects seeking to reverse the power dynamic of imperialism and exert authority over their former rulers. More subtly, in her discourse surrounding the Falklands conflict—and throughout her tenure as Prime Minister—Margaret Thatcher seeks to reestablish Great Britain as the great imperial edifice of centuries past. Analysis of Thatcher and Powell’s rhetoric best encapsulates the political atmosphere of 1970s/1980s Britain, which on the right at least cried out for a continuation of imperial power in whatever mode possible. This call, again, came at a time when British citizens could hardly avoid the evidence that they were “no longer,” to quote Thatcher’s speech to an exuberant Cheltenham crowd, “the nation that had built an Empire and ruled a quarter of the world,”³⁴¹ or that times were economically and politically grim.

An April 1968 Gallup poll found 74 percent of listeners agreed with Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech. Thatcher and, historically, large sections of the British public thus found a receptive audience for Thatcher’s anachronistic message about the ways in which Britain’s greatness could be restored through a new imperial attitude. In her address in Cheltenham, Thatcher said of those who doubted Britain’s might: “Well, they were wrong. The lesson of the Falklands is that Britain has not changed.”³⁴² Speaking to the House of Commons on June 15, Thatcher described the retaking of the islands as “a great military victory that will go down in the

³⁴¹ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Conservative Rally at Cheltenham,” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 3 July 1982. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.

³⁴² *Ibid.*

history books . . . the brilliance with which it was planned and executed is unequalled.”³⁴³

Thatcher, Gilroy argues, found a solution to Britain’s crisis of authority by “making ‘race’ and nation the framework for a rhetoric of order through which modern conservatism could voice popular protest against Britain’s post-imperial plight and marshal its historic bloc.”³⁴⁴ The turn to popular protest and the marshaling of a voting public—social critics from left and right alike attribute Thatcher’s 1982 reelection to a groundswell of patriotic feeling following the Falklands conflict—allowed Thatcher to win consensus for her policies despite continuing economic woes in Britain. Her re-created “rhetoric of order” inscribes Britain’s new role as emotional imperialist, leading the world through displays of what Thatcher called “might, right, and majesty”. Britain in the late 1970s and early 1980s once again popularly perceived itself as imperial, with the Raj, the “jewel in the crown,” key to Britain’s political destiny and national character. The hugely popular, critically-acclaimed artistic productions of this period are essential to that movement.

For the question remains: by 1982, why was Britain ready to heed Thatcher’s call? In 1968, Powell, despite popular support, was forced out of office after giving his speech. What changed during the 1970s and early 1980s to produce a horizon of expectations within which Thatcher’s Falkland Islands drama could overcome leftist protest and succeed? In “Falklands Fallout,” Eric Hobsbawm states that “we on the left had always predicted that Britain’s loss of Empire, and general decline would lead to some dramatic reaction sooner or later in British politics . . . [T]here is no question that this [the Falklands conflict] was a reaction to the decline of the British Empire” (260). Hobsbawm’s direct attribution of Thatcher’s actions and the popular acclaim that greeted them to “Britain’s loss of Empire,” accords with the theoretical

³⁴³ Margaret Thatcher, “HC S: [Falkland Islands],” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 15 June 1982. Web. 29 Sept 2011.

³⁴⁴ Paul Gilroy, *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991). 48.

framework guiding this chapter—Paul Gilroy’s diagnosis of *Postcolonial Melancholia* in Britain’s national psyche. The following series of close readings argues that such melancholia created an avid audience for Raj Revival fictions that revisited the Raj novel genre’s ideological assumptions. That audience, fed simplified visions of imperial duty and British national character, was primed by books, films, and television serials to think of Great Britain as having achieved its potential in imperial service—a service modeled by the Anglo-Indians. The Raj Revival perpetuated images of the British as natural colonizers; neither the hero of Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions*, an updating of Kipling’s *Kim*, nor Kim himself can avoid the path of authority to which their whiteness calls them. This pattern recurs throughout the Booker-winning fictions of Paul Scott, Ruth Praver Jhabvala, and J.G. Farrell. Though India is now seen as an antithesis to the British person, physically repelling or overwhelming Anglo-Indians who attempt to serve it, the country is still depicted as needing such noble service and sacrifice to the imperial ideal.

Many factors are relevant in the popular acclaim which greeted Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative policies. The virulent racism that motivated Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech and prompted Gilroy to begin his project of analyzing Britain’s national consciousness under the title *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* is particularly salient. The following analysis, however, focuses on the Raj Revival texts. Using the background of British character and the description of how the traits that best defined Britishness were modeled by Anglo-Indians in the rigors of service to the Raj, I explore once more how literary productions operate as tools for crafting ideologically persuasive fictions of nation. The Raj Revival did not cause the Falkland Islands conflict, but as a movement in popular culture, it anticipated the cultural attitudes that conflict revealed. “The loss of empire—and the additional loss of certainty about the limits of national and racial identity that result from it,” Gilroy writes, “have begun, ironically, to sustain people,

providing them with both pleasure and distraction.”³⁴⁵ In the following section I explore how that “loss of certainty” about British identity looks, and how fictional productions of the 1970s and 1980s Raj Revival provided the “pleasure and distraction” that aimed to assuage it.

“The jewel in the crown is made, these days, of paste”: Imperial Fiction for a Post-Imperial Age

The Raj Revival was a period of literary and artistic production within Great Britain that spanned the late 1960s to the mid-1980s. The first major work of this movement was *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), by Paul Scott (1920-1978). Scott followed this novel—greeted by critics as a model of insight into Britain’s imperial legacy and its new relationship with India—with three other novels comprising the *Raj Quartet* (*The Day of the Scorpion* [1968], *The Towers of Silence* [1971], and *A Division of the Spoils* [1974]).³⁴⁶ The literary agent for M.M. Kaye (1908-2004), Scott championed her monumental 1979 Raj Revival bestseller, *The Far Pavilions*; Kaye in turn had suggested the theme of Scott’s 1977 coda to the *Raj Quartet*, *Staying On*, about an elderly British couple who remain in India after Independence. This novel won the Booker and was adapted for television in 1980. *The Far Pavilions* and the *Raj Quartet* in its entirety were also adapted for television in 1984; the latter, released under the title *The Jewel in the Crown*, was a huge success, dominating the BAFTA, Emmy, and Golden Globe Awards in the acting and production categories. In contrast, *The Far Pavilions* (featuring white American actress Amy Irving in “black face” as mixed-race Indian princess Anjali-Bai) stumbled in its HBO airing.

³⁴⁵ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 106.

³⁴⁶ The origins of the term “Raj Revival” appears to trace back to Rushdie’s use of the term “Raj Revival fictions” in his essay “Outside the Whale” (*Imaginary Homelands* 87). The sudden rise of this sub-genre across a variety of media has been much commented on in analyses of 1970s/1980s British cultural history. Jenny Sharpe uses the term in her description of Paul Scott (*Allegories of Empire* 143-44); so too does Tana Wollen in her article “Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgic Screen Fictions for the 1980s” (1991). Chicago’s Museum of Broadcast Communications has also described “a cycle of film and television productions which emerged during the first half of the 1980s, which seemed to indicate Britain’s growing preoccupation with India, [and] Empire” (n pag.)

Kaye, who was born in Simla and spent much of her childhood and early married life in India, was also the author of *Shadow of the Moon*, a novel of the Indian Mutiny. Published in 1957, it was reissued in 1979 to capitalize on the success of *The Far Pavilions* and the general enthusiasm for Raj fictions. Kaye's obituary in the *Guardian* recalls her books arriving "on the Raj cultural wave – that period from the late 1970s to 1985 that encompassed the televising of the *Raj Quartet*, the David Lean film of *A Passage to India* and Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*."³⁴⁷ Despite the *Guardian*'s somewhat awkward inclusion of Rushdie's postcolonial masterpiece in "the Raj cultural wave," the perception of this period as one in which neurotic re-analysis of Britain's imperial glories consumed literary audiences is salient. Participating in the Raj Revival did not guarantee success: works such as *Zemindar* (1981) by Valerie Fitzgerald, a Mutiny novel about the siege of Lucknow, and a series of martial novels such as *The White Dacoit* (1974) by Berkely Mather,³⁴⁸ met with only middling response. They do, however, indicate the enthusiasm for Raj literary production at this time.

Other notable works that fell within the window of the Raj Revival include J.G. Farrell (1935-1979)'s Booker Prize-winning novel, *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973),³⁴⁹ a homage to—and to some extent a parody of—Mutiny novels such as Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* (1896); and Ruth Praver Jhabvala (1927-)'s Booker Prize winner, *Heat and Dust*

³⁴⁷ Veronica Horwell, "Obituary: M.M. Kaye, Novelist in harmony with the far pavilions of her Indian youth," *The Guardian*, 4 February 2004. Horwell locates the Raj "cultural wave" in the "late 1970s to 1985," but this move seems guided by the broadcasting of the film versions of books and ignores the fact that the texts themselves were published in the previous decade and achieved their greatest success at that point.

³⁴⁸ The author's real name is John Evan Weston-Davies. His other Raj Revival works include *The Memsahib* (1977).

³⁴⁹ Farrell was born in Liverpool, the second son in an Anglo-Irish family. His fictional output is highlighted by the Empire Trilogy, of which *The Siege of Krishnapur* forms the second book. The first, *Troubles* (1970), deals with struggles between Catholics and Protestants in 1910s/1920s Ireland. The third, *The Singapore Grip* (1978), features a British family running a trading company in World War II-era Singapore. The three texts are linked thematically by the examination of life in varied venues of imperial Britain.

(1975),³⁵⁰ adapted for the screen by British film production company Merchant-Ivory in 1983, the year that Sir Richard Attenborough's epic biographical film, *Gandhi* (1983), swept the Academy Awards. A year later, Merchant-Ivory's adaptation of E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, directed by David Lean (1908-1991), was released and feted at the Oscars; Jhabvala wrote the screenplay. The film notably dulls the novel's pessimistic tone, and spotlights British nobility. In the nonfiction genre, 1975 saw the successful publication of *Freedom at Midnight*, by Larry Collins and Dominique LaPierre, a narrative nonfiction work (based on research and interviews, but written in a casual tone) about the lead-up to Indian Independence and Partition. Its success led LaPierre to produce a second work on India, the novel *City of Joy* (1985), about a notorious Calcutta slum.³⁵¹ Also in the 1970s, the BBC aired a series of interviews with former Anglo-Indians, termed "survivors" of the British Raj; the program was so successful that a printed book, *Plain Tales from the Raj* (1975), went into six subsequent editions.³⁵² The anthology leans heavily on quotations from Raj novelists Maud Diver and Rudyard Kipling.

Within this wealth of literary and filmic production, space constraints lead me to limit my analysis to the most successful—based on critical and financial success in the 1970s and 1980s—

³⁵⁰ Jhabvala, a German Jew who immigrated to Britain with her parents in 1939, moved to post-Independence Delhi with her husband, Parsi architect Cyrus Jhabvala, in 1951. After moving to New York in 1975, she divided her time between the United States and India. Jhabvala wrote five novels of India prior to *Heat and Dust*, including *The Householder* (1960); after writing the screenplay for the 1960 Merchant-Ivory film of this novel, she penned screenplays for Merchant-Ivory for twenty years, winning Oscars for *A Room With A View* (1985) and *Howard's End* (1992), both of which examine aspects of British cultural identity. While the breadth of Jhabvala's career offers numerous objects of study, I focus on *Heat and Dust* because of its Booker Prize win, the timing of its popularity in relation to the Raj Revival, and its applicability to my discussion of Raj novel genre themes in Chapters I-IV.

³⁵¹ Notably, *City of Joy* focuses on the efforts of white characters (a Polish priest and an American doctor) to work in the slum of "Anand Nagar" and improve the lives of its residents there. While a novel, it draws heavily on real-life inspiration. The implicit message of the book is that poverty and social injustice in India still cry out for Western intervention; while this is in keeping with the "theme" of the Raj Revival novels, there is no explicit reference to Britain's Indian Empire within this work, or in the subsequent film adaptation starring Patrick Swayze (1992).

³⁵² In a testament to its ongoing popularity, *Plain Tales from the Raj* was reissued—along with similar volumes about Britain's African (*Tales from the Dark Continent*; 1979) and Pacific Empires (*Tales from the South China Seas*; 1984)—as a 2008 anthology, *Plain Tales from the British Empire: Images of the British in India, Africa, and South-East Asia*. Charles Allen collected and edited all three volumes, as well as the anthology edition.

Raj Revival novels: Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* and *Staying On*; Kaye's *The Far Pavilions*; Farrell's *The Siege of Krishnapur*; and Jhabvala's *Heat and Dust*. Exploring the ways in which these works observe and comment on one another, and on the Raj novel genre texts, reveals how the ostensibly post-colonial, in the sense of "after" empire, Raj Revival incorporates a renewed imperial impulse supportive of the political atmosphere in which Margaret Thatcher's Tory agenda met with such avid reception. Using the films, television productions, and other Raj Revival novels to support and expand on trends of theme, character, and plotting, I show a general ideological consensus among the Raj Revival texts. Expressed in different styles and with varying degrees of certainty, there is nonetheless an optimistic approach in these works to the idea of imperialism, a sense that had the British Empire only been given more time, it might yet have done great things for India.³⁵³ In making this claim, the Raj Revival novels perpetuate the Anglo-Indian ideality produced in the Raj novel genre. By giving character traits and plot elements (the rape from Forster's *A Passage to India*, reexamined by Scott and Lean; the savvy British man who predicts the Mutiny, reexamined by Kaye and Farrell; British and Indian love affairs, explored by Kaye, Scott, and Jhabvala) a more politically correct coating with regards to race and gender, the Raj Revival novels reinstitute the idea that the Anglo-Indians were a unique and ideal group of men and women. As in the Raj novel genre, this claim is supported by emphasis on India's supposed need for Britain, and by the subtle reworking of stereotypes of Indian insufficiency in the face of "authentic" Anglo-Indian knowledge. The Raj Revivalists tout

³⁵³ Hanging over this sentiment is the cloud of Partition and the terrible violence that accompanied the division of the subcontinent into India, Pakistan, and East Pakistan (now Bangladesh). A great effort is made in the Raj Revival novels and in the nonfiction work *Freedom at Midnight* to absolve the British of responsibility. For instance, Collins and LaPierre, basing their claims on interviews with Lord Edward Mountbatten, last Viceroy of India, slot the blame for Partition onto Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the Muslim founder of Pakistan. Elsewhere, Scott ends *The Jewel in the Crown* with a reference to that "awful savagery – that Hindu-Muslim bloodbath last year that marked the end of our unifying and civilizing years of power and influence" (446). Simultaneously, the narrating character (British matriarch Lady Manners) claims the British "allowed" Partition violence to take place. This tactic of condemning while still maintaining an illusion of decisive British authority and knowledge is rife amongst the Raj Revival works.

the ability of their heroes and heroines to perceive the inevitable failure of the imperial project, whilst simultaneously conveying the tragedy the Raj Revival construes said failure to be.

The effect of this approach is to resurrect the model of British character scripted in the Raj novel genre from the mid-nineteenth century onward. The Raj Revival texts repeat the claim that Anglo-Indians were an idealized quasi-nation; at times, the Raj Revivalists embrace this as truth even when purporting to reject it. My analysis of British character focuses on the legacy of the Raj novel genre within the Raj Revival novels, the ways in which a continuing conscription of British persons to an imperial ideal of national service and personal character occurred, and how it helped foment the political environment of 1970s and 1980s Britain. Margaret Thatcher's administration worked to carry out the new imperialism for which the Raj Revival novels called, to reinvigorate the imperial ideal authors such as Paul Scott and M.M. Kaye portrayed as still pertinent three decades after the end of the Raj. The loss of empire is construed as a tragedy, a profoundly felt national sorrow which the Raj Revival texts attempt to ameliorate.

Writing about the Raj Revival in "Outside the Whale" (1983), Salman Rushdie slots these texts within "a very long line of fake portraits inflicted by the West on the East," the mode of fantastic projection described by Edward Said in *Orientalism*—itself published in 1978, as the Raj Revival gained steam. Rushdie argues that the Raj Revival texts "provide moral, cultural, and artistic justifications for imperialism and its underpinning ideology" (*Imaginary Homelands* 88, 89), a fact borne out in the revived political imperialism that Thatcher's Falklands conflict embodied. While arguing that the Raj Revival texts do not add new elements to the process of Orientalist stereotyping, Rushdie concedes the appeal of these novels. While it "would be easy to conclude that such material could not possibly be taken seriously by anyone, and that it is therefore unnecessary to get worked up about it," this "quietest option" ignores the fact that "in

Britain today the refurbishment of the Empire's tarnished image is under way. The continuing decline, the growing poverty, and the meanness of spirit of much of Thatcherite Britain encourages many Britons to turn their eyes nostalgically to the lost hour of their precedence" (*IH* 88, 91-92). The ambivalence Rushdie detects in British audiences (our desire is not serious; but it is) mirrors the technique the Raj Revivalists use to masterful effect in their fictional productions. By seeming to set aside the old ideals of the Raj novel genre in favor of ostensibly more complex creations, the Raj Revivalists are free to continue projecting the same idea of British character in the background, subtly reinserting it beneath more "modern" surface plots. The protagonists of the Raj Revival novels are placed in contact with and seem to condemn what is now depicted—in the spirit of E.M. Forster—as small-minded Anglo-Indian attitudes. Yet, in this space of difference between protagonists, admirable secondary characters, and the Anglo-Indian masses, the Raj Revival texts reassert the superiority of the best Anglo-Indians, dismissing inferior members of the larger community as not constitutive of true Britishness. The ambivalent protagonists are seen as outliers, with the ideal in the middle—the secondary figures.

Such techniques recall the Raj novel genre's globe-trotter device. Contrasting British persons from "Home" with Anglo-Indians allowed Raj authors such as Kipling to portray bad British behavior with appropriate shock and horror: "[H]ow on earth could I have known that this innocent, fluffy T. G. would break out in this disgusting manner?" (*Plain Tales from the Hills* 266). The reader must decide who is more ill-mannered, the globe-trotter who calls the Raj servants "colonists" and insists on "shooting tigers on the Station Mall" (263), or the Anglo-Indians, appalled at his behavior. Contrast permits dismissal of "Home" Britons but maintains the right to poke fun at Anglo-India's foibles. In this and many other respects, Kipling and the other Raj novel genre authors are a touchstone for the Raj Revivalists. Outlining the plots of the

bulky Raj Revival texts—Kaye’s is the longest at 955 pages—demonstrates the direct influence of the Raj novel genre on the stories, themes, and characters of the Revivalists, what Rushdie refers to as “identical strategies of what, to be polite, one must call borrowing” (*IH* 89). After tracking similarities between the nineteenth and early twentieth-century texts and their late twentieth-century counterparts, I provide an analysis of the Raj Revival texts’ ideological components, highlighting similarities between their image of British national character and that of the Raj novel genre.

Having mentioned Kipling, it is appropriate to begin with M.M. Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions*, a fictional exploration of the question, “What if Kim grew up?” *The Far Pavilions* is the story of a British boy, Ashton Pelham-Martyn. The history of his mother, Isobel, a young woman drawn to India by the glamour of the Northwest Frontier and the desire to assist her brother with housekeeping, duplicates Honor’s in Maud Diver’s *Captain Desmond, V.C.* (1907). Orphaned as a youth,³⁵⁴ Ash is raised by his *ayah*, Sita, in the treacherous Indian kingdom of Gulkote, near the Himalayas, where he befriends the princess Anjuli. After being educated in Britain and rebelling against the commands of his elite military unit, the Corps of Guides, Ash meets Anjuli as an adult and they fall in love. But Ash must escort Anjuli to be married; only after he saves her from forced *suttee* on her dissolute husband’s funeral pyre do they wed. Kaye’s book then shifts to a historical retreading of the Second Afghan War, with a focus on Ash’s friend and fellow Guide, Walter “Wally” Hamilton, who dies heroically defending the Kabul Residency. *The Far Pavilions* copies the origin story of Kipling’s *Kim*: Ash is orphaned, grows up a bazaar boy (49) with an unreadable packet of papers to confirm his identity (103;

³⁵⁴ Sita’s attempts to return Ash to the British are thwarted by the outbreak of the Mutiny; Kaye is thus able to incorporate a Mutiny narrative—and a rehash of Mutiny horrors—in *The Far Pavilions*, even though her main characters’ ages make this event irrelevant to the book as a whole. *Shadow of the Moon* is solely a Mutiny narrative, and follows many of the conventions visible in the works of Flora Annie Steel and B.M. Croker.

105-7); intrigues the British military because of his ability to “pass” for Indian and thus spy for Britain (208); and debates his identity in diction that echoes Kipling’s famous “What is Kim?” quandary: Ash felt “an intense longing to be rid of pretence and be himself – only himself. But which self? Who was he? Ashton ...? Ashok ...? Akbar ...?”³⁵⁵ Which? Which two could he discard? Or must he always be an amalgam of all three[?]” (874-75). In the end, Ash and Anjali forsake Britain and India to ““build [their] own world”” in a “lost” Himalayan valley (949).

Less sweeping in scope than Kaye’s novel, J.G. Farrell’s *The Siege of Krishnapur* plays satirically on Mutiny novel conventions while re-circulating key character tropes and images in a manner that recalls Steel and B.M. Croker’s Mutiny works. Farrell’s book follows the fictional garrison of Krishnapur through the misery of an extended 1857 siege. His protagonist, the progressive Collector Mr. Hopkins, a man of science enamored with the Great Exhibition of 1851, recalls Steel’s Jim Douglas in his ability to anticipate the Mutiny. Tropes of the buildup to the rebellion (the spread of mysterious chapattis; cartridges reportedly greased with beef and pork fat; the corrupt state of East India Company rule) are rehearsed; *The Siege of Krishnapur* then settles in for an extended tale of siege rigors (a similar progression takes place in Kaye’s *Shadow of the Moon* and Fitzgerald’s *Zemindar*). Farrell uses staged intellectual debates between characters trapped in the Residency—aesthete George Fleury, who rejects materialist philosophy; heroic subaltern Harry Dunstaple; the phrenology-obsessed atheist Magistrate—to critique Victorian philosophies and pseudo-sciences that justified imperialism. But in staging the deaths of beloved characters, including many innocent British children and women, showing the tolerant nature of the Collector, the heroism of Fleury and Harry, and intricately detailing the misery of those trapped in the residency, Farrell’s novel promotes sympathy for the British.

³⁵⁵ Ashton is Ash’s birth name; Ashok is the Indian name under which he is raised by Sita; Akbar is the name he takes on in the final stages of the book when spying on the Afghans for the British.

This is a tactic similar to Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*, which re-writes Forster's *A Passage to India*. Forster makes the "rape" of Adela Quested by the Indian Dr. Aziz hysterical fancy; Scott announces his opposite intention in the book's first line: "This is the story of a rape" (1). Set in August 1942, the action of *The Jewel in the Crown* is spurred by Mahatma Gandhi's "Quit India" protests and strikes—a move that recalls Maud Diver's *Far to Seek* (1921) and the instigation of action via the 1919 Rowlatt Act. Scott's novel begins with an attack on elderly mission school teacher Edwina Crane and her Indian colleague, Mr. Chadhuri, who is killed. From this scene of violence, Scott records the events leading up to the gang rape of a British woman, Daphne Manners, by Indian peasants in the Bibighar Gardens. This violation is explicitly related by Scott to the imperial relationship between Britain and India.³⁵⁶ Daphne is in love with Hari Kumar, an Indian man educated in England from the age of two; Hari is more "British" than many white characters in the novel, including villainous District Superintendent of Police Ronald Merrick. Hari and a group of young Indian radicals are arrested for Daphne's rape; Daphne goes to the Himalayas to bear a daughter, Parvati, and dies in childbirth. The novel's anonymous narrator interviews the Indian and British residents of Mayapore, where the rape occurred, in an attempt to truthfully tell the story.

Scott's depiction of imperialism is, on the surface, one of the most nuanced in the Raj Revival novels. This claim is complicated, however, by Scott's decision to render literal what Forster made ironic—an overwhelming fear of India producing hysterical visions of violation. In

³⁵⁶ Daphne writes in her journal, "There is that old, disreputable saying . . . 'When rape is inevitable, lie back and enjoy it.' Well, there has been more than one rape. I can't say . . . that I lay back and enjoyed mine. But Lili [an elderly Indian woman with whom Daphne lives] was trying to lie back and enjoy what we've done to her country. I don't mean done in malice. Perhaps there was love" (434). Scott's comparison of the relationship between India and Britain to a love story is a common Raj Revival tactic; here, it problematically elides the brutal violence of rape, recalling Pamela Lothspeich's description of Forster's *A Passage to India*, which "discredits" Adela's rape to expose a "greater horror . . . the rape of a nation" (9). One of Scott's focuses in rewriting Forster seems to be undoing this idea of Britain "assaulting" India; Daphne's experiences are downplayed in favor of such symbolic focus.

Staying On, Scott confines himself more rigidly to the postcolonial milieu. Set in 1972 at the remote hill station of Pankot, where Col. “Tusker” Smalley and his wife Lucy have retired after “staying on” in independent India, the novel begins with Tusker’s death from a heart attack. He has received a notice of eviction from Mrs. Bhoolabhoy, his grotesque, rapacious Indian landlady, and a stand-in for the new commercial India which Scott makes antithetical to the old style of British civility embodied by Tusker and Lucy. Through a series of domestic disputes, wryly observed by the Smalleys’ only remaining servant, Ibrahim, and by Mr. Bhoolabhoy, *Staying On* reprises Tusker and Lucy’s love story, a narrative linked, somewhat heavy-handedly, to the rise and fall of the British Empire: the dominant symbol in the book is an image of the sun shining on Lucy and Tusker’s union. As the sun “sets” on the Raj, romance leaves the couple’s marriage. In the end, it becomes clear they have stayed on for nothing, and Lucy is left alone, sobbing on her “throne”—an outdated and old-fashioned toilet (thunder-box). But while Scott deconstructs symbols of British imperial might, he casts the necessity of that deconstruction as tragic, and in the character of Mrs. Bhoolabhoy, scripts a shallow and crass future for India.

Finally, *Heat and Dust*, by Ruth Praver Jhabvala, which with *Staying On* is the Raj Revival text least obviously indebted in its plotting to the Raj novel genre. Split between the 1970s and the 1920s, it is the story of an unnamed British woman who travels to India to research the story of Olivia Rivers, her grandfather Douglas Rivers’ first wife. Olivia became pregnant after a relationship with a local Indian ruler, the Nawab (also unnamed); she aborts the child but leaves with the Nawab and spends the remainder of her life in the Himalayas. In the 1970s, the narrator finds her own life mirroring Olivia’s: after sex with her Indian landlord Inder Lal (in the Hindu shrine where Olivia first slept with the Nawab), the narrator learns she is also pregnant. Deciding to keep the baby, she travels to the Himalayas to give birth in a remote

ashram near the house where Olivia died. Both the 1970s narrative, which pokes fun at spiritual tourism to India and the life of young Indian dilettantes in Britain,³⁵⁷ and the focus on interracial romance, set *Heat and Dust* apart. However, as this analysis will show, the depiction of Douglas Rivers and Jhabvala's portrayal of Anglo-Indian society more generally are strongly indebted to the work of authors such as Sara Jeannette Duncan, Alice Perrin, and Maud Diver.

Taken *en masse*, the heroes and heroines of the Raj Revival no longer embody the simple tally of ideal qualities seen in, say, Diver's heroic Desmonds. Where Raj authors such as Diver and Croker paired British men with British women and teased drama out of their struggles to live up to the ideals of Anglo-Indian masculinity and femininity required by Raj service, the Raj Revivalists incorporate characters of this type but relegate them to a secondary status. District Commissioner Robin White in *The Jewel in the Crown*, Wally Hamilton in *The Far Pavilions*, and Douglas Rivers in *Heat and Dust* are prime examples. In the Collector, Farrell maintains a British ideal as his novel's hero. However, *The Siege of Krishnapur* undercuts easy assumptions of ideality by showing Hopkins' familial difficulties and his struggle to relate his "civilized" ideals to real experience in India. Scott also treads the middle ground in *Staying On*, showing the Smalleys to be themselves lapsed ideals, possibilities foreclosed by the passage of time. With Anglo-Indian character modeling still enshrined, but on the sidelines, the Raj Revival's primary characters are ambivalent, and this new complexity allows a portrayal of race and gender more politically appropriate to the post-colonial era. Further, it introduces a venue within which postmodern ideas of narrative unreliability and the multivalent nature of narrative are examined. Again recalling Forster's *A Passage to India*, Scott and Jhabvala create multi-layered narratives that trouble reliable witness as part of their theme. And Farrell, like Sara Jeannette Duncan and Kipling, uses irony to explore the pitfalls of imperialism.

³⁵⁷ Also a target for Scott in *Staying On*, though he has Indian characters do the mocking. See 163-65.

On the surface, then, the Raj Revival texts acknowledge and partially condemn the aims of British imperialism. This critique is often subtle: in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, the Collector anticipates the Mutiny and orders that the Residency be surrounded by earthen ramparts. When the monsoons arrive and India explodes with growth, the ramparts obstinately melt, despite being propped up by the trappings of British modernity. The image of British defenses turning to Indian earth despite a conglomeration of scientific and artistic objects thrust into their midst, “bookcases full of elevating and instructional volumes, embroidered samplers, teaset[sic] of bone china” (268), encapsulates the futility of the imperial enterprise. Other critiques are more direct. In *The Far Pavilions*, Ash condemns small-minded British officers in a speech that recalls Maud Diver’s preference for direct ideological address to the reader:

[He] . . . is precisely the type of supercilious, bone-headed bastard who ought never to be allowed to set foot in this country, for he and his kind can ruin the lifework of a thousand good men by a single fatuous display of rudeness and insularity. Thank God there are only a very few of them. But even one would be too many, and it is depressing to think that our descendents will probably accept the view that dear Lionel was “typical,” and that the whole damned lot of us, from Clive onwards, were a bunch of pompous, insular, overbearing and mannerless poops! (498-99)

Kaye denigrates bad behavior by racist British persons who would keep Indians separate from their rulers—Ash’s rant occurs when he is chastised for socializing with Indian servants whom Ash considers friends. But simultaneously, Kaye follows the Raj novel genre in distinguishing the racists from the Anglo-Indian norm (“Thank God there are only a very few of them”) and the bulk of Anglo-Indian history. By linking better Anglo-Indians to “Clive onwards,” the history of British rule in India is portrayed as separate from the racist behavior Ash despises. Again, this technique parallels Diver and Alice Perrin, whose Raj novels celebrate Anglo-India’s history as teaching a better form of rule. Paul Scott also acknowledges the loss of British precedence in *Staying On*, but casts it as a quiet tragedy: Lucy asks Ibrahim to recall the days when it was felt,

“‘An Englishman’s word is as good as his bond because he is known throughout the world to be an honest man.’ / ‘Honest because British, Memsahib.’ / ‘Yes, Ibrahim. But that is all so long ago’” (44). England’s loss of face becomes a loss for the world;³⁵⁸ it has happened, and Lucy and Tusker are unquestionably at India’s mercy, losing their home to the greedy Mrs. Bhoolabhoy, but the reader is subtly urged to question whether this situation is preferable to life under the Raj.

Ruth Praver Jhabvala also uses contrast to stage an ostensive critique of imperialism. In *Heat and Dust*, Olivia and Douglas’ friend, Major Minnies, is “so sympathetic to India” that he and his wife stay on after Independence in Ooty (170). Yet the monograph the Major publishes in retirement about “‘the influence of India on the European consciousness and character’” reads as “a warning” (170) to the 1970s narrator. Such simultaneous affection and distaste reinforces Jhabvala’s message, summed up in her novel’s title, that a near environmental antipathy drives residents of India and Britain apart. This disconnection removes the onus or blame from the British; they cannot take the heat,³⁵⁹ but this is environmental weakness rather than weakness of government or policy. Jhabvala claims Major Minnies saw India as “an opponent, even sometimes an enemy, to be guarded and if necessary fought against from without and, especially, from within,” yet the Major’s monograph argues that India is dangerous to the British because it appeals to a weakness “in the most sensitive, often the finest people – and, moreover, in their finest feelings” (171). The best elements of the best British are vulnerable to India. What looks to a contemporary reader of *Heat and Dust* like outmoded imperial fear-mongering (India as

³⁵⁸ This rhetorical gesture resonates with Margaret Thatcher’s repeated claim in her speeches about the Falklands that Britain’s actions would be a moral influence on the world, and that British failure to be decisive or to follow the dictates of duty would somehow justify the existence of dictatorships internationally.

³⁵⁹ J.M. Coetzee, pithily summarizing the plight of *A Passage to India*’s Adela Quested in the novel *Elizabeth Costello* (2003), calls her “the one who cannot take it, who panics and shames everyone. Who cannot take the heat” (144). Jhabvala’s British characters literally embody this dilemma; the heat and dust of India mirrors their emotional reactions until it becomes unclear if the British are in control of India or the Indian environment in control of them.

opponent) is thus transmuted into an elevating gesture. Again, this is the sort of ‘critique’ of the Raj made by Alice Perrin in *The Anglo-Indians* (1912). Like the Major, Perrin’s heroine, Fay, is “enraptured” by India (115); the Major recites Urdu poetry fluently (*Heat and Dust* 150) while Fay reads endlessly about the country (*The Anglo-Indians* 32). But Fay finally rejects such fascination in accordance with proper British behavior—the course recommended by Major Minnies: “She knew that the old enchantment of the East would hold her in its grip no longer to the same absorbing, overmastering extent” (289). The terms “absorbing” and “overmastering” occur also in *Heat and Dust*, but in a different context. Where Fay breaks free from India’s mastery, the 1970s narrator of *Heat and Dust* desires absorption into Indian life: “I felt part of it all – absorbed as I had been absorbed by the worshipping crowd packed into the shrine” (67). In this contrast, Jhabvala pays homage to the better type of Anglo-Indian, serving the country from “Clive onwards,” in M.M. Kaye’s words, while showing that fear and distaste for absorption in the country is a thing of the past. Here is her real critique of the Raj as imperial institution: it refused to truly engage with the country it ruled, despite loud protestations to the contrary.

But if the Raj Revival texts dwell in an area of uncertainty with regards to colonialism, it is not necessarily because they do not believe in the aims of the imperial mission. Rather, these texts repeatedly express faith in the attitude or spirit behind British rule in India—a spirit betrayed by mismanagement, not the failure of imperialism as an institution. Edward Said writes in *Culture and Imperialism* that Rudyard Kipling’s novel *Kim* “not only depended on a long history of Anglo-Indian perspective, but also, in spite of itself, forecast the untenability of that perspective in its insistence on the belief that the Indian reality required, indeed beseeched British tutelage more or less indefinitely” (xxi). To shift this claim forward, the tension in the Raj Revival productions, which depend like Kipling on a “long history of Anglo-Indian perspective,”

is between the forced recognition (*viz* the historical fact of Indian Independence) of imperial rule's untenability and the belief that, nonetheless, India did "beseech" British aid "more or less indefinitely."³⁶⁰ Criticism of the imperial institution takes place in the Raj Revival largely because the Raj's actual end makes discussion of its failure unavoidable. Said argues that "[a]ppeals to the past are among the commonest of strategies in interpretations of the present"; these appeals are animated by "uncertainty about whether the past really is past, over and concluded, or whether it continues, albeit in different forms" (*Culture and Imperialism* 3). This is the dilemma that drives the Raj Revivalists. Even as they critique the imperial scene, they question whether it should be past. Emblematic of this negotiation is filmmaker David Lean.

Speaking to the *Guardian* in 1984 about his film adaptation of *A Passage to India*, Lean said, "Forster was a bit anti-English, anti-Raj and so on. I suppose it's a tricky thing to say, but I'm not so much . . . I don't believe all the English were a lot of idiots."³⁶¹ Lean's goes on to list changes he made to Forster's text in the transition to film: the removal of *A Passage to India*'s famous ending, which states the impossibility of ongoing British/Indian relations; greater focus on Adela's character, and new scenes to make her more sexually vibrant (in the book, Lean says, she is an "absolute 'stick'" and "quite uninteresting"); the portrayal of the "Bridge Party," in Forster an awkward staged encounter between British and Indians, as fun and relaxed ("I think Forster went a little bit overboard," Lean says of his decision to remove dialogue from the novel that criticizes British conduct); restaging the rape trial to emphasize the death of Mrs. Moore and

³⁶⁰ This belief seems to emerge most strongly in the works of M.M. Kaye, born to an Anglo-Indian family, married to an Anglo-Indian, and the only Raj Revival author to live in India under the Raj. Jhabvala, as noted, married an Indian man and lived in post-Independence India from 1951 on; Scott visited post-Independence India several times but did not live there; Farrell did not visit India. Kaye's experiences, shared with later Raj novelists such as Diver and melded with her stated adoration for Kipling (see Introduction), perhaps explains the particularly striking ideological and stylistic similarities between her works and those of the Raj novel genre.

³⁶¹ Derek Malcolm, "David Lean in Conversation with Derek Malcolm," *The Guardian*, 23 Jan. 1984.

to cast the Anglo-Indian community's behavior in a more flattering, powerful light.³⁶² Lean's edits and the logic motivating them are redolent of Raj novel ideology. For instance, in re-envisioning Adela, Lean says, "I thought that I had to find a way that fills her out a little more, to let you see that she is beginning to awaken sexually . . . because India can do this, you know."³⁶³ Adela's "awakening," in the film of *A Passage to India*, occurs when she finds and contemplates ancient Indian statues in sexual poses. Its (desexualized) Raj novel equivalent is Anne Crivener's "awakening" in Perrin's *Idolatry* (1909), in which the female protagonist contemplates ancient Indian religious statues and feels her soul come to life. Lean's precise repetition of a Raj novel scenario, and his general claim that personal changes are allowed by a transcendent encounter with the Indian landscape, encapsulates the fundamental denial of Forster's ambivalence enacted by Lean's film and Jhabvala's screenplay. The movie version of *A Passage to India* nullifies Forster's pessimistic deconstruction of the Raj novel genre's claims for Anglo-Indian ideality, and makes *A Passage to India*, as a film, what the book was not: an avid championing of the Raj novel genre's valorization of Anglo-Indian rule.

Lean's direct embrace of Raj ideology is extreme. But throughout the Raj Revival, less emphatic airings of the question—Yes, the Raj ended, but should it have?—color Indian independence with a sort of injustice, a wrong done by Indians to the British. In redressing that wrong, the Raj Revival retraces steps made in the Raj novel genre, similarly constituting ideal Anglo-Indian character and reestablishing the clear purpose, accurate knowledge, and heartfelt affection of imperial rule's practitioners in a recuperative effort more subtle, but no less ideologically inflected, than the alterations to Forster's resolutely ambivalent text.

³⁶² The English have "got to be worthy opponents," Lean said—and while this change has the effect of valorizing Aziz by defeat of a more powerful foe, it—as with moving the death of Mrs. Moore to a central point in the trial—keeps the focus on the British as, following Rushdie, "the ones whose stories *matter*". All quotes from Harlan Kennedy's "David Lean in Interview: *A Passage to India*" (1985).

³⁶³ *Ibid.*

Romance and Revival: The Inherited Ideal of British National Character

Only the later Raj novelists (Maud Diver, Sara Jeannette Duncan, E.M. Forster, and to some extent Alice Perrin) seriously confronted the idea of Indian Independence. Reflecting the different times at which they wrote, Duncan—the earliest—does not deeply entertain it, while Forster treats the issue with cool pessimism and Perrin and Diver strive to promote a new mode of imperial rule that will stir up readers in service of a reconfigured Empire. None of these attitudes properly anticipate the post-colonial reality within which the Raj Revival works appear, and the critique of imperialism delivered in the Raj Revival texts and films is thus distinct from that in the Raj novel genre because of the former's knowledge of post-Independence history. But in terms of affection and authoritative knowledge, and in the portrayal of characters who express that knowledge, the Raj Revivalists continue the ideological project set out for them in the genre upon whose conventions they play.

By analyzing the ways in which the Raj Revival texts reiterate the value system of ideal Britishness put forth in the Raj novel genre, the continually coercive power of Raj novel visions of Anglo-Indian character—and the importance of Anglo-India to the British nation—emerges strikingly unaffected by historical fact. The Raj may be no more, but the attitudes the Raj propagated, the idea that service to that institution bred Anglo-Indian men and women of unique strength, dignity, devotion to duty, and moral integrity, remains. It is such quality, Rushdie reminds readers in “Outside the Whale,” that makes the Raj Revival texts dangerous. Having praised the acting in *The Jewel in the Crown* miniseries, particularly Peggy Ashcroft as Barbie (a character in later *Raj Quartet* novels), and Susan Wooldridge as Daphne, Rushdie cautions that such impressive performances “run the grave risk of helping to shore up the conservatism, by offering it the fictional glamour which its reality so grievously lacks” (92). Showing the British

to be good, Rushdie argues, repeats Raj Revival attempts to shore up “the fantasy that the British Empire represented something ‘noble’ or ‘great’ about Britain; that it was, in spite of all its flaws and meanness and bigotries, fundamentally glamorous” (101). While I concur with Rushdie, my analysis goes further, suggesting that the Raj Revival productions argue for the British Empire being in spite of its shortcomings fundamentally good, in a moral sense and in a practical sense of being “good for” the Indians it colonized, who continue to be depicted in the Raj Revival as necessitating British intervention and ‘love’.

These implications are often veiled, however. The only protagonist who continues the pattern of (somewhat ameliorated) heroism modeled by the Raj novel genre is the Collector in Farrell’s *The Siege of Krishnapur*. As such, he offers a point at which the traits that define ideal Anglo-Indians in the Raj novels may be recalled. “[L]arge and handsome,” the Collector is “a man of considerable dignity, too, with a keen, but erratic, sense of social proprieties” (6). Like Jim Douglas in Flora Annie Steel’s *On the Face of the Waters*, the Collector deduces from the appearance of the chapattis and unease among the sepoys that an uprising is nigh. Much in *The Siege of Krishnapur* is played humorously by Farrell, but here the joke elevates the Collector, whose warnings only amuse oblivious Company authorities (30-32). Like Steel’s Douglas, the Collector is not fully idealized; he struggles to relate to his children, a difficulty which stems from retention of Victorian gender divisions.³⁶⁴ For the Collector, even croquet is a test of personal capacity: he wins “game after game, implacably, because it was his duty . . . and his daughters lost game after game, because they were weak” (68). Here, Farrell, writing in an era

³⁶⁴ The Collector strives to understand what he views as an excess of emotion in his daughters; in perceiving the distance between father and children, Farrell implicitly describes the ways in which strict gender roles lead to male-female separation: “Although, of course, it was right that they should love and respect him as their father, what did they really know of him? His real self was a perfect stranger to them . . . he often thought that he would have liked to understand them better, but how could he?” (164). The specifics of this disconnect might be yoked to the Collector’s difficulty connecting to the Indians as imperial subjects; however, Farrell’s text does not make this link.

that saw the 1970s rise of second-wave feminism,³⁶⁵ satirizes the assumed hierarchies of male and female “duty” so strenuously regulated by the Raj novel genre. It is an interesting aspect of the Raj Revival that its texts and films often break down gender stereotypes inherited from the Raj novelists, but do not deconstruct racial stereotypes in the same way. Farrell’s satirical claim that it is the Collector’s “duty” to punish his daughters’ “female” weakness undermines the strict gender stratifications produced by the Raj writers. The effect is similar to depictions of female sexual freedom in Paul Scott, Ruth Praver Jhabvala, and, via his sexualizing of Adela, David Lean in *A Passage to India*. Yet, despite the postcolonial moment and the rise, concurrent with feminism, of brilliant deconstructions of Britain’s ongoing imperial racism by authors such as Frantz Fanon and Chinua Achebe,³⁶⁶ the Raj Revivalists’ critique does not extend to the idea that Britain’s “service” of India as colonial master was similarly misguided. Does this stem from gender offering a somehow clearer site at which the Raj Revival can claim it corrects outdated views? This is Lean’s attitude in describing his adaptation of Forster; but it is also salient that the racial hierarchies of the Raj novels support the elevation of white Britishness echoed in anti-immigrant 1970s/1980s discourse such as Enoch Powell’s. The Raj novel genre orients the domestic sphere as an acceptable venue for British women’s participation in empire; the Raj Revival’s “feminist” updating moves British women into the political spheres controlled in the

³⁶⁵ Major feminist texts began to appear as early as the 1950s and 1960s; this “second-wave” of the movement articulated a systemic denial of women as full persons, the effects of which were political (fewer women than men in positions of authority; denial of the vote/equal rights to women throughout the world), economic (women paid less than men for equal work), and cultural (reductive depictions of women in novels, films, and television; lack of support for female artists or works dealing with female issues). Simone du Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex*, written in 1949 and translated into English in 1953, articulated an idea of “women’s liberation” which was expanded to the domestic sphere by works such as Betty Friedan’s *The Feminist Mystique* (1963) and popularized in journals such as *Ms.* magazine, started by Gloria Steinem in 1970. Spurred by new cultural awareness, feminist activism swept the United States, Great Britain, and Europe throughout the 1970s.

³⁶⁶ I am thinking here of Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* (1952; trans. 1967), *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961; trans. 1963), and *Toward an African Revolution* (1964; trans. 1969), Achebe’s novel *Things Fall Apart* (1958) and lecture “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s ‘Heart of Darkness,’” a groundbreaking deconstruction of Joseph Conrad’s imperialist saga *Heart of Darkness* (1900), and Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s *Decolonizing the Mind* (1986).

nineteenth and twentieth-century Raj texts by white men, ostensibly empowering women while upholding the imperial project in its entirety.³⁶⁷ Gender stereotypes can be broken down without giving up attempts to revive the Raj; racial stereotypes cannot.

For overall, the rhetoric of duty and dignity in Farrell's *The Siege of Krishnapur* is deeply positive, an attitude traceable to the Raj novel genre's emphasis on duty as an essential Anglo-Indian trait. In spite of ill health and despair, "[i]t was only to be expected that sooner or later the Collector's sense of duty would reassert itself"; "[s]ure enough," this occurs (281). The Collector repeatedly makes statements such as "[o]ne's duty has to come first, of course" (133), and suits word to deed by digging graves for the fallen and washing laundry (a "domestic" task) to show there is no shame in working with one's hands. These tasks have an ideological agenda: "it was the principle of the thing that mattered. He wanted to help those who were ashamed . . . While quite capable of overlooking more serious misfortunes, the Collector was sensitive to such cases of threatened dignity" (256). Farrell's characteristic sarcasm again modulates his portrayal of the Collector, but this mockery vanishes in moments such as the Collector's inspirational speech to the survivors of the siege, which inspires them to unite and continue their resistance (284-85). In the end, the siege does undermine the Collector's belief in Western progress. Though he wins a battle by firing pieces of a statue called "'The Spirit of Science Conquers Ignorance and Prejudice'" at the advancing sepoy (317), immediately after the Collector is entangled in the folds of a Union Jack shot down from its flagpole. Farrell shows him to be nearly suffocated by this constricting symbol of Britishness (318)—a gesture indicative of the novel's reluctance to make any character in *The Siege of Krishnapur* unambivalent in his or her embrace of the imperial project. Speaking to the cultural attitudes of reception and promotion in the 1970s, Farrell's ambivalence is not shared by *The Siege of Krishnapur*'s publishers, who dub the

³⁶⁷ Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather* (1995) documents similar moves in imperial discourse more broadly.

Collector “a magnificent creation, a figure of heroic proportions, a reserved, compassionate man of deep convictions” (n pag., flap copy). Such a descriptor situates the Collector as akin to a Raj novel genre hero more enthusiastically than Farrell’s work does.

Farrell stages his titular siege less ambivalently. Like the battles outside Delhi in *On the Face of the Waters* (in which Steel’s flawed Major Erlton dies a redemptive death), *The Siege of Krishnapur* is a chance for the British to master strife and hardship, atone for past sins, and improve morally. Aesthete George Fleury epitomizes this shift. Hardened by battle, he becomes a capable warrior, performing the dictates of martial masculinity which the Raj novel genre saw honed by life in Anglo-India. Maud Diver writes in *Candles in the Wind* (1909): “‘The British ‘sub’ is reputed idle and empty-headed by those who label human beings wholesale like jam-jars . . . But . . . India, being a serious country, has the knack of developing them’” (126). In the course of the novel, Fleury is “developed” by the rigors of Indian life, just as the Raj novel heroes that precede him. Newly arrived in India, he is overweight with “slender legs” (24); he pursues meaningless artistic hobbies, such as playing violin (badly) in the garden at night (18), and finds a collection of Indian weapons boring (80). In contrast, at the end of *The Siege of Krishnapur*, Fleury capably utilizes Indian weapons (313), invents new battle tactics (316), and strangles a “large and powerful” sepoy with a violin’s strings (322-23)—reconstituting each of his artistic pursuits as weapons of masculine domination. Fleury is romantically rewarded with the woman of his dreams, Louise Dunstaple, Harry’s beautiful sister, and in this manner enacts the plot arc set out in Raj novels such as B.M. Croker’s *Mr. Jervis* (1894) and Alice Perrin’s *Idolatry* (1909), which requires the hero’s maturation before he can win the ideal British woman.

The final scene in *The Siege of Krishnapur* brings the Collector and Fleury together in Britain. As they talk, the Collector thinks that “[i]n 1880, he had come to believe that a people, a

nation, does not create itself according to its own best ideas, but is shaped by other forces, of which it has little knowledge” (343). This statement, like many in Jhabvala’s *Heat and Dust*, obviates British responsibility for colonial malfeasance. In its entirety, *The Siege of Krishnapur* demonstrates the Raj novel maxim that imperialism, a product of Great Britain’s “best ideas,” aimed to create an India which lived up to those ideals. The failure of this effort, in the 1857 Mutiny or the end of the Raj itself, is attributed to vague “other forces, of which it has little knowledge.” Farrell takes refuge in British ignorance, which allows a sort of innocence. This is also Jhabvala’s approach. The ideal Anglo-Indian in her text is not Olivia Rivers, who models the transgressive qualities and freer sexuality characteristic of Raj Revival protagonists, but Olivia’s spurned husband, Douglas. Jhabvala describes him as “noble and fair” (16), “stern and serious” (36); his voice is “firm and manly” (37); he speaks Hindustani “very fluently” (36), and when he attempts (but fails) to save a widow forced to commit *suttee*, “[e]veryone praised Douglas for the calm and competent way he had handled the situation. Even the Nawab made a point of congratulating him” (56). Humble Douglas responds in a “cool and deprecating” manner (56). Later in the novel, Jhabvala introduces an ambivalent note; Douglas and Olivia struggle to become pregnant, and Olivia sees in her husband a new aspect—he smokes and chews “slowly, stolidly” (116). Yet, “his face [might] have changed, but his eyes had remained as clean and clear as ever” (117). In the end, that clarity allows Douglas to overcome Olivia’s betrayal, remarry, and find happiness.

Beyond rearticulating the hallmarks of ideal Britishness laid out in the Raj novels (stern, manly, calm, clear, competent), and being placed in a position of sympathy by Olivia’s adultery, Douglas is located within a family history that sums up the legacy of British service to India. He

thus models the particularly Anglo-Indian identity common to the Raj novel genre. Describing his family, Douglas recalls

. . . Edward Rivers who had been one of Henry Lawrence's band of young administrators in the Punjab; John Rivers, a famous pig-sticker, killed in a fall from his horse at Meerut; and a namesake, an earlier Douglas Rivers who had died in the Mutiny. He had been present at the storming of the Kashmere [sic] Gate in which the Hero of Delhi, John Nicholson, also fell. Douglas' ancestor died of his wounds just a day after Nicholson and was buried very near him in the Nicholson cemetery at Delhi. The way Douglas said that made Olivia tease him: "You sound as if you envy him." "Well . . . it's not a bad way to go . . . Better than to drink yourself to death," he said, attempting a lighter tone. "Some of them did that too. It can get very tedious if you're stuck out too long in a district all on your own." "With only a few million Indians," Olivia could not refrain from saying. (154)

In staging this debate, the old ideal of Anglo-Indian character, manifested in Douglas, encounters the postcolonial reality embodied in Olivia's transgressive ambivalence. Douglas' ancestors, who found glory or drank themselves to death in remote India, span the range of Raj novel imagery. For instance, Stephen Dare, troubled protagonist of Perrin's *The Waters of Destruction* (1905), battles impure desires in the remote station of Nandi (where he is, indeed, surrounded by "a few million" Indians). Tellingly, this is not the fate of Douglas' namesake³⁶⁸ who, like Major Erlton in Steel's *On the Face of the Waters*, dies heroically in the Mutiny. Indeed, Jhabvala has the previous Douglas Rivers die with Nicholson in the actual storming of the Kashmir Gate—a high-water mark for nineteenth-century British imperial heroism.

Jhabvala's situation of Douglas within a legacy of Anglo-Indian heroism is a revival of the Raj novel genre tactic of legitimating Anglo-Indian rule through familial history and "real" knowledge of the country. Moreover, it anticipates the rhetorical strategy used by Thatcher in her

³⁶⁸ Beyond their shared names, Jhabvala aligns Douglas with valiant Mutiny officers and the Anglo-Indian heroics of the Mutiny novel—recalled also in *The Siege of Krishnapur*—by comparison to the inscription on a Mutiny hero's grave. Olivia reads to Douglas the words, "[a]s a soldier ever ready where Duty called him, a dutiful son, a kind and indulgent Father but most conspicuous in the endearing character of Husband . . . 'Just like you, darling,' she told Douglas" (105). The language is, again, the nineteenth-century roll call of ideal personal traits (duty, fidelity to family, wife, and nation), but Jhabvala counters its allure with Olivia's thought that she "didn't want [Douglas] to see how irritated she was both with him and the dead heroes" (106).

1982 speech to the Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives to justify her military agenda. Thatcher describes a legacy of Conservative service to Britain, and, implicitly, the British Empire, that spans the lives of Winston Churchill, Benjamin Disraeli, and Queen Victoria. “What I am saying is that this is the way the thread of history runs,”³⁶⁹ Thatcher argues. The idea in Jhabvala’s portrayal of Douglas, seen also in Thatcher, is that Britishness is defined, even earned, by a history of imperial service. To use the title of the Kipling poem which Thatcher repeatedly quotes, a title which evokes a profitable contemporary mode of British identity production, such duty is Great Britain’s “heritage”. In Jhabvala, the mythology of Anglo-Indian duty underscores the quality of Douglas’ character. More broadly, this tactic implies Britain’s work in the world is ongoing. That is, viewing past British foreign policy as a handing-on of the imperial torch suggests that progression will continue—even if it has temporarily stalled. In Thatcher’s political vision, Robert Gray writes “[t]he national past, or a selectively mythologized version of it, is a source of identity and hope.”³⁷⁰ Jhabvala’s location of Douglas in *Heat and Dust* as a “source of identity and hope” gives the reader a point of continuity in the face of Olivia’s rogue desire. Like Farrell’s undermining of gender hierarchies in *The Siege of Krishnapur*, this Raj Revival text questions the gender restrictions placed upon Raj novel heroines, and gives Olivia the autonomy of a romantic choice. Simultaneously, the glorification of Douglas as bearer of Anglo-India’s noble history reasserts hierarchies of race and imperial power under the Raj.

In *The Jewel in the Crown*, Paul Scott creates an Anglo-Indian icon yet more idealized than Douglas Rivers—or even the heroes of the Raj novel genre. Deputy Commissioner Robin White is, in Scott’s novel, the seat of authoritative Anglo-Indian knowledge. As Chapters II and

³⁶⁹ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

³⁷⁰ Robert Gray, “The Falklands Factor,” in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 276.

III argue, this is a key theme in the Raj novel genre. To White's awareness of the complexities of imperial rule, Scott adds a postcolonial perspective that makes him a "true" champion of India. White's name itself is symbolic; he is white, and he embodies the ideals of nineteenth-century Raj novel "whiteness" (morally clean, pure, well-intentioned) while inaugurating a new type of whiteness, a blank slate upon which Scott inscribes his retroactive vision of "progressive" imperial rule. White's first action in *The Jewel in the Crown* epitomizes this juxtaposition: he transgresses racial boundaries by bringing Indian guests to the whites-only Gymkhana Club. Here Scott contrasts an old image of whiteness in India (exclusionary) with his new, improved version. White's behavior impresses the Indian lawyer Srinivasan, who sees him "sticking his neck out" and waiting "with typical British restraint" to make the symbolic gesture more meaningful (180). Again, past and present meld; White takes a risk but does it with "typical British" caution and care, moving in a new direction in an respectable style that validates Anglo-India's Britishness as the inheritance of a catalogue of idealized character traits.

Tellingly, White is convinced to bring Indians to the Gymkhana after a discussion of British literature with the Indian Minister of Education, an exchange whose pedagogical resonances recall the dynamic of learned suppression set out in Gauri Viswanathan's *Masks of Conquest* (1989). Viswanathan argues that English literary education allowed the East India Company to venerate Britain's "higher" impulses in colonizing India: "The split between the material and the cultural practices of colonialism is nowhere sharper than in the progressive refinement of the rapacious, exploitative, and ruthless actor of history into the reflective subject of literature" (21). Literature was a point at which colonialism's economic motives might be obscured via claims of a "civilizing" project. Scott stages this scenario anew: White's ideals are portrayed in *The Jewel in the Crown* as stemming from political opinions which his taste in

literature echoes. The Indian Minister enjoys Kipling, stand-in here for traditional Raj rule; White “thinks poorly” of him (180). The reason for this dislike is not stated, but White’s general persona allows the reading that his new, sympathetic mode of rule differs too vastly from Kipling’s imperial ethos for White to find intellectual accord. Viswanathan argues that the “affirmation of an ideal self and an ideal political state through a specific national literature—English literature—is in essence an affirmation of English identity” (*Masks of Conquest* 20). The same affirmation of Scott’s new imperial actor as an identity model occurs here: White embodies the abstract ideals of Anglo-Indian character catalogued in the Raj novel genre, diffused under the Raj via the instruction of Indians in English literature, and now cunningly dismissed en route to enshrining a different, but still dominant, Britishness via White.

That is, in White’s conversation with the Indian Minister, and in the Minister’s affection for Kipling, Scott stages what Paul Gilroy calls “the need to maintain the moral preeminence and progressive momentum that define colonial power as the redemptive extension of civilization into barbarity and chaos.”³⁷¹ In *The Jewel in the Crown*, Scott accomplishes this on two levels. He confirms the success of Raj programs such as English literary instruction in creating progressive Indian subjects who embrace British ideals (*e.g.* Kipling’s Raj narratives). But Scott works on another level as well. Recalling Jean-François Lyotard’s theory of pragmatics, which articulate the relationship of author to audience as well as that of author to textual material, this scene negotiates with the late twentieth-century reader to maintain what Gilroy calls the colonial nation’s “moral preeminence”. White is a fictional character. He is thus one of the textual objects from which Indians under the Raj might have absorbed British ideals. Now, presented to British post-imperial audiences, he serves the purpose of assuaging British doubts over the imperial

³⁷¹ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 94.

mission by embodying an image of British fidelity, purpose, and imperial uprightness that confirms the worth of the Raj project even in its moment of imminent dissolution.

How does Scott define his new ideal imperialist for his audience? Like Douglas Rivers, with his family legacy of Anglo-Indian service, White's character owes its essential traits (duty, dignity, seriousness) to ideals set forth in the Raj novel genre. Brigadier Reid, who represents in Scott's text the old guard of bumbling, racist Anglo-Indians,³⁷² respects White

for the sense of responsibility that after several meetings I could not help but get an impression of from his very demeanor, which was reserved, somewhat "intellectual", but very down-to-earth and practical in terms of action. White was fairly typical, I realize, of the new race of District Officers who reached maturity just at the moment when our Indian Empire was due to come of age and receive "the key of the door" from our government at home – perhaps prematurely, but as a token of our patience and goodwill and historical undertakings. (283)

Reid rehearses the familiar markers of ideal Anglo-Indian masculinity: White is responsible, "down-to-earth and practical in terms of action". But now such qualities, rather than being channeled into the martial exploits of Northwest Frontier heroes such as Diver's Theo Desmond, are located in the intellectual realm of a "new race of District Officers" rising to power in 1930s/1940s India. As with White's symbolic name, Scott's term, "a new race," is pointed.³⁷³ Using Reid, a neutral witness inasmuch as he and White disagree on everything, Scott implies that the Raj was cut off in its prime, before it could take on the noble responsibility, so respectful

³⁷² Ensuring that White is not considered an individual exception, Scott expands the comparison between White and Reid to encompass their branches of service more generally: "On the whole civil officers were much better informed about Indian affairs than their opposite numbers in the military. In the later stages of our administration it would have been rare to find in the civil a man of Reid's political simplicity" (315).

³⁷³ White confirms this characterization; his portrayal of himself upon arriving in India as a young civilian in 1921 exploits images from British Indian popular mythology propagated in the Raj novels: "I'd done my swotting and passed the exams, and read all the myth and legend . . . fancying myself to no end as a promising administrator who would straight out young and old and be remembered as White Sahib, become a legend myself and still be talked about fifty years after I'd gone as the fellow who brought peace and prosperity to the villages" (323). The incorporation of textuality (White "read all the myth and legend") locates this imagery directly within the literary output of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. But, White adds, "I simply wasn't cut out for paternalism" (323)—a qualification that emphasizes the fineness of the line Scott draws between "paternal" and "responsible for". The latter allows Indian autonomy, but such autonomy is only guaranteed by ongoing British rule.

of individual alterity, embodied by White. This formulation expands upon the Raj novel genre's argument that Britishness performed in Anglo-India was distinct from and superior to Britishness practiced at "Home": now there are increasingly complex variants of Anglo-Indian Britishness, and the heroic model (more heroic, to a postcolonial reader, than its Raj novel counterpart) is even harder to displace from its zone of ideality.

Scott goes so far as to reference Forster's *A Passage to India* in reconstituting British imperialism through White—a project only slightly more palatable than David Lean's attempt to reclaim British imperialism by rewriting Forster wholesale. Woven into *The Jewel in the Crown* is a mini-episode in which White describes how he came to love the "real" India. Taken sick while touring a remote district, he is nursed by an elderly woman who feeds him curds "as she would have fed her own son" (324). White "was on my dignity at once, and waved her away, but she came to the bedside . . . and made me eat . . . She said nothing and I couldn't even look at her — only at her black hands and the white curds . . . I felt that I had been given back my humanity, by a nondescript middle-aged Indian woman" (324). Leaving the next day, White finds a flower on the pommel of his horse and feels "it coming from them — the good wish, the challenge to do well by them and by myself" (324). The scene summons up Raj novel genre images of India as a rural idyll—among the stereotypes of the "East" Edward Said critiques in *Orientalism*, deployed un-ironically here for emotional effect. Before this encounter, White "hated India — the real India behind the pipe-puffing myth" (323). He is won over by a parade of kind, "nondescript" villagers stripped of identity beyond a demonstrative subservience to the needs of a white man. Scott thus restages Raj novel genre imagery of object Indians as instrumental in the uplifting of British subjectivity and rule; this fantasy of timeless Indian benevolence restoring European humanity, seen also in Lean's new scenes for Adela in *A Passage to India*, and echoing Raj novels such as

Alice Perrin's *Idolatry*, justifies White's empathy.³⁷⁴ White's narrative is also intercut with postcolonial insights ("We were in India for what we could get out of it" [316]) that show his broadmindedness. However, these insights are followed by White's claim that—*vis-a-vis* Said's *Culture and Imperialism*—imperial rule was "beseeched" by the clash of a flagging Mogul Empire and "a comparatively new energetic civilization that had been on the up-grade ever since the Tudors" (317). British superiority, in Scott's text, cannot be denied, and it is still expressed, as in the reference to the Mogul Empire, in terms drawn from the Raj novel genre.

Further, British superiority cannot be understood apart from the institution of imperial rule. *Staying On* is the story of a less than ideal couple—Tusker and Lucy Smalley are cranky, forgetful, at times small-minded and racist. He drinks too much; she belittles him. Yet, Scott treats their love story as a beautiful tragedy. Further, by paralleling its rise and fall with the historical progression of the Raj, he makes the loss of the imperial "romance" tragic. Like Robin White, the Smalleys are introduced to the reader through Indian eyes. Ibrahim and Mr. Bhoolahoy watch them with a wry acceptance of their foibles, and it is one of the twists of Scott's novel that the new dynamic of power in independent India makes the Smalleys objects of fascination for a dominant Indian gaze. Nonetheless, Tusker and Lucy still embody traits tied indelibly by the Raj novels to Anglo-Indian ideality. Recalling the genre's emphasis on Anglo-Indian knowledge, Mr. Bhoolahoy is awed by Tusker's ability to speak on topics of interest: "The range of Tusker's knowledge of the world had astonished him, fascinated him" (4). Lucy,

³⁷⁴ Scott repeatedly shows this empathy to be reciprocal. Srinivasan, the Indian lawyer, is awed by White. Watching him enter the Gymkhana, he "understood what it was that men like Robin White stood for, stood for against all narrow opposition . . . I saw then how well he *fitted* the club. How well the club fitted him . . . It was shabby and comfortable. But rather awe-inspiring" (185). White *fits* the club, that bulwark of imperial rule's strict racial barriers, but instead of embodying its failures and ethos of racist separation, he elevates it, making it "awe-inspiring." This endorsement of Scott's new imperial actor by an educated Indian character recalls the use of educated Indians to debate pertinent political issues, and subtly support the Empire, in Raj novel texts such as Sara Jeannette Duncan's *The Burnt Offering* (1909), and Forster's *A Passage to India*.

Mr. Bhoolahoy thinks, has “the gift of quietly commanding obedience from those who owed it to her” (96). Ibrahim respects Lucy’s ability to demonstrate control and reserve when needed: “Behind Colonel Memsahib’s gentle manner he recognized the familiar steel” (26). Even after Tusker drunkenly collapses at a party, Lucy maintains an air of authority: “At the end of one’s life all that was left was dignity and one was damned lucky to have the chance to show it” (149). This display of dignity is necessitated by Tusker’s lack of same; here and elsewhere, the Raj as ideal versus Lucy and Tusker as “reality” is a theme of Scott’s novel. For example, the couple meet when Lucy is secretary to Tusker’s trust in England: “Amid all those dusty boring files and boxes and deeds,” Lucy recalls, “it was this unknown young officer serving in India who provided the single element of mystery and romance in my life” (133). When she sees Tusker, he does not live up to her Raj novel-inspired romantic fantasy. “I’d always imagined him lean and brown, a soldier in uniform, instead of which there he was, not over tall, thickset rather than lean, in civilian clothes, really quite ordinary” (138). Ordinary but “not,” Lucy adds, “no, not at all a disappointment” (138). Here, *Staying On* recalls *The Siege of Krishnapur*; Scott’s ostensive realism, like Farrell’s humor, maintains Raj novel genre ideals while demonstrating awareness that such ideals are somewhat outdated or ridiculous.

In this partial acknowledgement of breaks or ruptures in the imperial myth, Scott’s text encompasses what Paul Gilroy calls the “discomforting ambiguities of the empire’s painful and shameful but apparently nonetheless exhilarating history.”³⁷⁵ As in *The Jewel in the Crown*, Scott nods to the shortcomings of imperialism. That is, he admits pain and shame—but only *en route* to reconstituting those aspects of imperialism which made Anglo-Indian existence under the Raj “exhilarating”. Thus, Tusker is not the fantasy, but neither is he disappointing; the Raj is not the ideal, but neither is it a failure. Exploring the role of melancholia in Scott’s *Raj Quartet*,

³⁷⁵ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 100.

Jason Mezey describes Scott's writing style, which obsessively foreshadows, backgrounds, and anticipates its own plot elements, as a "revision of Raj history into an act of retranscription."³⁷⁶ *Staying On* similarly begins at its ostensive ending (Tusker's death), and retraces the events of Tusker and Lucy's life in an attempt to revise personal history and "retranscribe" the imperial ideal for which, to Scott, the Smalleys stand. Their marital tragedy, and its parallel to the waxing and waning of British fortunes in India, is narrated solely by Lucy's sympathetic inner monologue. *Staying On*'s Indian characters do not comment on it, and there is no humor or sarcasm in these scenes. Mezey sees in Scott "the displacement of imperial archetypes from the past to the present, at which point they are re-enacted"³⁷⁷; this is the stylistic technique of the Raj Revival generally, and here it offers a salient description of the ways in which Scott manipulates the imperial iconography of the Raj (and the archetypes of the Raj novel genre) to cast the end of British rule in India as a personal, sentimental tragedy.

The key symbol used by Scott is the sun and the resultant evocation of that famous claim, "the sun never sets on the British Empire." Meeting Tusker, Lucy is "dazzled . . . Sun, sun, endless sun. Women need the sun. There's plenty of it in India but that's not the kind of sun I mean. The kind I mean is the kind that if it's absent makes you feel your heart is undernourished and eventually that you are dying very slowly. Of neglect" (140, 141). Having made the sun a symbol (India's real sun is "not the kind" Lucy means) of affection and romance, Scott ties it to the dream of imperial accord and valor by making the "brightest" part of Tusker and Lucy's life their years in the princely state of Mudpore. There, Tusker advises the Maharajah. Recalling Forster's language without Forster's irony, Lucy describes these years as the "real India" (70), India as "I imagined it" (133, 141). Service to a Maharajah in unbelievable palatial luxury

³⁷⁶ 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 (Fall 2006). 331.

³⁷⁷ Mezey 338.

evokes a shorthand vision of Anglo-Indian romance at which even Raj novelists such as Diver and Sara Jeannette Duncan poke fun—in this way Scott’s Raj Revival text goes further than its precursors in its use of archetypes, embracing an Orientalist fantasia even the Raj novelists, for all their fantasies of loyal Indian servants and perfidious mutineers, did not claim existed. During their years in Mudpore, “the sky hadn’t a cloud in it”; after the Smalleys are absented from the dream of ideal British service to exotic India, “the cloud of Tusker’s never explained withdrawal . . . grew and grew and for years now has largely filled my sky. I expect my own cloud has filled his” (141). Years pass; the British prepare to leave India; the Smalleys grow apart. As Independence looms, Lucy thinks that “perhaps after all the sun would come out again, between us. But it didn’t. Not really. Except once – and that paradoxically was after sunset” (143). The staging of this final, tragic moment is a set-piece of Scott’s novel. More than any other, it makes Scott’s nostalgic longing for Raj rule palpable:

It was so moving that I began to cry. And Tusker put his hand in mine and kept it there, all through the hymn and when we were standing all through God Save the King, and all through that terrible, lovely moment when the Jack was hauled down inch by inch in utter, utter silence. The only sounds you could hear were the jackals hunting in the hills and the strange little rustles when a gust of wind sent papers and programmes scattering. There was no sound otherwise until on the stroke of midnight the Indian flag began to go up, again very slowly, and then the band began to play the new Indian national anthem and all the crowds out there in the dark began to sing the words and when the flag was up there flying and the anthem was finished you never heard such cheering and clapping. I couldn’t clap because Tusker still had hold of my hand and didn’t let go until all the floodlights came on again and the troops marched off to the sound of the band. (144)

The elements of the scene seem meant to induce maximum pathos: Lucy’s tears; Tusker’s relentless grip on her hand; their inability to applaud the new Indian flag and anthem; the singing of that anthem in the dark. Left in the twilight of empire, the Smalleys are unsuited for the “floodlights” – harsh, modern, and mechanical; the values embodied by Mrs. Bhoolabhoy – that “reveal” the new India. After Tusker’s death, Lucy remembers an earlier darkness, a “party

when we seemed to be absolutely stranded. Perhaps that was symbolic . . . everyone else gone and just Tusker and me, peering out into the dark waiting for transport that never turned up” (216). Scott’s double meaning of transport recalls the usage of the term in Raj novels such as Alice Perrin’s *The Anglo-Indians* (1912). Literal and metaphorical, the idea of elevation into a greater imperial dream is thwarted: transport, spiritual or otherwise, “never turn[s] up.” The last image of the book is Lucy, alone, crouching on her toilet “throne,” sobbing Tusker’s name. The sun has set; the empire is gone. Scott’s humor vanishes in this moment, and only pathos remains. Malcolm Muggeridge reflects this sentiment in his 1977 *New York Times* review: Scott has “summoned up the Raj’s ghost in *Staying On* . . . the story of the living death, in retirement, and the final end of a walk-on character from the [Raj] quartet.”³⁷⁸ In this review, Muggeridge emphasizes Lucy and Tusker’s liminal status between the lingering, “ghostly” whispers of empire and independent India, and the “living death” of the remnants of the Raj’s ideals.

Paul Scott’s vision of imperial benevolence culminates in his attempts to show how new Anglo-Indian leadership such as White’s might have avoided the tragedy enacted by the Raj’s end on the Smalleys. In contrast, M.M. Kaye is content to reiterate the Raj novel genre’s ideal Anglo-Indians in her characterization of Walter “Wally” Hamilton. *The Far Pavilions* is the most overt rendering of the Raj Revival’s ideological project, and in this respect it is telling that among the novels read here, it was by far the biggest seller. In *The Far Pavilions*, ideal British character formed through Anglo-Indian service is celebrated with much the same vigor that greeted Thatcher’s imperial excursions in the Falklands. Cultural authorities have accordingly cast Kaye as a Raj novelist born in the wrong era. The *Guardian* wrote in her 2004 obituary, “Her father read her Kipling’s *Jungle Book* stories when she was four, and she . . . [spoke] Hindustani before English, while playing around gun emplacements and dodging her *ayah* to

³⁷⁸ Malcolm Muggeridge, “Review of *Staying On*,” *The New York Times Book Review*, 21 Aug. 1977, 1, 36.

listen to storytellers in the Delhi bazaar. Like Kipling's Kim, she thought herself Indian, 'just a member of a different caste in a land of castes.'"³⁷⁹ This projection, encouraged by Kaye's stated identification with Kipling, extends to the primary figures in *The Far Pavilions* and perhaps explains Kaye's reliance on *Kim* in crafting her narrative. But it is not Ashton Pelham-Martyn, the Kim substitute, who embodies Kaye's British ideals. Rather, his best friend Wally represents the form of national character best produced by the rigors of Anglo-Indian life. Wally is a "patriot and a romantic" who feels "that to die for one's country would be a good and splendid thing"; his head "might be in the clouds, but both his feet were firmly on the ground, and he had a mind of his own" (493). Wally has an affinity for the Indians with whom he serves, and like many Raj novel heroes and heroines, and Jhabvala's Douglas Rivers, his "command of Pushtu was excellent" (853)—an ability that serves him well in Afghanistan.

Kaye juxtaposes his goodness against a malevolent India that would not be out of place in the texts of Maud Diver or B.M. Croker. *The Far Pavilions* sets the princely state of Bhithor as typical of India outside British rule, imagining a syphilis-ridden ruler who spends his days plotting murder, consuming drugs (much like drug-addled sepoy Soma in Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters*), and consorting with eunuchs. "Bhithor doesn't belong to this century," Ash declares bitterly, "let alone this half of it" (549-50). Following Raj novel genre norms, Kaye constructs un-colonized India as evidence of the country's primitive, violent nature. Like Wally's Anglo-Indian ideality, the particular indebtedness of Kaye's Raj Revival novel to the Raj novel genre comes clear in this depiction. Ash's loyalty to both India and Britain muddies the waters somewhat, but this ambiguity is defused by Wally, who has a clear mission: to do his duty and serve the Raj with all the strength, vigor, and moral integrity he possesses.

³⁷⁹ Veronica Horwell, "Obituary: M.M. Kaye, Novelist in harmony with the far pavilions of her Indian youth," *The Guardian*, 4 February 2004.

Wally describes this task with affection: “the Guides were in ‘tremendous shape,’ the Commandant and the other officers ‘the best of fellows,’” while the captain is ““an absolute corker”” (708) His character arc, and Kaye’s focus on the Northwest Frontier, brings to mind the theme of Diver’s Desmond Trilogy (*Captain Desmond, V.C.* [1907] and *Candles in the Wind* [1909] are particularly relevant): the Northwest Frontier makes the men who serve it superior even amongst their admirable Anglo-Indian counterparts. At the outset of *The Far Pavilions*, Wally is impressionable, prone to wild infatuations and the composition of terrible poems. After conscription in the Guides, his devotion becomes communal, shifting to the men of his regiment and the British nation. Ash thinks that if Wally wrote poems after years of service, they would “be concerned with such abstract subjects as Patriotism and Immortality. And the next time he fell in love it would be for ever: he would settle down and marry the girl and raise a family” (709). This scenario recalls the endorsement of domesticity in the Raj novel genre. So too does the outcome of Wally meeting the girl of his dreams—Ash’s wife Anjuli, who “did not suggest the East to him, but rather the North” (718). Even here, Wally’s loyalty remains with Britain; even here, his behavior is noble. Rather than being tempted to pursue Anjuli, Wally is relieved to have his emotions squared away. His self-denial recalls the Desmonds’ ability to suppress their feelings in *Captain Desmond, V.C.*, and fulfills the British stoicism praised in the Raj novels.

In the last third of *The Far Pavilions*, while the defense of the Kabul Residency grinds to its tragic end, Wally becomes a partial narrator (and thus authority within Kaye’s text). In battle, he displays valiant courage while pursuing his duty, and finally sacrifices his life—a decision, Kaye emphasizes, that makes him a metonym for all British men struck down too early in service of the Empire. Kaye locates Wally in a classical tradition of heroism by having him (in an accord with Enoch Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech) quote Virgil’s *Aeneid* in his final moments:

“Everyone has his allotted day. Short and irrecoverable is the lifetime of all; but to extend our fame by deeds, this is the task of greatness.’ Today it had been his task to help extend the fame of the Guides” (936). Like Farrell’s Collector, Wally gives an inspirational speech to his men in which he summarizes the ideal character traits espoused by the Raj novel genre:

They had fought, he said, like heroes, and most splendidly upheld the honor of the Guides. No men could have done more. Now all that remained for them was to die in a like manner, fighting the foe. The alternative was to be killed like rats in a trap. There was no other choice, and he did not need to ask which they would choose . . . “[N]o matter if I fall, or how many of us fall, remember that those who are left will still hold the honor of the Guides in their hands . . . You have all lived with courage and what you have done this day will bring you everlasting renown; for your deeds will not be forgotten as long as the Guides are remembered.” (936, 937)

This summation of personal quality evokes the Anglo-Indian character traits beloved of the Raj novelists: acting (and dying) with honor; going proudly and decisively to one’s death (Wally “does not need to ask” what his men will choose); fighting with strength; living with courage; and existing to inspire a future generation of imperial heroes.

It is essential that Kaye ends her book on this note. *The Far Pavilions* is presumptively the story of Anjuli and Ash’s interracial romance and Ash’s struggle to choose between his British and Indian selves. Yet Anjuli barely appears in the last two hundred pages of the novel, and during the battle for the Residency, Ash is locked in a room, unmanned by his inability to join the action. It is Wally, Kaye’s image of ideal Anglo-Indian service to the British imperial nation, whom the reader is left to remember. Wally’s words are emphasized, his body lifted by Ash and laid upon a cannon: “it was only right that [the cannon] should provide him with a bier on which he could lie in state; and when he was found there, those who came would only think that one of their number had placed him there for the same reason he had been spared mutilation – in recognition of gallantry” (954). The final image in *The Far Pavilions* is a view of Wally’s corpse, ideal British heroism and sacrifice made physically manifest. Even the Afghans sense

Wally's "gallantry" and will accept his lying "in state" on a "bier" as a proud warrior's due. It must be said that with Wally's death, any affection Ash maintained for Britain vanishes.³⁸⁰ This is Kaye's only real concession to the post-colonial moment in which she composed her novel; *The Far Pavilions* in its entirety enthusiastically embraces the Raj as an institution built by Britain's better impulses and defended by its bravest men. The novel perpetuates the Raj as a source of ideals which must continue in cultural memory, in the hearts and imaginations of Kaye's British audiences, as part of the heritage Thatcher's Conservative government constructs for Great Britain of the 1980s.

In weaving together Kaye's fictional re-waging of the Second Afghan War, Thatcher's defense of the Falklands, and the lionization of British heritage in the 1970s/1980s, Paul Gilroy's observation about the British preoccupation with World War II offers great insight. The Second World War is "a privileged point of entry into national identity and self-understanding," Gilroy writes; it reveals the desire of Great Britain's citizens "to find a way back to the point where the national culture—operating on a more manageable scale of community and social life—was, irrespective of the suffering involved in the conflict, both comprehensible and habitable."³⁸¹ Applied to other wars refought by British authors on the printed page, Gilroy's observation explains why it does not matter that Wally dies at the end of *The Far Pavilions*. "Irrespective of the suffering involved in the conflict," the Afghan War offers Kaye—as the Mutiny offers Farrell, as the lead-up to Independence offers Scott—a historical moment at which war was waged "against foes who are simply, tidily, and uncomplicatedly evil" (*Postcolonial Melancholia* 89). Farrell devotes as little time to characterizing the sepoy storming his

³⁸⁰ There are points of critique in Kaye's depiction of the Second Afghan War; she is critical of commanding officer Major Louis Cavagnari, and of what she condemns as Britain's desire to add more territories to its Empire despite the cost to its men—though the latter is tempered by a desire to defend that Empire in its high Victorian entirety.

³⁸¹ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 89.

Residency as Kaye devotes to the Afghans storming hers—as little time as Thatcher devotes to characterizing the Argentine bid for territory in the Falklands. “I want to say very little indeed about the origins of the Falklands war because that war actually had very little to do with the Falklands,” Eric Hobsbawm writes in 1983; “[h]ardly anybody knew about the Falklands.”³⁸² The “villains” in the 1970s/1980s revival of Great Britain’s imperial image and agenda are practically irrelevant because Great Britain is no longer, practically, an imperial power. What matters is the symbolic legacy of victory over enemies akin to those now being defeated in the symbolic realm of the Raj Revival fictions.

By reinstating the memory of what it felt like for Britain to be, in Thatcher’s words, “the nation that had built an empire and ruled a quarter of the world,”³⁸³ a political agenda that accords with the values upon which that empire and rule claimed to stand is given new emotional heft and practical momentum. Heather Nunn argues that the “accumulation of these images and the way they were bound together in this moment constituted a posture that I designate the ‘nation rampant,’”³⁸⁴ a Great Britain ready for return to international prominence. The archetypes of the Raj novel genre, particularly the sensibility of imperial “might, right, and majesty”³⁸⁵ that undergird Thatcher’s rhetoric, are inextricably intertwined with this rise. In a 1983 interview with the *Daily Mail*, Thatcher again paid homage to “Rudyard Kipling’s influence upon her, in particular his poems about heroic imperial masculinity”; she describes visits to the graves of unknown soldiers, “who gave their lives for us, buried halfway across the Empire.”³⁸⁶ In the

³⁸² Eric Hobsbawm, “Falklands Fallout,” in *The Politics of Thatcherism*, ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983). 257.

³⁸³ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Conservative Rally in Cheltenham,” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 3 July 1982. Web. 28 Feb. 2010.

³⁸⁴ Heather Nunn, *Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2002). 135.

³⁸⁵ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

³⁸⁶ Heather Nunn, *Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2002). 135.

hands of the Raj Revivalists and Thatcher's Conservative government, the symbolic power of Britain's imperial service and the concrete reminders of Britain's rule abroad facilitate what Gilroy calls the nation's "rejection or deferral of its present problems."³⁸⁷ The Raj novelists, perhaps because they were not forced to confront the loss of the spaces within which their novels envisioned ideal Anglo-Indian selves forming, do not approach the idea of Anglo-Indian ideality as problematic. It is assumed, desired, and celebrated. In 1984, David Lean's description of adapting *A Passage to India* stubbornly maintains this attitude. Asked whether Forster was right about the British in India, Lean states: "It's all very well to criticize the English but just take a look at New Delhi, look at the railway system, look at the postal system – which works. We've left them all sorts of bad things, I suppose, but they also got some very good things . . . It's awfully easy to sit back and say [the British] were a lot of clowns. They weren't."³⁸⁸ To justify the attribution of effectiveness to the British Empire's "civilizing" project claimed by Lean, the Raj Revivalists broadly reify racial hierarchies and reinstate images of Anglo-Indian nobility, continuing the influence of the Raj novel genre in defiance of historic actuality.

But "After Empire," to crib Gilroy's British title, in the space of nostalgic mourning and forced acknowledgment of imperial failure, such ideals are repeatedly shattered—as lost as Wally, dead on the cannon he defended, untouched by enemies forced to shy away from his gallantry, but dead nonetheless. If the Raj Revivalists, in their preoccupation with refighting the battles of imperialism (and Thatcher's Conservative government, in its preoccupation with making new ones), pursue any project, it is akin to that Gilroy suggests: "In drawing the new map of Britain in Europe . . . we must be prepared to make detours into the imperial and colonial zones where the catastrophic power of race thinking was first institutionalized and its distinctive

³⁸⁷ Paul Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York: Columbia UP, 2005). 89.

³⁸⁸ Harlan Kennedy, "David Lean in Interview: *A Passage to India*," *American Cinema Papers*, 1985. Web. 18 Jan. 2012.

anthropologies first put to the test, above all, in the civilizing storms of colonial war” (148). In the 1970s and 1980s, fictional texts and political rhetoric developed a resurgent Conservative ethos that encouraged racial stratification within the space of post-colonial Great Britain, and which suggested but ultimately avoided the “detours” Gilroy suggests into genuine engagement with Britain’s imperial history. In so doing, they bear out the importance of the Raj novel genre in casting images of Anglo-Indian ideality that powerfully facilitated the metanarrative of British imperial identity, images that continue to echo in British popular and political culture forty years after the midnight moment when India achieved independence from British colonial rule.

VII. Conclusion: “The Power with the Need” – Raj Fictions and the Post-Colonial World

My dissertation argues for a relationship of influence between the authors of what I term the “Raj novel genre,” or works by British authors who lived in India between 1858 and 1947 and produced novels set in that country, and authors of the 1970s and 1980s Raj Revival. This relationship is most clearly visible in the ways both claim ideal British character is manifested by Anglo-Indians, British persons—like the Raj novel genre authors—living and working in India, who develop a series of exemplary character traits through the rigors of daily service in the subcontinent. In the Raj novel genre, this model of Anglo-Indian character is used as a strategy by which to elevate the nascent Anglo-Indian community. The Raj writers argue for Anglo-India’s essential importance to the British metanarrative of identity formed through imperial enterprise, establishing Anglo-Indians as prescriptive examples for British persons at “Home”. In the Raj Revival, the Raj novel genre’s ideal of character is scripted almost identically, but for a different purpose, one necessitated by the massive political changes taking place in Great Britain between Indian Independence in 1947 and Margaret Thatcher’s 1979 election as Prime Minister. In this 32-year span, the British Empire was all but dismantled, and Britain saw its international influence shrink. The Raj Revival texts thus appear at a moment when imperial glory, and the idealized Anglo-Indian identities formed via imperial duty, is only nostalgic memory. By revisiting such ideals, the texts and films of the Raj Revival follow the conservative strategy of Thatcher’s Tory party, which in enterprises such as the Falkland Islands conflict attempt to ‘restage’ Britain as an imperial nation—and implicitly, a power on the global stage. Where the Raj novel genre’s image of Anglo-Indian ideality is prescriptive, the Raj Revival renders this image nostalgic and comforting, a means of asserting lost prominence through familiar markers

of British identity inherently imbued with what Thatcher, in a 1982 address to the Mid-Bedfordshire Conservative Party, called “might, right, and majesty.”³⁸⁹

In tracing this relationship of literary and ideological influence, I suggest a new mode of reading texts whose support for Great Britain’s colonial project has been cogently denigrated by postcolonial scholars. As discussed in Chapter IV, the Raj novel genre advances the metanarrative of British imperial identity, uplifting the Anglo-Indian crafters of a specific colonial mythos by denigrating the fictional person(ae) of the colonized subject. The Raj Revival texts, I argue in Chapter V, carry out the same project—despite the fact that these works are produced in an ostensibly post-colonial (e.g. after the end of empire) moment, and despite the fact that the Raj Revival authors make a pretense of approaching Indian subjectivity and history with greater sophistication and sympathy. It is my contention that such sympathy is a mode by which the consumptive, congratulatory attitudes that mark so much of nineteenth and early twentieth-century imperial discourse continue to reproduce themselves in the absence of a practical imperial project. These attitudes manifest a cultural and intellectual “imperialism” which in extreme cases, such as the foreign policy agenda of Thatcher’s Tory government, affect Britain’s dealings with the world at large. Further, such attitudes remain painfully visible within the physical spaces of contemporary Great Britain—including England, nostalgically referred to in the Raj novel genre as “Home”.

In October 1985, at the tail end of the Raj Revival, young, predominantly black youth rioted in Tottenham, North London after Cynthia Jarrett, an Afro-Caribbean woman, died from a heart attack suffered when police burst into her home on a raid. These Broadwater Farm riots recalled the April 1981 Brixton riots. Occurring as the Raj Revival was at its height, this earlier

³⁸⁹ Margaret Thatcher, “Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands),” *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*, 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

conflagration grew out of ongoing tensions between the police and the predominantly African-Caribbean community of Brixton, a South London suburb. Twenty-six years later, in August 2011, minority youth in Birmingham, Liverpool, Bristol, and the Enfield section of London rioted after the August 4 shooting of twenty-nine-year-old Mark Duggan. In 1985, the comments of a senior officer to the British Broadcasting Corporation about the Broadwater riots bespoke a sense of deep cultural uncertainty: “This is not England. This is just madness.”³⁹⁰ In a commentary on how the 2011 riots impacted race relations in Britain, writer Joshua Surtees evokes a similar disquiet via quoted conversation with Kirk, a young black man. “I never feel like this is my home,” Kirk told Surtees. “If they wanted to move us out of this area quickly they could[;] it’s their land at the end of the day. Wherever you go they’re always gonna look at you as a nigger.”³⁹¹ Kirk and the unnamed senior officer articulate an ongoing awareness that the actions of minorities residing in the physical space of the British Isles do not comprise a contribution to the larger ideological figuration of the British nation. The 1980s and 2011 rioters are placed outside Britishness and dismissed as “madness,” an incomprehensible—and implicitly invalid—force besieging the center. Beneath the multicultural surface of contemporary British society, a disquieting construction of Britain as a somehow pure “racial” entity lingers; this is the ideal from which Kirk bespeaks his felt alienation. I encountered Kirk’s quotation in late 2011, while analyzing the Raj novel genre’s construction of Anglo-India as an essential—if discrete, by virtue of physical distance—aspect of Britain’s metanarrative of imperial identity. Kirk’s use of the word “home” resonated with the wistful reiteration of this term I was observing in the Raj novels. The situation of a young, male minority in contemporary Britain obviously differs hugely from that of the Anglo-Indians, a privileged white minority group exerting hegemonic power in

³⁹⁰ “1985: Policeman killed in Tottenham Riots,” British Broadcasting Corporation, 6 Oct. 1985. Web. 15 June 2012.

³⁹¹ Joshua Surtees, “After the riots Black Britons have pulled together – and away?” *The Guardian*, 30 Dec. 2011. Web. 15 June 2012. No further identifying details about Kirk (last name, age, etc.) are given in Surtees’ article.

India. Yet both usages of the word “home” evoke for me the constructedness of national identity, and the ongoing necessity of understanding and critiquing the descriptive models that signify inclusion with and exclusion from the narrative components of national allegiance. Next to the *Guardian* article, I scribbled a question: “How does one feel at ‘Home’ in a nation?”

This project represents a methodology by which the complexities underlying that query may be further parsed. The Raj novel genre develops a specific mode for enacting an idealized form of British identity—a way of writing oneself into the nostalgically-rendered “Home” that is Great Britain. The Raj Revival follows the instructions, so to speak, of the Raj novel writers, but obviates the complexities that stem from the practical experience of daily life in the imperial edifice. By articulating how the Raj novel genre creatively constructs Britishness, I expand the scope of use to which the Raj novels can be put, and add to the ways in which their rhetorical and literary inheritors, from Thatcher to Paul Scott to David Lean, may be interpreted. The Raj novel genre is useful for understanding how subtle assumptions about race, gender, and power allowed colonial Britain to rhetorically amplify its practical authority over the colonial subject. As my analysis demonstrates, the Raj novels are also useful for understanding how the colonizer comprehends him or herself, and how he or she understands his or her role as integral to the composition of a national identity. Again, that identity’s constitutive power is borne out in incidents ranging from the Falklands War to the arguably endemic British institutional racism that finds voice in burnt cars in Birmingham. By turning the focus to how the Raj novel genre authors understand themselves as national actors, and by reflecting on the prescriptive image these authors develop of British national character, I offer a new lens for reading the Raj texts and understanding their somewhat remarkable afterlife.

My articulation of Raj novel constructions of British imperial identity also offers a tool for analyzing recent works by Indian artists, who—like the Raj Revivalists—re-inscribe Raj novel genre tropes in ways that productively complicate discussions of influence and ideological inheritance. Particularly interesting in this respect, and worthy of in-depth future research, are a set of films produced in the Indian film industry (Bollywood) between 2000 and 2010. All three star megastar actor Aamir Khan, and feature musical sequences—an essential component of Bollywood films—by Bollywood legend and Oscar-winning composer A.R. Rahman.³⁹² *Lagaan: Once Upon A Time in India* (2001) and *The Rising: Ballad of Mangal Pandey* (2005) are set during the high period of the Raj (lyricist Javed Akhtar collaborated with Rahman on both); *Rang de Basanti* (2006) is set in modern India, but contains many flashbacks to 1920s British India. With varying degrees of credulity, the three films incorporate images of Britishness that would have been familiar to nineteenth-century readers of Flora Annie Steel or Rudyard Kipling: the heroic *memsahib*; the arrogant British “gentleman” who refuses to deal with Indians; the plucky modern British woman who travels to India to trace her Raj ancestors’ pasts; the *suttee* widow, saved from the funeral pyre by a handsome British officer; the doomed interracial couple; the wise British man who predicts the Mutiny. The specific repetition of these images is as striking as the experience of reading M.M. Kaye’s *The Far Pavilions* (1979) or viewing Lean’s film of *A Passage to India* (1984)—a viewer familiar with the Raj novel genre may feel they have been thrust back into the heat and dust of Anglo-India’s fevered literary imagination.

Yet, these works are made exclusively by Indian filmmakers. Moreover, while *Lagaan*, nominated for the 2002 Academy Award for Best Foreign Film, was a runaway international hit, the primary audience for Bollywood films is Indian and diasporic Indian viewers. I argue in my

³⁹² Rahman received the 2009 Academy Award for Best Original Score and Best Original Song (“Jai Ho”) for *Slumdog Millionaire* (2008).

dissertation that understanding the Raj novel genre's model of British imperial identity produces a specific interpretive paradigm for critiquing the actions of twentieth-century Britain as a political or multicultural entity. The Raj novel model sees literary or rhetorical gestures attempting to "sell" a specific, recurrent vision of Britishness. Future analysis of the presence of Raj novel genre tropes in popular Bollywood films such as *Lagaan* and *Rang de Basanti* may clarify how Anglo-Indian constructions of British character also affect postcolonial artists in Britain's former colonies. What purpose is served when Indian voices, intentionally overwritten by the Raj novel genre, reconstitute visions of Britishness originally scripted by Anglo-Indians? If the revivalist fantasies of 1970s/1980s British authors and filmmakers show an enthusiasm for influence, what attitude is manifested in Bollywood, and what impact does this have on contemporary political interchange between Britain and India? I believe analysis of Bollywood's offerings will reveal a complex blend of critique—*The Rising* makes Pandey, an Indian sepoy credited by Victorian popular culture with starting the Mutiny, a heroic martyr—and nostalgic reminiscence. All three films positively depict interracial romance, suggesting in a manner akin to the Raj Revival that Britain's rule of India contained moments of poignant connection as well as exploitation and abuse. The possibilities for expanding Paul Gilroy's concept of *Postcolonial Melancholia* (2005), and questioning the seemingly unlikely existence of imperial nostalgia in contemporary India, are intriguing.

Almost a century ago, in his poem "The Song of the Dead," Kipling wrote of the British desire to explore and rule: "We were dreamers, dreaming greatly, in the man-stifled town / We yearned beyond the sky-line where the strange roads go down / Came the Whisper, came the Vision, came the Power with the Need, / Till the Soul that is not man's soul was lent us to

lead.”³⁹³ To me, there is something haunting in those words, the urgency of the imperial calling that inhabits the margins of Thatcher’s 1982 Falklands speeches, bursts from the pages of Kaye’s books, and lingers in the frames of Lean’s films. By explicating the contours of the Raj novel genre’s vision, I offer an explanation for the yoking of poetical power and political expediency, and a mode by which nineteenth and twentieth-century Victorian fictions of Empire can be assigned their due cultural weight in contemporary British literature and political rhetoric.

³⁹³ Rudyard Kipling, “The Song of the Dead,” in *Rudyard Kipling’s Verse* (New York: Doubleday, Page, 1920). 197. The poem specifically treats Robert F. Scott’s failed expedition to the Antarctic South Pole in 1910.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “1985: Policeman killed in Tottenham Riots.” *On This Day*. The British Broadcasting Corporation. 6 Oct. 1985. Web. 15 June 2012.
- A Passage to India*. Dir. David Lean. Perf. Judy Davis, Victor Banerjee, Peggy Ashcroft. 1984. EMI Films, 2008. DVD.
- Achebe, Chinua. “An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad’s ‘Heart of Darkness.’” *Hopes and Impediments: Selected Essays*. 1988. New York: Anchor, 1990. Print.
- . *Things Fall Apart*. 1958. New York: Knopf, 1992. Print.
- Allen, Charles. *Plain Tales from the British Empire: Images of the British in India, Africa, and South-East Asia*. London: Abacus, 2008. Print.
- Allen, Charles and Michael Mason. *Plain Tales from the Raj: Images of British India in the Twentieth Century*. 1975. London: Futura, 1983. Print.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review, 2001. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. 2nd ed. 1983. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. 1951. New York: Harvest, 1973. Print.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987. Print.
- Arnold, Matthew. 1869; preface 1875. *Culture and Anarchy*. Ed. John Dover Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971. Print.
- Auerbach, Nina. *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982. Print.
- Bakhtin, M.M. “The Problem of Speech Genres.” *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. 1986. Austin: U of Texas P, 2004. 60-102. Print.
- Balibar, Etienne. “The Nation Form: History and Ideology.” *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. New York: Verso, 1992. 86-106. Print.

- Barr, Pat. *The Mem Sahibs: The Women of Victorian India*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1976. Print.
- “BBC- History – British History in Depth: Britain, the Commonwealth, and the End of Empire.”
The British Broadcasting Corporation. n.d Web. 10 April 2012.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. 1949. Trans. Constance Bode and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier (2009). New York: Vintage, 2011. Print.
- Bennett, Arnold. *Letters of Arnold Bennett, Vol. 1*. Ed. James Hepburn. London: Oxford UP, 1966. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi. “Introduction: narrating the nation.” *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 1-7. Print.
- . *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Bitzer, Lloyd. “The Rhetorical Situation.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (Jan. 1968). 1-14. Print.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 2nd ed. 1973. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997. Print.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern British Novel*. 1993. London: Penguin, 1994. Print.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988. Print.
- Burgess, Miranda. *British Fiction and the Production of Social Order: 1740-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- Burns, William. *A Brief History of Great Britain*. New York: Facts on File, 2009. Print.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 1990. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.
- The Cambridge History of English Literature*. Ed. Sir Adolphus William Ward and Alfred Rayney Waller. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1930. Print.
- Cannadine, David. *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire*. London: Allen Lane, 2001. Print.

- Carlyle, Thomas. *Collected Works, Vol. XII: Heroes and Hero-Worship*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1869. Print.
- . *History of Friedrich II of Prussia*. London: Robson & Sons, 1858. Print.
- Carroll, David. "Narrative, Heterogeneity, and the Question of the Political: Bakhtin and Lyotard." *The Aims of Representation: Subject/Text/History*. Ed. Murray Krieger. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1987. 69-106. Print.
- Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Chamberlain, Joseph. *Mr. Chamberlain's Speeches*. Ed. Charles Boyd. London: Constable, 1914. Print.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978. Print.
- Churchill, Winston. "Our Duty in India." *The Churchill Centre and Museum*. 18 March 1931. 2 Dec. 2011. Web.
- City of Joy*. Dir. Roland Joffé. Perf. Patrick Swayze, Pauline Collins, Om Puri. 1992. Sony Pictures, 1994. DVD.
- Coetzee, J.M. *Elizabeth Costello*. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- Cohen, Ralph. "History and Genre." *New Literary History* 17:2 (Winter 1986). 203-18. Print.
- Collett, Nigel. *The Butcher of Amritsar: General Reginald Dyer*. 2005. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007. Print.
- Collins, Larry and Dominique LaPierre. *Freedom at Midnight*. 1975. New York: HarperCollins, 1997. Print.
- Cosgrave, Patrick. *The Lives of Enoch Powell*. London: Bodley Head, 1989. Print.
- Crocker, Bithia Mary (B.M.) *A Third Person*. Toronto: William Bryce, 1893. Print.
- . *Her Own People*. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1903. Print.
- . *Jungle Tales*. London: Holden & Hardingham, 1913. Print.
- . *Mr. Jervis, Vol. 1*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1894. Print.
- . *Mr. Jervis*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1895. Print.

- Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. London: John Murray, 1871. Print.
- . *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. New York: D. Appleton & Co, 1869. Print.
- David, Deirdre. *Rule Britannia: Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995. Print.
- Davis, Lennard. *Resisting Novels: Ideology and Fiction*. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print.
- Dean, Misao. *A Different Point of View: Sara Jeannette Duncan*. Montreal: McGill-Queens UP, 1991. Print.
- Devitt, Amy J. "Integrating Rhetorical and Literary Theories of Genre." *College English* 62:6 (July 2000). 696-718. Print.
- Dewey, Clive. *Anglo-Indian Attitudes: The Mind of the Indian Civil Service*. London: Hambledon, 1993. Print.
- Dickens, Charles and Wilkie Collins. "The Perils of Certain English Prisoners." 1857. *The Lazy Tour of Two Idle Apprentices; No Thoroughfare; The Perils of Certain English Prisoners*. London: Chapman & Hall, 1890. 237-327. Print.
- Dilke, Sir Charles Wentworth. *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English Speaking Countries During 1866 and 1867*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1869. Print.
- Dillingham, William B. *Rudyard Kipling: Hell and Heroism*. New York: Macmillan, 2005. Print.
- Diver, Maud. *Candles in the Wind*. New York: John Lane, 1909. Print.
- . *Captain Desmond, V.C.* 1907. London: Blackwood, 1912. Print.
- . *Far to Seek: A Romance of England and India*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921. Print.
- . *The Great Amulet*. 1908. London: Blackwood, 1913. Print.
- . *Lilamani: A Study in Possibilities*. London: Hutchinson, 1911. Print.
- . *The Unsung: A Record of British Services in India*. London: Blackwood, 1945. Print.
- Druce, Robert. "'And to think that Henrietta Guise was in the hands of such human demons!': Ideologies of the Anglo-Indian Novel from 1859-1957". *Shades of Empire in Colonial and Post-Colonial Literatures*. Ed. C.C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. 17-34. Print.

Duncan, Ian. *Modern Romance and Transformations of the Novel: The Gothic, Scott, Dickens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.

Duncan, Sara Jeannette. *The Burnt Offering*. 1909. New York: John Lane, 1910. Print.

--. *Set In Authority*. 1906. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 1996. Print.

--. *The Simple Adventures of a Memsahib*. New York: D. Appleton, 1893. Print.

The Economist, Vol. 15. 26 Sept. 1857. Print.

Eigner, Edwin. *Robert Louis Stevenson and the Romantic Tradition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1966. Print.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Essays (First Series)*. 1841. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1876. Print.

--. *Nature*. Boston: James Monroe, 1836. Print.

Erll, Astrid. "Re-writing as Re-Visioning: Modes of Representing the 'Indian Mutiny' in British Novels, 1857-2000." *European Journal of English Studies* 10.2 (2006). 163-85. Print.

Evans, Eric. *Thatcher and Thatcherism*. 1997. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. 1952. Trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove/Atlantic, 2008. Print.

--. *Toward an African Revolution*. 1964. Trans. Haakon Chevalier. New York: Grove/Atlantic, 1994. Print.

--. *The Wretched of the Earth*. 1961. Trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove/Atlantic, 2004. Print.

The Far Pavilions. Dir. Peter Duffell. Perf. Ben Cross, Amy Irving, Christopher Lee. 1984. Acorn Media, 2011. DVD.

Farrell, James Gordon. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973. Print.

--. *The Singapore Grip*. 1978. London: Orion, 1992. Print.

--. *Troubles*. 1970. London: Orion, 1993. Print.

Ferris, Ina. "Writing on the Border: the National Tale, Female Writing, and the Public Sphere." *Romanticism, History, and the Possibility of Genre*. Ed. Tilottama Rajan and Julia Wright. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998. 86-108. Print.

Fitzgerald, Valerie. *Zemindar*. 1981. New York: Bantam, 1982. Print.

- Forster, E.M. *A Passage to India*. 1924. New York: Harcourt, 1999. Print.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 1975. New York: Knopf, 2012. Print.
- . *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon. Brighton: Harvester, 1980. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Katarina." *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: Norton, 1989. 78-95. Print.
- . *Moses and Monotheism*. Trans. Katherine Jones. New York: Vintage, 1955. Print.
- . "Mourning and Melancholia." *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: Norton, 1989. 584-9. Print.
- . *The Uncanny*. 1919. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. 1963. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1976. Print.
- Gandhi*. Dir. Richard Attenborough. Perf. Ben Kingsley, Candice Bergen. 1982. Columbia, 2007. DVD.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. 1983. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. Print.
- Gikandi, Simon. *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996. Print.
- Gilbert, Sandra and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. 1979. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000. Print.
- Gilmour, David. *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2002. Print.
- . *The Ruling Caste: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2005. Print.
- Gilroy, Paul. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia UP, 2005. Print.
- . *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*. London: Hutchinson, 1987. Print.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Prison Notebooks*. New York: Columbia UP, 1992. Print.

- Gray, Robert. "The Falklands Factor." *The Politics of Thatcherism*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983. 271-81. Print.
- Green, Martin. *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*. New York: Basic, 1979. Print.
- Gregg, Hilda. "The Indian Mutiny in Fiction." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 161 (1897). 218-31. Print.
- Guy-Bray, Stephen. *Loving in Verse: Poetic Influence as Erotic*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006. Print.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1989. Print.
- Hall, Catherine. "Going a-Trolloping: imperial man travels the Empire." *Gender and Imperialism*. Ed. Claire Midgley. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998. 180-99. Print.
- Hall, Stuart. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. New York: Verso, 1988. Print.
- Hawkins, Mike. *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945: Nature as Model and Nature as Threat*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Heat and Dust*. Dir. James Ivory. Perf. Julie Christie, Greta Scacchi. 1982. Merchant-Ivory, 2003. DVD.
- Hechter, Michael. *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development*. 2nd ed. 1975. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1999. Print.
- Heffer, Simon. *Like the Roman: The Life of Enoch Powell*. London: Orion, 1999. Print.
- Hewison, Robert. *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*. London: Methuen, 1987. Print.
- Higson, Alex. "Re-Presenting the National Past: Nostalgia and Pastiche in the Heritage Film." *Fires Were Started: British Cinema and Thatcherism*. Ed. Lester D. Friedman. 1993. London: Wallflower, 2006. 91-109. Print.
- Hirschmann, Edwin. "*White Mutiny*": *The Ilbert Bill Crisis in India and Genesis of the Indian*

- National Congress*. New Delhi: Heritage, 1980. Print.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. "Falklands Fallout." *The Politics of Thatcherism*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1983. 257-70. Print.
- Hobson-Jobson: The Anglo-Indian Dictionary*. Ed. Henry Yule and Arthur Coke Burnell. 1886. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth, 1996. Print.
- The Holy Bible: English Standard Version*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007. Print.
- Horwell, Veronica. "Obituary: M.M. Kaye, Novelist in harmony with the far pavilions of her Indian youth." *The Guardian*. 4 Feb. 2004. Web. 26 Sept. 2011.
- Hubel, Teresa. "'The Bride of His Country': Love, Marriage, and the Imperialist Paradox in the Indian Fiction of Sara Jeannette Duncan and Rudyard Kipling." *ARIEL* 21:1 (January 1990). 3-19. Print.
- Huenemann, Karyn. "Art and Photography: Sara Jeannette Duncan's Response to Kipling." *Victorian Review* 21:1 (Summer 1995). 17-35. Print.
- Inkeles, Alex and Daniel J. Levinson. *National Character: A Psycho-Social Perspective*. New Brunswick: Transaction, 1997. Print.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. 1981. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- The Jewel in the Crown*. Dir. Jim O'Brien and Christopher Morahan. Perf. Peggy Ashcroft, Charles Dance, Art Malik. 1984. A&E, 2008. DVD.
- Jhabvala, Ruth Praver. *Heat & Dust*. London: John Murray, 1975. Print.
 --. *The Householder*. 1960. New York: Norton, 2001. Print.
- Jones, Greta. *Social Darwinism and English Thought: The Interaction Between Biology and Social Theory*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester P, 1980. Print.
- Kaye, M. M. *The Far Pavilions*. 1978. New York: St. Martin's, 1997. Print.
 --. "Interview." *Wall Street Journal*. 13 Oct. 1978. Web. 31 March 2012.
 --. *Shadow of the Moon*. New York: St. Martin's, 1979. Print.
- Kennedy, Harlan. "David Lean in Interview: *A Passage to India*." American Cinema Papers Print

- Archive. 1985. Web. 12 April 2012.
- “*Kim*, by Rudyard Kipling: A Review.” *Atlantic Magazine*. December 1901. Web. 17 July 2012.
- Kipling, Rudyard. “Baa Baa, Black Sheep”. *The Week’s News*. 21 Dec. 1888. Print.
- . “If—.” *Rewards and Fairies*. New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1910. 181-82. Print.
- . *Kim*. 1901. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004. Print.
- . *Life’s Handicap*. 1891. New York: Doubleday & McClure, 1899. Print.
- . *The Phantom Rickshaw*. 1885. New York: Regent P, 1900. Print.
- . *Plain Tales from the Hills*. London: W. Thacker, 1889. Print.
- . “Recessional.” *Kipling: Poems*. New York: Everyman’s Library, 2007. 95. Print.
- . *Something of Myself: For My Friends Known and Unknown*. 1937. Edinburgh: R & R Clark, 2006. Print.
- . “The Song of the Dead.” *Rudyard Kipling’s Verse: Inclusive Edition 1885-1918*. New York: Doubleday, Page, 1920. 196-99. Print.
- . “The White Man’s Burden.” *McClure’s* 12 (Feb. 1899). Print.
- Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- Lackey, Michael. “E.M. Forster's Lecture ‘Kipling's Poems’: Negotiating the Modernist Shift from ‘the authoritarian stock-in-trade’ to an Aristocratic Democracy.” *Journal of Modern Literature* 30: 3 (Spring 2007). 1-11. Print.
- LaPierre, Dominique. *City of Joy*. 1986. London: Arrow, 1992. Print.
- Larsen, Nella. *Passing*. 1929. New York: Courier Dover, 2004. Print.
- Lee, Clive Howard. *The British Economy Since 1700: A Macroeconomic Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.
- Leonard, Suzanne. “The Threat to Whiteness: White Women’s Marital Betrayals in Colonial Settings.” *At Home and Abroad: Historicizing Twentieth-Century Whiteness in Literature and Performance*. Ed. La Vinia Delois Jennings. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2009. 119-43. Print.
- Lothspeich, Pamela. “Unspeakable Outrages and Unbearable Defilements: Rape Narratives in the Literature of Colonial India.” *Postcolonial Text* 3:1 (2007). 1-19. Print.
- Lukacs, Georg. *The Theory of the Novel*. 1920. Trans. Anna Bostock. Boston: MIT P, 1974. Print.

- Lynch, Deirdre. *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998. Print.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. 1979. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984. Print.
- Macaulay, Thomas. "Minute by the Hon'ble T. B. Macaulay, dated the 2nd February 1835." Columbia University. 2 Feb. 1835. Web. 29 Nov. 2011.
- MacLagan, E.D. "Review: *The Unsung: A Record of British Services in India*. By Maud Diver." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 78 (Jan. 1946). Print.
- MacMillan, Harold. *At the End of the Day, 1961-1963*. London: Macmillan, 1973. Print.
- MacMillan, Margaret. *Women of the Raj*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1988. Print.
- Malcolm, Derek. "David Lean in Conversation with Derek Malcolm." *The Guardian*. 23 Jan. 1984. Print.
- Mandler, Peter. *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006. Print.
- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.
- . "‘No Longer in a Future Heaven’: Gender, Race, and Nationalism." *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997. 89-112. Print.
- McLuskie, Peter. "Jewel in the Crown: British Serial Drama." *The Museum of Broadcast Communications*. n.d. Web. 28 Sept. 2011.
- Metcalf, Thomas. *The New Cambridge History of India, Vol. III: Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- Meyers, Jeffrey. "Introduction." *Kim*. 1901. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004. xv-xxix. Print.
- Mezey, Jason Howard. "Mourning the Death of the Raj? Melancholia as Historical Engagement in Paul Scott's Raj Quartet." *Studies in the Novel* 38:3 (Fall 2006). 327-52. Print.

- Midgley, Claire. "Introduction: Gender and Imperialism: mapping the connections." *Gender and Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998. 1-20. Print.
- Mijares, Loretta M. "Distancing the Proximate Other: Hybridity and Maud Diver's *Candles in the Wind*." *Twentieth-Century Literature* 50:2 (Summer 2004). 107-40. Print.
- Miller, Carolyn R. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (May 1984). 151-67. Print.
- Moore, Charles. "What Would the Iron Lady Do?" *The Wall Street Journal*. 17 Dec. 2011. Web. 23 July 2012.
- Moore, Robin J. "Curzon and Indian Reform." *Modern Asian Studies* 27 (1993). 719-40. Print.
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. "'The Bhabhal of Tongues': reading Kipling, reading Bhabha." *Writing India, 1757-1990: The Literature of British India*. Ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996. 111-38. Print.
- Morris, James (Jan). *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire*. 1968. New York: Harcourt, 1980. Print.
- Mosley, Leonard. *The Last Days of the British Raj*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1961. Print.
- "Mrs. Alice Perrin". *The Times*. 15 Feb. 1934. 9. Print.
- Muffett, D.J.M. *Empire Builder Extraordinary, Sir George Goldie: His Philosophy of Government and Empire*. Surrey: Shearwater P, 1978. Print.
- Muggeridge, Malcolm. "Review of *Staying On*." *The New York Times Book Review*. 21 Aug. 1977. 1, 36. Web. 21 July 2012.
- My Beautiful Laundrette*. Dir. Stephen Frears. Perf. Saeed Jaffrey, Roshan Seth, Daniel Day-Lewis. 1985. MGM, 2003. DVD.
- Nagarajan, S. "Sara Jeannette Duncan's Anglo-Indian Novels." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 12:33 (1977). 33-45. Print.
- Nairn, Tom. *The Break-Up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism*. 1977. Altona, Vic.: Common Ground, 2003. Print.

- . "Britain's Living Legacy." *The Politics of Thatcherism*. Ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jaques. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1983. 281-90. Print.
- The New Woman in Fiction and in Fact: Fin-de-Siècle Feminisms*. Ed. Angelique Richardson and Chris Willis. New York: Palgrave, 2001. Print.
- Newby, P.H. *Something to Answer For*. 1968. London: Faber & Faber, 2008. Print.
- "The Nobel Prize in Literature 1907: Award Ceremony Speech". Nobelprize.org. n.d. Web. 28 April 2012.
- "Noted Writer is Held Up as 'Senile.'" *The New York Times*. 14 March 1914. Web. 28 Jan. 2012.
- Nunn, Heather. *Thatcher, Politics, and Fantasy: The Political Culture of Gender and Nation*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2002. Print.
- Orwell, George. "Rudyard Kipling." 1946. *Kipling's Mind and Art*. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966. 70-84. Print.
- Pare, Anthony. "Genre and Identity: Individuals, Institutions, and Ideology." *The Rhetoric of Ideology and Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change*. Ed. Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, Tatiana Teslenko. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton, 2002. 57-71. Print.
- Parry, Benita. *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*. London: Allen Lane, 1972. Print.
- . *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*. 1972. London: Verso, 1998. Print.
- Paxton, Nancy. *Writing Under the Raj: Gender, Race, and Rape in the British Colonial Imagination, 1830-1947*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1999. Print.
- Pearce, Charles. *Love Besieged: A Romance of the Defense of Lucknow*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg, 1911. Print.
- Pearl, Sharrona. *About Faces: Physiognomy in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2010. Print.
- Penny, Fanny Emily (F.E.) *The Outcaste*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1912. Print.
- . *The Rajah*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1911. Print.
- Perrin, Alice. *A Free Solitude*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1907. Print.
- . *The Anglo-Indians*. London: Methuen, 1912. Print.

--. *Idolatry*. New York: Duffield, 1909. Print.

--. *The Waters of Destruction*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1905. Print.

--. *The Woman in the Bazaar*. London: Cassell, 1914. Print.

Poon, Angelia. *Enacting Englishness in the Victorian Period: Colonialism and the Politics of Performance*. Burlington, VT.: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Porter, Andrew. "Introduction: Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth Century." *The Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century*. Ed. Andrew Porter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 1-30. Print.

Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts. Ed. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin. 1998. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Powell, J. Enoch. *Joseph Chamberlain*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1977. Print.

--. *Reflections of a Statesman: The Writings and Speeches of Enoch Powell*. London: Bellew, 1991. Print.

Powell, Violet. *Flora Annie Steel: Novelist of Empire*. London: Heinemann, 1981. Print.

Rang de Basanti. Dir. Rakeysh Omprakash Mehra. Perf. Aamir Khan, Soha Ali Khan, Siddharth. 2006. UTV, 2007. DVD.

Reitan, Earl A. *The Thatcher Revolution: Margaret Thatcher, John Major, Tony Blair, and the Transformation of Modern Britain, 1979-2001*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003. Print.

Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" 1882. *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990. 8-22. Print.

"Review of *A Passage to India*, by E.M. Forster." *The Guardian*. 20 June 1924. Web. 20 July 2012.

"Review of *The Charm*." *The New York Times*. 22 Oct. 1911. Web. 20 April 2012.

"Review of *Set in Authority*." *The Athenaeum* 1:791 (30 June 1906). Print.

"Review of *Set in Authority*." *The Spectator* 96 (28 June 1906). 989. Print.

"Review of *Mr. Jervis*." *The New York Times*. 26 Dec. 1894. Web. 31 March 2012.

Richards, Thomas. *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. New York: Verso, 1993. Print.

The Rising: Ballad of Mangal Pandey. Dir. Ketan Mehta. Perf. Aamir Khan, Rani Mukherjee. 2005. VII, 2006. DVD.

Rodrick, Anne. *The History of Great Britain*. London: Greenwood, 2004. Print.

Roy, Paroma. *Indian Traffic: Identities in Question in Colonial and Postcolonial India*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1998. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. London: J. Cape, 1981. Print.

--. "Outside the Whale." *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism, 1981-1991*. London: Granta, 1992. Print.

Sabin, Margery. "The Suttee Romance." *Raritan* 11.2 (Sept. 1, 1991). Web. 14 Oct. 2012.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. 1993. New York: Knopf, 1994. Print.

--. "Introduction." Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. 1901. Ed. Edward Said. New York: Penguin, 1989. 7-46. Print.

--. *Orientalism*. 1978. New York: Vintage, 2003. Print.

Sainsbury, Alison. "Married to the empire: the Anglo-Indian domestic novel." *Writing India, 1757-1990: The Literature of British India*. Ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996. 163-87. Print.

Sandison, Alan. "Kipling: the Artist and the Empire." *Kipling's Mind and Art*. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. 1964. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966. 146-67. Print.

Scott, Paul. *A Division of the Spoils*. 1974. New York: Avon, 1979. Print.

--. *The Day of the Scorpion*. 1968. New York: Avon, 1979. Print.

--. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Heinemann, 1966. Print.

--. *Staying On*. London: Heinemann, 1977. Print.

--. *The Towers of Silence*. 1971. New York: Avon, 1979. Print.

Seeley, John Robert. *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures*. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1883. Print.

Sharma, Arvind. *Sati: Historical and Phenomenological Essays*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988. Print.

- Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993. Print.
- “Short History of Immigration: 1972-1979.” *BBC News: Race UK*. The British Broadcasting Corporation. n.d. Web. 21 July 2012.
- Simpson, David. *Romanticism, Nationalism, and the Revolt Against Theory*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993. Print.
- Singh, Bhupal. *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. London: Oxford UP, 1934. Print.
- Sladen, Douglas. *Twenty Years of My Life*. London: Constable, 1915. Print.
- Spivak, Gayatri. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg and Cary Nelson. Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1988. 271-313. Print.
- Sprinker, Michael. “Forward.” *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*. 1972. London: Verso, 1998. Print.
- Steel, Flora Annie. *The Hosts of the Lord*. London: Macmillan, 1900. Print.
 --. *On the Face of the Waters*. 1896. London: Heinemann, 1897.
 --. *Voices in the Night: A Chromatic Fantasia*. London: Macmillan, 1900. Print.
- Stieg, Margaret F. “Indian Romances: Tracts for the Times.” *Journal of Popular Culture* 18.4 (1985). 2-15. Print.
- Strongman, Luke. *The Booker Prize and the Legacy of Empire*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002. Print.
- Sullivan, Zohreh T. *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993. Print.
 --. “Race, Gender, and Imperial Ideology in the Nineteenth Century.” *Nineteenth-Century Contexts* 13:1 (1989). 19-32. Print.
- Surtees, Joshua. “After the riots Black Britons have pulled together – and away?” *The Guardian*. 30 December 2011. Web. 15 June 2012.
- Tausky, Thomas. *Sara Jeannette Duncan: Novelist of Empire*. Toronto: P.D. Meany, 1980. Print.

Tennyson, Sir Alfred. "The Defence of Lucknow." *Every Day in the Year*. Ed. James and Mary Ford. 17 Nov. 1902. Bartleby.com. Web. 13 July 2012.

Thatcher, Margaret. "HC S: [Falkland Islands]." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 3 April 1982. Web. 28 Feb. 2010.

--. "HC S: [Falkland Islands]." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 15 June 1982. Web. 13 Sept. 2011.

--. "Speech to Conservative Party Conference ('Confrontation with reality')." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 14 Oct. 1977. Web. 23 July 2012.

--. "Speech to Conservative Rally in Cheltenham." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 3 July 1982. Web. 28 Feb. 2010.

--. "Speech at Lord Mayor's Banquet." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 12 Nov. 1979. Web. 23 July 2012.

--. "Speech to Mid-Bedfordshire Conservatives (Falklands)." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 30 April 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

--. "Speech to the Scottish Conservative Party Conference." *Margaret Thatcher Foundation*. 14 May 1982. Web. 23 Sept. 2011.

Thomas, David Wayne. "Liberal Legitimation and Communicative Action in British India: Reading Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters*." *ELH* 76:1 (Spring 2009). 153-87. Print.

Thomson, Capt. Mowbray. *The Story of Cawnpore*. London: Richard Bentley, 1859. Print.

Todd, Richard. *Consuming Fictions: The Booker Prize and Fiction in Britain Today*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996. Print.

Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1997. Print.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. John Dryden. *The Internet Classics Archive*. Web Atomic and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. n.d. Web. 23 July 2012.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. 1989. New York: Oxford UP, 1998. Print.

wa Thiong'o, Ngugi. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: Heinemann, 1986. Print.

- Wagner, Kim. *The Great Fear of 1857: Rumors, Conspiracies and the Making of the Indian Mutiny*. Oxfordshire: Peter Lang, 2010. Print.
- Warburton, Anne. "Maud Diver: lost gem of the British Raj." *The Book Show*. 6 Dec. 2007. Web. 31 August 2011.
- Watts, George. *The Fallen Woman in the Nineteenth-Century English Novel*. Kent, Australia: Croom Helm, 1984. Print.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Country and the City*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1973. Print.
- Wilson, Angus. *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1979. Print.
- Wilson, Edmund. "The Kipling That Nobody Read." 1941. *Kipling's Mind and Art*. Ed. Andrew Rutherford. 1964. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1966. 17-69. Print.
- Wollen, Tana. "Over Our Shoulders: Nostalgic Screen Fictions for the 1980s." *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*. Ed. John Corner, Sylvia Harvey. 1991. London: Routledge, 2005. 173-88. Print.
- Woodcock, George. "The Changing Masks of Empire: Notes on some Novels by Sara Jeannette Duncan." *Yearbook of English Studies* 13 (1983). 210-27. Print.
- Wright, Patrick. *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985. Print.
- Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- . *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Print.
- . *White Mythologies: Writing, History, and the West*. London: Routledge, 1990. Print.