CHAPTER II

THE CRUMBLING OF THE EDIFICE

The period 1939 to 1947 was one of the most dramatic in the history of the world in terms of conflict – the conflict of military power as well as the conflict of ideologies. Democracy was embattled against militarism and dictatorship in Europe as the Allies struggled against the powers of Hitler and Mussolini; while in the East Japan threw back the outposts of the farflung empires of European countries and matched her strength against the United States. Against the lurid background of world violence, in which India was unwillingly involved, was the Indian struggle for independence - a struggle based on non-violent non-co-operation led by Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress. The exercise of non-violent power at the time when the world was in the grip of violence as never before was at first incomprehensible but later fascinating to those who studied the situation.
Paul Scott’s *The Alien Sky* and *The Raj Quartet* are fictional representations of the imperial-colonial scene in India, mainly during the five years before India became independent in 1947 and the public events stemming from the ambivalent love-hate relationship - the “‘imperial embrace” (*Jewel 2*) between the two peoples. The scenario opens with the actions and reactions related to the Quit India resolution of the AICC and ends with the arrangements for the partition of India and the British withdrawal in August 1947.

British India from 1942 to 1947 is topical and dispensable as momentous history; it concerns the winding up of one Empire at one time and place, in its finite specific and apparent ‘closed-in’ nature. It is as intractable as a particular experience can be for any contemplated concern with universals. By the beginning of the Second World War the authorities became quasi-aware that even their favourite Indians were turning against them. In September 1939, the Viceroy declared India to be at war with Germany. Congress provincial ministries promptly resigned, claiming that if India really was on the way to Dominion Status the Viceroy should have had the courtesy to consult the Indian leaders before committing the country to world war. August 9, 1942, signalled India’s last confrontation with the alien ruler. Gandhi shocked the world by saying: “‘Leave India to God. If that is too much, then leave her to
anarchy’” (Rao104). This mood had been gathering force. As Scott puts it in The Jewel in the Crown, even as “the English were developing their theories of the White Man’s burden to help them bear the weight of its responsibility, the Hindus and the Muslims were taking a long hard look at their religions, not to explain their servitude but to help them to end it” (363). Consequently, the government and the people were taking militant postures to attack and retaliation.

The fictional events that Scott has chosen to symbolize this challenge from the ruled to the ruler is the rape of an English girl, Daphne Manners, by a group of unknown Indians and the assault on Edwina Crane, a missionary teacher, by native crowds. The atmosphere was tense, fraught with doubt and distrust, elements which had come to stay ever since the Mutiny of 1857. “The English community . . . knew they now had their backs to a wall that the Indians seemed set on removing, brick by brick” (Jewel 40). The age of the Raj is passing away. The Second World War postponed the day of Indian independence, but the end is inevitable nonetheless because the Raj is dying from within. Even the most stalwart members keep the form but no longer have faith in God or their own sacred history and moral guidelines. That the Raj is doomed is an unarguable fact, as Scott presents it. The Raj community in Pankot is caught between a new world and an old as the Edwardian sun is setting.
They are in their final autumnal days and the air is filled with the sweet smell of decay.

Writing in the 1960s, a decade which saw the demand for social liberation in Europe and the final moments of decolonisation in Africa, Scott looks back to the Second World War and the events leading up to the loss of India, Britain's most important colonial possession. It is in India that Scott locates the most significant and wide ranging example of the disintegration of English imperial identity. Scott is primarily concerned with history's relation to the present because he argues that to understand a situation fully one must see it as a constellation of forces which has happened before and will happen again as the same human conflicts are enacted by different individuals. The past, both fictional and factual foreshadows future events, and is not casual but predictive. While writing his fiction Scott is always acutely aware that he is working within a framework provided by history - and this awareness is one that is also imparted to the persons in his work. Like their author, they too live and work and have their being within the confines drawn by an historical context. All of his characters are conscious, to a greater or lesser degree, that they are living at a time when a whole epoch of imperial history is coming to an end and are aware of the ways in which this directly affects their thinking, their behaviour and their actions as a consequence.
On the one hand Scott has a historian’s obsession with accuracy, with recording precisely the Raj’s failure to promote love, friendship, or political equality between Indians and Britons. On the other hand he has a visionary’s sense of what relations between the races could have been like. Scott’s attempts to reconcile these rival world-views by invoking conception of history which admits both the historical and the utopian. He derives this conception from Ralph Waldo Emerson, whom Barbie Batchelor and Guy Perron, two major characters in The Raj Quartet are fond of quoting. Emerson describes history as a “wave” (Towers 192) in which both crests and troughs or “beats” and “pauses” carry meaning (Jewel 382). The metaphor suggests a continuum punctuated by hiatuses. Whereas the historian in Scott is interested in the continuum of daily life, the dreamer is preoccupied with the breaks, when life for an instant seems to drop out of time and to escape the nightmare of history. For Scott, these possibilities are realized in those moments of pause in history’s wave. In The Jewel in the Crown, the nun Sister Ludmilla speaks of these moments’ crucial nature:

It is merely an illusion that some of us stand on one bank and some on the opposite. So long as we stand like that we are not living at all, but dreaming. So jump, jump in, and let the shock wake us up. Even if we drown, at least for
a moment or two before we die we shall be awake and alive. (156)

In this way Scott’s story about the crumbling of the British Empire begins as it is to continue in the enlargement of personal experience and understanding which fiction can bestow more immediately than history. Yet history too, offers applicable insights which Scott uses to the full in placing history in North India between the years 1942 and 1947. For “it was there and then, in Scott’s own words, that the liberal philosophy last excited the British” (Mahood 245).

Scott’s specific historical subject is the failure of British imperialism, the turmoil the British created and were caught by in pre-independent India. Scott dramatizes the debacle of division, not only of India and Pakistan, but more certainly, the divorce of England from the Indian subcontinent in the years leading up to and including partition. His choice of political facts from Indian history under the Raj is necessarily selective, but the imprisonment of Congress members and the civil disturbances in August 1942 to the time of partition, Scott makes them prominent in the novels and uses them to frame the narrative. In the words of Francine Weinbaum, “Scott presents a picture – politically, sociologically, and psychologically revealing – of how two nations came
into tragic confrontation, and of how and why British rule ended in failure and a sense of diminished importance” (Critical Study 94).

The Quit India Resolution passed by the All India Congress Committee on August 8, 1942 had great unpredictable impacts. It was really another crushing blow to the great British Empire, whose 1,30,000 strong garrison in Singapore had already surrendered to a much smaller Japanese Army. One of the most important pillars of power in the Empire had been the maintenance of prestige, which underpinned the coloniser’s assumption of his innate superiority over his subjects. As the historian Robert Blake has commented, “that crushing blow by an Asiatic power was never forgotten. Britain’s departure from India, Burma and Ceylon (five) years later was fore-shadowed in this defeat” (259). The British Empire seemed on the verge of collapse. Many historical phenomena came together in August 1942; the seeming breakdown of British liberal policies towards India; the seeming collapse of trust between Raj and Indian, the revelation of a far more authoritarian, even fascist Raj, beneath its benevolent paternalist facades; a crisis in the policies of the Congress Party; and a question still unresolved by historians or fiction writers, as to the extent to which this was a spontaneous or planned uprising. However, to bring India under total control the coloniser jumped into prompt action. The reaction of
Whitehall and their representatives is graphically portrayed by Scott. Congress leaders all over India, including Mohammed Ali Kasim, the fictional former Chief Minister of Ranpur, who resigned his post in 1939, were arrested. The result was widespread mayhem on August 9, 1942. Two major incidents are reported. Edwina Crane, a mission school teacher noted for her pro-Indian sympathies and who has spent “thirty-five of her fifty-seven years” (Jewel 6) in India and her assistant, Mr Chaudhuri, the Indian teacher at the school in Dibrapur were attacked. Miss Crane was returning from Dibrapur with Mr Chaudhuri on the day after Gandhi’s arrest and the outbreak of anti-British violence in many parts of India. On the way her car was attacked, whether by radical nationalists or by mere hoodlums is not made clear. Mr Chaudhuri was murdered as he tried to protect Miss Crane.

The other ghastly incident is the gang rape of Miss Daphne Manners, the niece of former Governor, Sir Henry Manners, in the Bibighar Gardens, a deserted place by five or six Indian youths. Daphne was in love with Hari Kumar, who had been in England since he was two and returned to India after his father’s death. Both dared to defy the deeply ingrained social convention or jumped into the river as Sister Ludmilla remarked, and used to meet at The Sanctuary, Sister Ludmilla’s refuge for the sick and dying among desolate Indians or at the Bibighar
Gardens. While Hari and Daphne were consummating their love in the Bibighar Gardens disregarding the external violence and arson, six peasant-like youths appeared there, attacked Hari and brutally raped Daphne.

The events that befall the individual characters have a parallelism in the events of the Raj. There is perfect amalgamation of history and story in Scott's novels. Just as his fiction draws historical panorama into the narrow circle of its own myths, it continually assimilates public events to the lives of the characters. For all their psychological verisimilitude, the major characters are in one way or other representative of political movements, or social strata: Edwina Crane and Barbie Batchelor are earnest lower-middle class missionaries and women of liberal goodwill; whereas Mabel Layton and Colonel John Layton represent the flagging idealism of the upper class. This device not only allows Scott to draw diverse historical elements into a novelistic story, but also allows him to explore an alternative idea of history. Such a view locates the meaning of public events in the lives and consciousness of single people. Emerson, in his famous essay on "History" assumes that historical facts are impossible to come by or inherently unstable. He is dismayed by this prospect: "Who cares what the fact was, when we have made a constellation of it to hang in heaven an immortal sign" (Essays 6).
The facts as external events do not matter because there is “one mind common to all individual men” (3), we can all experience history in our own lives, through our own self-knowledge: “We are always coming up with the emphatic facts of history in our private experience and verifying them here” (6-7). One must note how consoling Emerson’s view of history as biography is to the historical novel’s traditional claims, since it affirms the validity of imaginatively experienced history and its accessibility to the well-intentioned and reasonable reader.

The friendship between Edwina Crane and Chaudhuri is symbolic of the love-hate relationship subsisting between the Indians and the British, each suspecting “the other of hypocrisy, of unrevealed motives, of hiding under the thinnest of liberal skins deeply conservative natures” (Jewel 46). Edwina is an intelligent but unsophisticated spinster, a mission administrator who is laughed at for her idiosyncrasies at the same time that she is grudgingly admired for her courage. Once some years before the tense 1940s, Edwina had stood at the very door of her schoolroom and firmly refused entrance to an unruly Indian mob, relying solely on the authority of her sacrosanct status as a white memsahib. By succeeding in turning back the mob, she had become, to her embarrassment, something of a heroine not only to her pupils but to her peers as well. This English missionary “still hopes that England can
recapture her original noble aspirations for India, to recognize her moral responsibility and withdraw from India after the war” (Rao 98).

There are important similarities between the fate of Edwina Crane and that of Daphne Manners. Like Edwina, Daphne has lost her family, makes a point of working for charitable organizations, and genuinely likes India. There were difficulties with Daphne and Hari’s relationship from the beginning. The repercussions of two events – the rape of Daphne Manners and the assault of Edwina Crane and the murder of the Indian teacher with her – are placed against the general unrest of the day-August 9, 1942, which in turn is seen as the outcome of ferment over the whole country.

The example of Edwina Crane illustrates how history is allegorized in the life of an individual. Miss Crane is famed for having resisted insurrection; for having stood firm under siege from rebellious Indians, echoing British stories of the sepoy uprising of 1857. Now, on a second occasion of unrest in 1942, Miss Crane takes the decision to try to avoid a confrontation by quitting her position, she travels with Mr Chaudhuri but leaves him at his insistence, like the British quitting India, escaping by car. While Miss Crane is abused, Mr Chaudhuri is killed by his fellow Indians.
Edwina Crane’s bitter experience bears parallels to the assault on Marcella Sherwood during the Amritsar disturbances of 1919. While Miss Sherwood was bicycling to one of her schools she was intercepted by a mob and dragged to the ground. She picked herself up and ran to a house where the door was slammed in her face. She was beaten with sticks and stones and left in the street. General Dyer gave orders for a triangle to be erected where she had fallen and for six youths whom he suspected of the offence to be flogged there, though they had been neither charged nor convicted. Similarly General A.V. Reid in the fiction, who was totally insensitive to the needs and feelings of blacks as individuals, ordered stern action against the rioters of Mayapore. Ronald Merrick, the District Police Officer, a crazy mixed up villain with sexual, racial and political obsessions, promptly arrested Hari Kumar and other young Indians and when he could not make the rape charge stick had them imprisoned as political detainees.

Ronald Merrick is a very important creation of Paul Scott with the intention of showing how British justice gone awry and the whole myth of imperial benefaction failed. Mabel Layton, the burra memsahib of the ruling elite stands for all noble aspects of imperialism. Similarly, Barbie Batchelor, the retired missionary of the lower - middle class, also a quester after truth, tries to find out what has gone wrong with the Raj.
These three characters represent the Raj in various ways. Mabel Layton functions as a critic of the foundations of the edifice, while Barbie lays bare the illusions of the Raj and Ronald Merrick significantly contributes to the crumbling of the edifice. According to David Rubin, in Ronald Merrick “we see a microcosm of the Raj unmasked as hypocritically rapacious, guilty of brutal injustice and rape” (After the Raj 144). Merrick, a typical member of the white community, like General Reid, is the personification of the British Raj in its declining years with all its evil aspects. He is its “great demythologiser: the one who sees through all its pretensions. Behind the claims of Raj paternalism Merrick sees nothing but the pursuit of power” (Copley 69). Merrick ridicules the claims to a man-bap relationship between the civilian and the peasantry. “I am afraid my experiences as a police officer have blighted any enthusiasm I ever had for the idea that the simple fellow from the village is eager to prove his devotion to the raj” (Towers 144 - 145), he says to Teddie. Merrick is not a true dynamic sahib like John Layton or Robin White, he is only a board school boy who has found his way into the Indian police, which was less discriminating in its recruitment policies than the ICS or the Indian Army, and is in charge of law enforcement during the 1942 riots.

Merrick’s origins are humble and he has had no more than a grammar school education. Because of his lower-middle class origins, he
has to work his way through the Raj from the inferior police service though it is a measure of the Raj’s flexibility or its new and desperate war-time circumstances, that he ends up as a Colonel in the Indian Army. India offered Merrick, as she offered chances to several middle class Englishmen who took India as “an avenue of advancement in the English social scale” (F.G. Hutchins 107), the kind of opportunities that would never have been his at home. He rose quickly through the civil ranks and within a few years became District Superintendent of Police, neither a glamorous nor heroic distinction, but important nonetheless. General Reid respected Merrick’s attitude and talents, and privately commissioned him to ferret out the secret but true leaders of Gandhi’s movement who hid behind Congress’s apron strings. In Reid’s own words Merrick was “young enough still to respond to simple issues with the right mixture of probity and keenness” (Jewel 311). However, Merrick is filled with the emotions of contempt and envy, and is suffering from his homosexuality. As so often in the Quartet, human error is associated with sexual error, that is, sexuality that is devoid of love and full instead of a lust for possession; a sexuality also that is most often not understood by those it drives. In Merrick’s conflict with Hari Kumar, in crushing down of the 1942 riots, in his relation with the Layton family and finally in his death, the reader can notice the evil aspects of imperialism. So naturally,
Merrick is the just opposite to Edwina Crane, Daphne Manners, Mabel Layton and Barbara Batchelor who epitomized the best aspects of British Raj.

The Anglo-Indian ruling class calls unavailingly on its now-bankrupt historic relationship with India to support its wavering faith in its own authority. At such moments Scott draws attention to the absolute inability of the Raj to achieve a full "imperial embrace" (Jewel 2). The conflict between Britain's liberal policies and hardcore imperialism is evident in the love-hate relationship between Hari and Merrick. Hari Kumar is the idealisation of Macaulay's anglicization of the native black or the 'brown-skinned Englishman', whereas Merrick represents the continuity of the Raj in the maintenance first of law and order, and later of military authority. "He is central to the Raj's responses to the Quit India movement, to the INA problem, and, in the end, to communal unrest in an Indian state" (Moore 134).

The Bibighar case contains something of all the issues Scott wants to raise: justice, responsibility, political expediency, law and order, sex and race, pride and prejudice, love and loyalty. Hari Kumar's experience in the cell is the direct result of Emergency laws, and the British giving up on their rule of law. The riot that precedes it is not presented as simply an arbitrary upsurge of native violence and explicable in terms of
anarchy. According to Danny Colwell, the riot is “a signal that Britain’s moral authority, and thus its time in India, had come to an end” (I am your Mother 218). Merrick’s rejection of Kumar epitomizes the callous rejection of all Indians by the British. We sense the confrontation, the first time Merrick and Kumar came across at the Sanctuary: “They formed a triangle, Merrick, Kumar, Rajendra Singh – each equidistant apart. There was this kind of pattern, this kind of dangerous geometrical arrangement of personalities” (Jewel 145). Yet it had been a logical meeting between “Kumar - one of Macaulay’s ‘brown-skinned Englishmen’ - and Merrick, English-born and English-bred, but a man whose country’s social and economic structure had denied him advantages and privileges which Kumar had initially enjoyed” (Division 332). But here both Kumar and Merrick have experienced situations similar. In England Hari enjoyed all the privileges which were denied to Merrick. In India the tables are turned. In the confrontation between this cultured, educated English gentleman of black skin and an ambitious white man from a deprived background there is only one possible ending, the tragedy of Bibighar. In their first encounter Merrick felt slighted by Kumar’s public school accent. His English showed his privilege, which was a white man’s prerogative. Wasn’t this something to be disdained at? Sister Ludmilla’s words bring out the contrast: “In perfect English. Better
accented than Merrick’s . . . That face. Dark. And handsome. Even in the western way, handsome, far handsomer than Merrick (Jewel 148).

During the riot, however destructive the natives’ actions are, they are never disconnected from the political events of British India in its last phase, and they reflect what we see in intense close-up in the enclosed space of the interrogation cell between Merrick and Kumar – the failure of British pretensions to liberalism in its overseas venture. As the interrogation proceeds, Hari is stripped, caned, physically examined and verbally abused by Merrick, whose hatred is fuelled both by the outsider’s envy of the class Kumar had once belonged to in England and by the racid fear and contempt that, according to Merrick underlie all British-Indian relationships. In his treatment of Hari there is as much envy as contempt and this introduces the personal side of his victimization of Hari as a particular chosen individual. To quote the apt words of Patrick Swinden, “Merrick’s view of the world is one that revolves around the twin poles of envy and contempt. Everything else is deception” (Images 88). Merrick is openly envious of Hari’s education and accent, of his marks of “superiority” in terms of class. As he makes Hari palpably aware, Merrick has been exposed to barriers of class, and he transposes these into a general view of a common human predicament governed by basic feelings of superiority and inferiority:
In India he’d got on far better than he could have done at home. In India he automatically became a Sahib. He hobnobbed on equal terms with people who would snub him at home and knew they would snub him. When he considered all the things that made him one of them in India - colonial solidarity, equality of position, the wearing of a uniform, service to king and country – he knew that these were fake. They didn’t fool either him or the middle and upper class people he hobnobbed with. What they had in common was the contempt they all felt for the native race of the country they ruled. (Scorpion 311-12)

Politically and psychologically, then, the events of 1942, and the years immediately after, led to a period of profound questioning of ideas about nation and class, in which Empire had played a definite role over the previous century. Ronald Merrick entered an administrative context in which the racial superiority of the British was taken for granted. The racist-imperialist contempt that characterised Merrick’s treatment of Hari had long festered under the Raj. Churchill whom Lord Halifax believed had never shed the prejudices of a late Victorian subaltern, spoke of the “‘gross, dirty and corrupt . . . baboos’ and thought they ‘needed the sjambok’” (Moore 144).
Merrick - Kumar encounter naturally brings to the centre of Scott’s reaction to British imperialism and related evils, namely the relationship between the English class system at home and colonial racism. In India a man of lower class origins like Merrick has the freedom, because he is white to assimilate himself to the upper class, but this freedom, depending as it does on colour, makes him an ardent racist. So Goonetilleke aptly says that Merrick “is a rabid racist” (Images of the Raj 146). Despite their differences, their antagonism, and their achievements, Merrick and Hari are connected by the importance of class. Both suffer rejection and loneliness because of its pervasiveness. Hari falls from a position high on the class-ladder to its foot, while Merrick brings pain to himself and others by trying to climb up from one of its lower rungs. Hari falls because he is restricted by stereotypes of class and race, whereas Merrick climbs by using any means he can to tighten the artificial, stereotypical impression he produces on people. So Merrick is a man who, in Fenny Grace’s words has “made something of himself” (Scorpion 424).

Merrick chooses Hari for a victim, not only because Kumar had enjoyed class privileges in England, which Merrick, though white, had been denied. Between them the race conflict is complicated by a reversal of privileged position. The power structure of the Raj gives Merrick an advantage over the visible Indian sej of Kumar. Aruna Srivastava
Merrick aptly says:

Merrick has the uncanny ability to peel away the superficialities, the myths of British rule. What he says and does to Hari demonstrates the fact that an imbalance of power is the basis of colonial rule, whatever protestations of comradeship there are to the contrary. (The Pageant of Empire 153)

Merrick's fortunes aim to reduce Kumar to the subservience expected of an Indian. The relationship between Merrick and Kumar is one of mutual hatred and this represents the polar opposite of the love that gradually unfolds between Daphne and Hari Kumar. These twin poles of human feelings and these two sets of relationships also have a wider significance since they represent the quint essential paradigm – so Scott has suggested from the start – of the historical-political relationship existing between the two countries, India and Britain, “locked in an imperial embrace of such long standing and subtlety it was no longer possible for them to know whether they hated or loved one another, or what it was that held them together and seemed to have confused the image of their separate destinies” (Jewel 2). Merrick’s treatment of Hari illustrates the fatal distrust by imperialists of the Indians they had created in their image. People in England, including Lindsey, Colin’s father, were taught and
believed that "the real Indian, the man most to be trusted, was likely to your servant, the man who earned the salt he ate under your roof, . . . . The last man you could trust, . . . was the westernised Indian, because he was not really an Indian at all" (Jewel 251).

Merrick's discovery reveals to him that his life could have been fulfilled only if he had lived by a fundamentally different code. Merrick is the Raj. "What was wrong about Merrick was wrong about the raj" (Tedesco and Popham 87). Imperialism, Scott the historian hereby suggests, could have succeeded only by inverting the assumptions on which it was implemented. It would have had the purge itself of suspicion and distrust of the people it governed. It would have had to forego its conviction of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority. Most important it would have had to accept and identify with its anglicized subjects, taking-arm-in-arm with them the last step of the imperial route.

According to Scott, Merrick is the kind of Englishman responsible for the decline of the Raj - ambitious, aggressive, ruthless - one who exercised white power only to destroy. As David Rubin aptly describes, "Merrick is personification of all the profane power in the world, a terrifying totalitarian intellect gifted with the mechanically perfect logic of hate and the capacity to destroy but not to create" (After the Raj 144). Merrick is very much like members of the Raj, but not in a way most of
them would have recognized. Only Sarah does:

You are, yes, our dark side, the arcane side. You reveal something that is sad about us, as if out here we had built a mansion without doors and windows, with no way in and no way out. All India lies on our doorstep and cannot enter to warm us or to be warmed. (Scorpion 415)

The Englishness of Kumar, Scott suggests, is of a different kind – it relies upon a code of honour, decency, reticence, norms followed by a few colonial settlers such as Brigadier Manners and Mabel Layton. Hari Kumar, Merrick’s victim, has the most perceptive insight into Merrick’s mentality; his belief that the true relationship between Raj and India is one of contempt and humiliation: The permutations of English corruption in India were endless: affection for servants, for peasants, for soldiers, pretence at understanding the Indian intellectual or at sympathising with, nationalist aspirations, but all this affection and understanding was a corruption of what he called the calm purity of their contempt (Scorpion 311).

In his metaphorical treatment of the torture of Hari kumar by Ronald Merrick, Paul Scott has managed to humanize the tortured relationship of Britain and India. The scene of physical torture brings to
focus the conflict between British imperialism and Indian urge for freedom. In the guise of judicial torture to extract acceptance of the rape charges, Merrick is really enacting another rape on the Indian. As an occupational force the British ruled India like a police force. They lacked the finesse, dedication, sensitivity and foresight to understand Indians and their problems. It is the vestiges of imperial power that allow Merrick, in the last moments of the Raj, to act out fantasy of absolute mastery and the roles of ruler and ruled. But it is also his homoerotic desire that undermines the very notions of masculine Englishness upon which the Raj was constructed. Merrick wanted to extract everything possible from the situation while Hari was in his power. Hari and Merrick were finally face to face, with everything in the white man's favour. The importance of the "situation" is that it mirrors the general facts of British rule in India. Merrick is in charge of Hari, has taken him into his power, and is now free to act as he sees fit. However, Hari's non-cooperation breaks the desired intentions of Merrick and the torture becomes a critique of imperialism showing that imperialism perverts the character of imperialists as surely as it breeds nationalism.

Merrick is both victim and victimiser. Merrick's painful suffering and final calamity is to be viewed against the background of Raj's struggle against its nemesis, embodied in the Japanese invaders of Malaya
and Burma who had shown that the British could be defeated. In the final phase of the Raj Merrick is haunted by those he has condemned. Reminders of Bibighar follow him as he moves from job to job around India. Chalk marks appear on his doorstep, stones are thrown; a woman in a widow’s white sari falls at his feet on a railway platform. The persecutor is persecuted in turn. People like the Laytons believe that Bibighar is a total and unforgivable disaster. But Merrick is not one of them: “I think . . . that I shall believe they were [guilty]”, Merrick informed Count Bronowsky, “until my dying day” (Scorpion 199). But Sarah recognizes that Merrick is a man without a conscience:

Perhaps that was the way in to him, to become his victim and then to haunt his conscience. But if so, it seemed to her that it was an approach without access at the end. There was, for some reason, no way into him at all, and all the people whom he chose as victims lay scattered on his threshold. (Scorpion 415)

Merrick is far more self-destructively a victim of his repressed homosexuality, necessarily repressed because of deep social prejudice and what its acceptance might tell him about himself. Like many of his peers in Anglo-India, Merrick is “a man unable to love” (Jewel 171). Although he proposes marriage to Daphne, his attention to her is a result
of his attraction to Hari Kumar. According to Sister Ludmila, it was Kumar whom Merrick wanted. Not Miss Manners. And it was probably her association with Kumar that first caused Merrick to look in her direction (171).

Merrick’s struggle with his homosexuality becomes an allegory of British failure to accept Indians, even completely anglicized Indians as equals – the final step which, untaken led to the tragedy. The coloniser’s structure of desire manifests itself above all in Merrick’s encounter with Aziz, a young Indian, at the end of The Quartet. Merrick both makes love to, and violently beats Aziz. However, Aziz takes part in the sexual encounter with Merrick and suffers the beating from him because of wider, political motives born out of the emergency, the disintegration of the Raj, and the resistance of militant Indian opposition. Finally, Merrick reaches his apogee in death. In his own scheme of things this is a glory — death that realizes the envy and fear felt towards him by others. However, J. G. Farrell, critic and writer, remarks that Merrick is “blown off like a safety valve by the expansive forces of independence” (Indian Identities 555). Merrick’s moral degeneration is symbolic of the Raj’s degeneration. In his nausea and death wish, he represents the Raj. Aziz finally kills him because Merrick himself wishes it. It is evident that he enjoys the night with Aziz before he is killed in a dreadful manner. In
Badiger’s words, Merrick’s “unnatural death is a form of suicide, representing the suicide of the raj” (Paul Scott 73). Yet, in Scott’s symbolic pattern it is necessary for Merrick to perish when the Raj dies because “he has attempted to create himself in its image” (Childs 129).

The historian Perron sees that characters like Merrick who disregard history are themselves disregarded by historians. Merrick is one of those “who lacked entirely that liberal instinct which is so dear to historians that they lay it out like a guideline through the unmapped forests of prejudice and self-interest as through the line and not the forest, is our history” (Division 332). Perron sees that Merrick chose a social definition that was anachronistic alliance with Anglo-India in its decline. Merrick hoped not to be drowned by the tides of history. In Perron’s opinion, there is no escape: “But he will be. Can’t the fool see that nobody of the class he aspires to belong to has ever cared a damn about the empire and that all that God-the – Father-God-the-raj was a lot of insular middle – and lower-class shit”? (229). On an earlier occasion, Merrick admits to Sarah human fallibility and passes some of the responsibility to the Raj for giving it rein: “I sometimes think that if I’d done something terribly wrong the rubber stamp would have endorsed it” (Scorpion 222). This is perhaps the closest Scott himself comes to identifying Merrick with the Raj. For Merrick, history is a series of
events whose significance has never been realized. Because they “couldn’t face up to their responsibility for them” (309). They prefer to view these events as part of an impersonal drift. By pretending they have no control, people ironically, contribute to the randomness of history’s flow. But the direction of history can be corrected, redirected, by understanding and enacting ideas, thus establishing their proper significance.

While Ronald Merrick serves as the representative of the evil aspects of imperialism, Mabel Layton, mistress of Rose Cottage, stands for the benevolent aspects of Empire, but at the same time foresees the crumbling of the edifice. Mabel is a strong independent woman who already senses that the days of the Raj are over. The Laytons have been in India for a long time and are “bone of India’s bone” (Scorpion358). Generations of Laytons had served the Raj as administrators and soldiers and they represent the essence of man-bap to Indian soldiers. Their origins, rise and fall are a reflection of the fortunes and disasters not only of the Raj, but of the British Empire in its entirety. Two of the Layton children, Sarah and Susan, were born in Pankot. Their father, John Layton was married here. Their grandfather, James Layton, had served as deputy commissioner for Pankot District. John had lost his mother quite early and had only dim memories of her. When his father James married
again his stepmother Mabel became more of a mother to him than his own mother had been.

Now Mabel Layton, the elderly, reclusive, deaf, rose-growing doyenne of the British colony in the hill station of Pankot, is regarded as an upstanding example of the Raj memsahibs. However, since the time she refused to contribute to the Dyer fund in 1919, Mabel has been considered hostile to the society of officers and memsahibs who represent the Raj in Pankot. The widow first of a British officer and then of a deputy commissioner, Mabel had rebelled against her class by contributing a hundred pounds to a fund for the victims of Jallianwallah Bagh. She sent a cheque to Sir Ahmed Akbar Ali Kasim, father of Mohammed Ali Kasim, a prominent Indian knighted by the British, to help the families of the Indian victims. Mabel’s gesture is an answer to Scott’s own question: why did the British come to India? To Mabel, the British mission meant imposing English standards of politics and government, religion, economics, language, and culture upon subject nations. “The choice,” Mabel says, “was made for me when we took the country over and got the idea we did so for its own sake instead of ours” (Scorpion 64).

Later in her life, Mabel is haunted by the memories of the massacre and the collective guilt of her countrymen which she expresses in her
troubled sleep. She mutters the words "Gillian Waller" (Towers 36) which are the twisted and garbled version of Jallianwailah Bagh. The identity of "Gillian Waller" is a minor mystery to many of her associates, and Barbie in particular. It is Scott's oblique and impressively imaginative way of hinting that in this unintelligible "Gillian Waller" lay the seeds that ultimately grew to uproot the Raj.

Towards the end of her life, when Mabel is unsociable at Susan's wedding party and leaves it without a word, people try to explain it away. Just as Susan withdrew emotionally from the community, Mabel Layton isolated herself physically. For Pankot, Mabel symbolized the spirit of a lost age along with those Edwardian attributes of certainty, self-assurance, and total conviction (Towers 193). Since she had lost two husbands to India and her stepson is a prisoner of war somewhere in Germany, it is natural to think of Mabel as "representing something" (22). The Raj does not condemn Mabel's silence and isolation because they assumed her silence is from one "who knew events could speak for themselves and would do so" (258), and they are sure they all would agree on the message. But a point comes when this is impossible. "The truth could no longer be avoided. It had been a criticism of the foundations of the edifice, of the sense of duty which kept alive the senses of pride and loyalty and honour... god was no longer there to
receive them" (252). Thus Mabel has withdrawn into her rose garden but
she knows it is not possible for a Britisher to be a recluse in India because
even when the British are alone they are on show, representing something
– the best and the worst aspects of the Raj. Mabel Layton, who knew that
the edifice of the temple was hollow and meaningless, could not see the
Raj way of life as the guarantee, the foundation of virtuous blossoms like
pride, loyalty, and honour.

From her life as a gardener Mabel knows that for a rose or a person
to flourish, one has to nurture individuality, coax roots to dig deeply, and
cultivate with fingers occupied by years of patient custom and love.
When Mabel knelt beside the storage trunk and unwrapped the gown,
Sarah noticed that her posture was the same as when she pruned her rose
bushes. It is appropriate, Sarah reflects, that decayed husks whether
religious or historical, should be pruned away. Only then could people
and roses be coaxed to their vigour and ripe old age, “with the removal of
those decayed relics of its former flowering” (Scorpion 370). What
angered Mabel most about the Raj and their tradition is its unchanging
quality. As she surveyed the silver and flags in the trophy room she told
Barbie: “I thought there might be some changes, but there aren’t . . . . I
can’t even be angry. But someone ought to be” (Towers 192).
The death of Mabel Layton is symbolic of the demise of the Raj. Her tranquil last years, seemingly the fitting end to a life spent as a typical memsahib in the service of the Empire, a true member of “the ruling class of India” (11), collapse into a moment of death that reveals something profoundly disturbing beneath the Raj’s civilised surface. Her companion Barbie Batchelor, tricks her way into the morgue and witnesses the death mask of the old ruling class: “The eyes were open and looking directly at the doorway. The mouth was open too and from it a wail of pain and terror was emitting” (228). The horror inscribed on her face at the moment of death, then has a specific origin (Amritsar) and connects the experience of the individual to those moments of colonial violence which provide an alternative narrative of Empire to that which the Raj officially sought to establish for itself.

Several weeks prior to her death Mabel had made a casual comment that she would never go to Ranpur again “at least not until [she is] buried” (181). This causal comment becomes a command to Barbie with all the sanctity of a last will and testament, her dear friend’s sacred wish that she be buried in Ranpur. Though Barbie tries to persuade Mildred to give Mabel a proper burial beside her first husband at Ranpur, Mildred disregards her words and arranges it at Pankot itself. In his
description of the funeral Scott associates Mabel’s death with the death of the Raj, its ideals unfulfilled:

There (she thought) went the raj, supported by the unassailable criteria of necessity, devoutness, even of self-sacrifice because Mildred had snatched half-an-hour from her vigil to see the coffin into the hole she had ordered dug . . . . But what was being perpe-trated was an act of callousness: the sin of collectively not caring a damn about a desire or an expectation or the fulfilment of a promise so long as personal dignity was preserved and at a cost that could be borne without too great an effort. (235)

In Bhaskara Rao’s opinion the lack of care and concern to this great lady’s wishes “symbolizes to Barbie the tragedy of the Raj itself in India” (Paul Scott 86). To Barbie this broken promise – similar to those made to India by Britain during the First World War – is symbolic of the moral failure of the Raj. In 1917, to maintain Indian co-operation with the war effort, Britain’s Secretary of State for India had promised India eventual self-government. But with the war won the Raj extended, through the infamous Rowlatt Acts, wartime powers enjoyed under the Defence of the Realm Act. Had Britain returned power to India as promised, then the history that contained Amritsar, national riots and protests, Bibighar, and
horrific scenes of mass Hindu-Muslim slaughter would have been altered. Even Mabel could have slept without these horrible dreams of "Gillian Waller". Instead the British insistence on independence on their own terms led thirty years more of repressive laws and growing hostility. The burial of Mabel's body against her wishes, in the convenient place instead of the promised place is symbolic of England's principles laid to rest without the promised union.

In Mabel Layton Scott's identification of idealistic England with moral purpose, egalitarian love, and the divine is apparent. With Mabel's death the reader must sense that Anglo-India has lost her conscience and that the English will soon be dispossessed forever. Francine Weinbaum also notices the relevance of Mabel. In her opinion, Mabel "is the spirit of loss and of mourning, the England that sees the opportunity missed, the guardian of the lost ideals" (Critical Study 180). Mabel Layton knew that the edifice of the temple was hollow and meaningless. She could not see the Raj way of life as the guarantee, the foundation of virtuous blossoms. All the edifice needed, Mabel and later Barbie came to understand, is to be toppled by a political or supernatural disaster a symbolic Quetta earthquake. Such a disaster might prove an end to the Raj's earthly ambitions, but that is preferable to the pathetic waste and impotent attempts to breathe life into the skeletal remains:
The charade was finished Mabel had guessed the word years ago but had refrained from saying it. The word was ‘dead’. Dead. Dead. It didn’t matter now who said it; the edifice had crumbled and the façade fooled nobody. One could only pray for a wind to blow it all away or for an earthquake such as Captain Coley’s wife had died in. (Towers 219)

Ronald Merrick’s and Mabel Layton’s representation of the Raj is poles opposite, whereas Scott makes his basic criticisms of the Raj through a highly dependable commentator, Barbie Batchelor, who reflects on her life’s work as a missionary during her five years as Mabel Layton’s companion in Rose Cottage, Pankot. This saintly and slightly dotty retired school mistress has resigned her missionary calling, but not her dedication to duty, sacrifice and selflessness. A devout Christian, she is, evangelical in spirit and believes that teaching children the word of God is more important than teaching them about the world. However, missionary India “had dried her out. There was nothing left of Barbie Batchelor” (Scorpion 336).

Scott’s characters suffer loss of belief in their inherited values and awareness of their irrelevance in the eyes both of Indians and of their own people in Britain. They are captive to their past. They are also burdened by the crushing weight of their own history, caught in what Emerson had
called “the moral drift of history” (Jewel 382). Scott would show this through the consciousness of Barbie, who represents displacement and a sense of lost mission:

[M]y life here has indeed been wasted because I have lived it as a transferred appendage, as a parlour maid, the first in line for morning prayers while the mistress of the house . . . kneels like myself in piety for a purpose. But we have no purpose that God would recognize as such. (Towers235).

Scott presents England’s loss of faith as Barbie’s feeling of loss. In February 1945 Winston Churchill wrote to his wife of the sorry plight to which they had reduced themselves by losing confidence in their mission: “I have had for sometime”, writes Churchill, “a feeling of despair about the British connection with India, and still more about what will happen if it is suddenly broken”(Moore 93). Thus through Barbie’s unfulfilled yearnings and psychological revelations the reader is guided to a sense of regret for the frustration of an ideal as well as to Scott’s view of the causes of British failure in India.

In the beginning of The Towers of Silence, when Barbie arrives in Pankot by rail to stay as paying guest at Rose Cottage with Mabel Layton, the faithful servant Aziz declares her trunk too heavy to go on the tonga.
The too heavy trunk that causes the fatal accident is always identified as Barbie’s life in India. Barbie is on the one hand an illustrative figure who embodies a view of history that Scott adopts from Emerson and on the other hand a person who, even if unconsciously perceives historical forces which will shape the future. The novel’s examination of Emerson’s theory centres around Barbie, “perhaps the most complicated and sympathetic of Scott’s characters” (Scanlan, Disappearance 158). Barbie’s search for meaning and continual perusal of Emerson is England’s bewildered quest for an explanation of what has gone wrong in India. Barbie becomes obsessed with Emerson when she comes across these lines in “History”: “If the whole of history is in one man, it is all to be explained from individual experience. There is a relation between the hours of our life and the centuries of time” (Essays 3 - 4).

We can read Barbie’s life and private experiences as history. Her recognition that the civil authorities encourage the divisions between Hindu and Islamic communities, for example, is a crucial perception for the last volume of the Quartet, A Division of the Spoils which ends with the religious massacres of 1947. Her Protestant zeal, however misguided, represents the idealist hope that Britain can leave behind a unified India, and perhaps the more basic hope that the best of its civilization is a positive legacy for India. From her experiences in Pankot’s white
community, Barbie came to the realization that the entire enterprise was a sham. The British have never become "bone of Indian's bone". They are only visitors, never becoming one with India or with its people. The Raj has no purpose God would recognize or bless. It has never truly been their "desire or intention to colour it permanently but only to make it as cloudless" (Towers 235) for themselves as they can. In her disappointment about her missionary work and in her feeling that God "no longer . . . believed in her or listened to her. She felt cut off from Him as she would if she had spent her life doing something of which He disapproved" (4), Barbie is representative of the British in India yearning for the moral certainty and sense of purpose of the past.

Barbie's attitude towards her trunk full of memorabilia from her missionary teaching days is put into words for her by her reading of Emerson:

'The trunk is a very different kettle of fish. Unlike a writing-table, unlike one's clothes, one's shoes, it is of no use. But it is my history. And according to Emerson without it, without that, I'm simply not explained. I am a mere body, sitting here. Without it, according to Emerson, none of us is explained because if it is my history then it is yours too and was Mine!' (269 - 70)
Barbie's possessions are like sacramental signs of her sacred labours. They explain her: they are the skeleton, the bones of her history, her holy relics. No one else appreciated her trunk, her writing-table, and her row of shoes, but Barbie would not allow herself to be separated from them. According to Peter Childs, the trunk "which carries the burden of her past, appears, as a Pandora's box out of which everything will fly except hope: for Scott its fate matches that of Anglo-Indian relationship at Independence" (*Paul Scott's Raj Quartet* 77). Barbie finds herself convinced through her reading of Emerson that her trunk with its possessions represents her own history and identity, she tells Sarah: "It is my life in India. My shadow" (*Towers* 270). The book of Emerson's essays supported and expanded Barbie's feelings about her own past. Just as Barbie believed herself explained by the relics of her past, Emerson regarded all of humanity to be explained by its history: "Man is explicable by nothing less than all his history" (67). This means that modern man, whether Raj or Indian must look to every and all aspects of the past belonging to all peoples before he could adequately understand himself.

During her stay with Mabel Layton as paying guest in Rose Cottage, Barbie has to face the wrath of Mildred Layton, "a minor symbol of imperial decadence" (*Goonetilleke* 148), wife of Colonel John Layton.
Mildred's long antagonism for Barbie also has symbolic overtones. Unable to cope with her added burdens, Mildred resorts to heavy drinking and an adulterous liaison with Kevin Coley, an ambitious junior officer, while her husband is a prisoner of the Nazis. She despises Barbie immediately for being Mabel's guest, and therefore keeping the Laytons out of Rose Cottage. Against the worldly pressures of history, Mildred continues to sustain the myths of the Raj. Although aware that there is no future for her or her kind in India, Mildred's sense of duty still prevails, and the knowledge that this might be a futile task is signalled only by her alcoholism. The image of Mildred sitting with drink in hand becomes an icon for the current state of the Raj. Mildred's drinking is her way of coping with "the unbearable comedy of life" (Towers 34). Mabel's death provides the opportunity to Mildred to send Barbie out of Rose Cottage; the spirit of insular selfishness has thrown England out of India. Barbie wants to leave the trunk in Rose Cottage because England wants evidence of its presence and good intentions to remain in India. The trunk, however, is discarded by Mildred's mali. Symbolically then, the history of the good intentions of the British in India is in the hands of the spirit of narrow selfishness, which, in discarding it, destroys the British and their history.
Barbie’s determination to hang on to her trunk, which she says “only contains [her] years and they are light enough” (378), loaded against Merrick’s advice results in the overloading of the tonga and the consequent accident. She feels the physical pressure of “the weight of the trunk at her back; her years pressing on her pushing her forward, pushing her downward” (379), thus revealing to her that her history is a burden rather than a consolation. She wondered if she would be better off if her past blew away like dandelion seeds or dry leaves, even if her religious principles departed with it. And finally this very trunk, the coffin of her history, drives her to madness and death. With her death, the “scattered relics” in the trunk became irrelevant, symbolizing her history which, like others, “now can never all be retrieved” (386).

All her life Barbie has been a compulsive talker, a teacher with a carrying voice. She dislikes her own chatter and admires Mabel’s “gift for stillness” (247). Shortly before Mabel’s death, Barbie begins to experience “imaginary silence” in which she cannot hear her own voice talking “with neither debit nor credit to her account, no longer in arrears with any kind of payment because the account had not been opened yet” (176). This sensation is so attractive that she thinks “Emerson was wrong, we’re not explained by our history at all, in fact it’s our history that gets in the way of a lucid explanation of us” (176 - 77). In trying to
grapple with Emerson's ideas of history Barbie finds herself facing a contradiction. Initially she fully agrees with Emerson's statement that man is explicable by nothing less than all his history, but refutes the idea later. "Barbie's belief", writes Srivastava, "that her personal history is represented by her personal belongings is a form of personal mythology, analogous to the Anglo-Indians' sense of history that is reducible to genealogy and a line of notable events" (The Pageant of Empire 268). Barbie tries to re-shape her silence so that it will not be "used to destroy contact but to create it" (Towers 177). The kind of history that obscures the "lucid explanation" that Barbie desires is the history which ignores human motivation and feeling in favour of the evidence of documents, physical artifacts, and single truths – a history which, by insisting on the intolerable burden of the past, posits an unavoidable sense of destiny.

The disastrous end of the Second World War is also a prediction of the end of the Raj. The English honoured their past but do not live it, perverting their own high principles and hastening the reign of the savage. Now Barbie, as England in India, lies dying in the Hospital of the Samaritan Mission of the Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy. Previously an incessant chatterer, she is now struck speechless; promises are meaningless when Britain permits the subdivision of the subcontinent. She can now see vultures on the Parsee "towers of silence"; perhaps Paul
Scott is suggesting, in symbolic terms, that the Raj is dead and its bones are waiting to be picked.

The major actions of the fictional story tend to constellate around the landmarks of the historical one and Scott carries the process of assimilating history to fiction to the point where history seems almost subsumed. Scott connects not only the date but the image of Barbie’s death with those of Hiroshima victims on August 6, 1945: “They found her thus, eternally alert, in sudden sunshine, her shadow burnt into the wall behind her as if by some distant but terrible fire” (Towers 386). The description of her corpse might depict any one of the Japanese victims, as if she participated in that experience. At the end of her life Barbie found the true value of her past: “One keeps up if one can and cherishes those possessions which mark one’s progress through this world of joy and sorrow” (382). Some of her relics “were blessed by the good intentions that created them” (386), but they were not synonymous with herself or her value as a person. She gave meaning to her past and to her belongings, not they to her.

Barbie functions as one of Scott’s most reliable and ‘graceful’ of moral guides. She did not succumb to the Raj’s social and moral blackmail as Sarah did. She did not let them make her small, although they tried to deny and starve her individual personhood. She was able to
face the truth about the evils of the Raj more courageously than Edwina Crane because she did not depend on some impersonal "moral drift of history" to right the wrong.

Paul Scott's presentation of the love-hate relationship between India and England is an examination of the unrecorded moments and the unrecorded people of conventional histories. People who are peripheral to the ruling group responsible for the creation and articulation of history are therefore rendered invisible to official version of history. As in other colonial arenas, the colonised — here the Indians — are thus silenced in British histories. But by concentrating on Ronald Merrick, Mabel Layton, Barbie Batchelor, and others, Scott is also illuminating their absence from or marginality to, conventional histories of the Raj. Barbie's obsessive attention to the fate of her trunk is thus part of her need to establish a history of her own, and Scott presents her on purpose as a "historical monument" to Hiroshima in order to underline her significance and participation in her country's and community's history. By throwing a "spotlight" (Division 332) and making Ronald Merrick a central character, (he is the only one who appears in all four books of the Quartet) precisely because he is "the unrecorded man" (332), Scott can examine the conflict between Merrick and Hari, which "reveals the real animus, the one that historians won't recognize, or which we relegate to
our margins" (332). Even Paul Scott in *The Raj Quartet*, set out to dramatize history from 1942-1947 does not include all the important events. He uses a variety of techniques to house the key currents of history and convey their complexity, suggesting that it is ultimately impossible for us to completely explain being history, historical figures or any human for that matter.

Scott had to maintain a distinctive emphasis on individual issues and at the same time dramatize the "moral continuum of human affairs" (*Jewel* 1). He solves this problem by showing how individual lives of Merrick, Mabel, Barbie and others form part of the official and political relationship between the two races, and also by demonstrating at the same time how these characters viewed this larger relationship and were affected by it; not simply as Indians or English but as individuals in need of emotional fulfilment and moral affirmation in their own separate ways. Furthermore, by revealing the situation and events as they impinge on the consciousness of Merrick, Mabel and Barbie, Scott ‘shows’ us how the events compelled them to examine themselves. Merrick’s identification with the Raj is the key to Scott’s illustration of the failure of imperial rule. In 1947, after more than a century of having professed to rule India in order to prepare the country for self-government, Britain hastily stepped away from the imperial embrace. India was left to stumble,
confused and bloodied, into independence. The Raj era's quiet slipping into history is signified by the death of Merrick.

The imperial context becomes for Mabel and Barbie a means by which they discover their true selves and explore the meaning of a moral life, in circumstances that rudely dislocated the smug routine of their lives in England, and of the lives of the Indians as they would have been without the British presence in India. By narrating the story of Merrick, Mabel and Barbie and other characters, Scott conveys a message that the Raj should have relinquished their stranglehold on India as long as they refused to co-mingle with India and insisted on inhabiting their towers of silence. The passing of the British would not be lamented:

You oughtn't to say, Gaffur,

That God created roses,

No matter how heavenly they smell.

You have to think of the time when you're both
dead and smell nasty

And people are only interested in your successors.

(Towers165)
Chapter III

The Paradise Lost