CHAPTER I

British Imperialism - its Facets

The British rule in India, spanning a period of two centuries, is a complex growth of imperialism and a considerable effort is needed to understand the British attitudes towards the Indian reality. A historical overview is required to see the various attitudes emerging with the passage of time and the requirements of the Empire. Despite differences in tone as well as in theme, these attitudes were subservient to the primary object of the Empire - the opening up of the Indian sub-continent both as the supplier of raw materials to Britain's ever-expanding industries, and as a market for the British products. Therefore, while discussing various British attitudes, we will have to constantly bear in mind the fact that such attitudes towards India did not so much spring from an awareness of the Indian reality as from that of socio-economic developments in England. As Allen J. Greenberger puts it:

The emphasis is always on England rather than on India. It is events in England, and in the West in general, which determine the image held of India at any particular time. From this it follows that the images were not changed by the Indian reality. It is far more likely that the images have influenced the way in which the reality was seen.

The consolidation of the British rule after 1818 prepared the ground for the increased influence that the Liberals and the Evangelicals were to exert on Britain's India policy. It also helped the growth of the imperial
attitude which was marked by a strong contempt for all that was Indian and by the necessity to hold on to the Empire at all costs. The idea of the British civilization being on a superior level was yet to take shape. But, as the Industrial Revolution progressed in England, leading to a total change in the modes and relationships of production, the British attitudes towards India underwent a radical change. The introduction of reform measures in India, therefore, must be viewed in relation to the growth of England as a colonial power. The exploitation of the country by the British Industrial capital called for a stable society in India and this consideration prompted the reforms. In this context Ramkrishan Mukherjee observes:

Warren Hastings had earlier felt the need for some 'reforms' in order to establish a stable basis for British rule in India, and he was rightly characterised as having laid the real foundations of the British power in India.²

There were two basic British attitudes which started developing in the nineteenth century and continued and were passed on into the twentieth century. The Liberals and the Utilitarian - the Evangelical groups - started talking in terms of Britain's mission of saving India. Charles Grant was the chief spokesman of this viewpoint and his influential tract, Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain (1794) listed the evils of Hindu Society and put forward the view that the British rule could be reconciled to India if the social structure of the country was radically transformed. He was trying to find a justification
for permanent British Rule in India. This he attempted by weighing the intrinsic merits of the two civilizations, the Western and the Indian. His lack of sympathy for the Indian culture and civilization made his attitude appear similar to that of the Imperial school of administrators. But, there was a fundamental difference. Grant believed that it was the duty of the British not only to provide protective rule to the people of India but also to look into the malaise affecting Indian society and seek the means to remove it. His was the typical evangelical stand. Grant attacked Hinduism and declared it to be the chief cause behind the moral degradation of the Hindus whose distinguishing mark he found to be an "abandoned selfishness." British power, Grant felt, could be permanently established only on the basis of good government which would be able to flourish only after the evils of Hinduism were done away with. For this, he advocated the spread of Western education alongside the spread of the Gospel. Grant's views were to receive strong support about twenty years later from the Utilitarian philosopher, James Mill. James Mill's emphasis on change, however, was from a secular angle.

According to Mill, the answer to all the ills in Hindu society lay in the moral and intellectual emancipation of the people and this could be achieved only through good laws and efficient government. In contrast to the approach of the Evangelicals, Mill looked at the problem of Indian backwardness from a secular angle. He virtually rejected
all that is Indian by way of culture and civilization. He, like his mentor, Jeremy Bentham, was poor in his understanding of the psychology of religion and culture and in many ways was a crude determinist. "The extreme position in relation to Indian society adopted by Mill was clearly born out of the lack of his direct contact with the Indian reality." 4

As already discussed, Evangelicalism and Utilitarianism arose out of the economic changes triggered off in England by the Industrial Revolution and both the movements were rooted in the capitalist relationships of production. Though both these movements shared a fundamental contempt for Indian institutions, they differed in their priorities regarding the transformation of Indian society. While the Evangelicals stressed a change of individual morality through the spread of the Gospel, the Utilitarians upheld the doctrine of secularism. Their ideas seriously challenged the earlier attitude of non-interference with the Indian way of life. Since events in England helped chiefly to shape the British image of India, it was quite natural for both the Utilitarians and the Evangelicals "to see the Indian situation predominantly from the British point of view." 5

As opposed to Liberal - Utilitarian viewpoint, there was a group of thinkers who earnestly believed and propagated that the Britishers should not try to interfere with the social, cultural and the moral system of India which is the product of the centuries of experience and whose success is time - tested. The Conservatives, led by men like Thomas
Munro and Mountstuart Elphinstone tried to uphold the idea that the interest of the Empire would not be served by trying to transform the Indian society and morals along the Western lines. The stand adopted by Munro and Elphinstone was supported by Charles Metcalf and, later on, by Lord Ellenborough. Munro drew his inspiration from Edmund Burk and opposed the Cornwallis system for imposing English ideas and institutions in India. Although Munro believed that British rule in India should be prolonged as far as possible, yet he envisaged a time when the Indians would be able to govern themselves. The aim of British policy, Munro believed, should be to prepare Indians towards this end.

It was Edmund Burke who gave the philosophical basis to the Conservative attitude towards India. In his speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings, Burke tried to show that Indian society was a civilized polity possessing laws, institutions and traditions which were the outcome of centuries of effort and experience and which were guided by the exigencies of natural law. While referring to India's laws and customs, Edmund Burke remarks:

But God forbid we should pass judgement upon people who framed their laws and institutions prior to our insect origins of yesterday. With all the faults of their nature, and the errors of their institutions, the institutions which act so powerfully on their natures, have two material characteristics which entitle them to respect; first great force and stability, next excellent moral and civil effects.6

But the Industrial Revolution brought about such a radical change in the content of British colonialism in India
that, despite so powerful a spokesman as Burke, the Conservative viewpoint started losing ground. The Industrial Revolution may be regarded as the prime cause behind the major shift which occurred in the British attitude towards India in the last days of the nineteenth century and thereafter. The new stage of colonialism required different colonial policies and consequently a different attitude towards Indian culture and civilization emerged. "Britain's relationship with India during this period must, therefore, be viewed in terms of the contrast between the rather static and traditionally feudal order in colonial India and the swiftly changing society of England." 7

One of the chief factors leading to the decline of the Conservative influence was the dichotomy between what the Conservative thinkers like Burke believed about India and her traditional society and the growing ineffectiveness of putting such ideals into action in the colony. This dichotomy arose from the practical difficulties of applying the Conservative stand to the Indian situation. As a result, Conservatism or rather the Conservative attitude towards India, appeared to be closer to the Imperial viewpoint especially when it came to advocate only that degree of preservation of the constitution which served the needs of the time and the Empire. This certainly was not what was advocated by Burke or Cumming. Whereas Burke believed that India should develop according to the traditions and the needs of her people, Conservatism as applied in the Indian situation came to be identified with forces which were opposed to India's rise to modernity. This
apparently reactionary image made it all the more easy for Utilitarians and the Evangelicals to finally defeat the Conservatives.

The Imperial attitude, which emerged at about the same time as the Conservative attitude of Burke and William Jones, appeared to have been based on the practical needs and difficulties of governing a distant colony whose inhabitants had a totally different culture and sensibility. This attitude was marked by limited objectives and was primarily aimed at preserving the Empire. It was advocated mainly by a set of British officials and statesmen who, while possessing little regard for or interest in the country and its people, were guided by the conviction that British power had to be maintained in India at all costs. "This feeling was marked, on the one hand, by the belief in the superiority of British rule, and, on the other, by the conviction that the Indians were, as a race, inferior and weak and their civilization was primitive." 

The upholders of the Imperial spirit seemed to have much in common with the Conservatives in that they too opposed the imposition of Christianity on the people of India. But whereas the early Conservatives opposed Christian proselytization on the ground that it would damage India's tradition and culture, the Imperial viewpoint saw in such proselytizing work the danger of creating undue complexities for British rule by upsetting the prevailing stability in Indian society. It was on the same ground that they opposed the introduction of the reforms, although they were prepared to tolerate a certain degree of
Anglicization of the administration. "The characteristic Imperial attitude was to maintain the Empire or to expand it reluctantly, to enjoy the benefits of trade but not to develop the commercial possibilities of India, to rule the country without introducing many changes." 9

The predominant consideration of the ruling British class in India was the perpetuation of the British rule notwithstanding various political and policy statements. Deep down, they were always motivated and governed by the Imperialistic considerations, whether the frame work of policy statements was Conservative, Evangelical, Liberal or Oriental. "The failure of these ideologies has been explained by the fact that it was impossible for British policy in the colonies to rise to the ideological and policy levels prevalent at home." 10 Therefore, in the ultimate analysis, the British attitude towards India tends to be imperialistic, aloof and deeply rooted in the racial superiority of the white. This is how George D. Bearce observes:

Britain had no philosophers of Imperialism but she cast her lot for the enlightened self-interest of maintaining the Indian Empire for the economic benefit of the motherland. There seems to be a consensus among historians and political analysis that Britain's Imperial attitudes were often the result of policies and actions stemming from the needs of running an empire rather than building a sound intellectual basis for such policy and action. 11

It is relevant to have a critical look into some
representative fictional works of the nineteenth century before proceeding to analyse the selected novels of Paul Scott and E.M. Forster. It will put the present study into a historical perspective and thus broaden our understanding of the subject.

William Delafield Arnold's *Oakfield Or Fellowship in the East* (1853) is not merely concerned with the state of affairs of the English community in India, but is designed to pose fundamental questions about the British relationship with India. Hence, as a reflection of the British attitude towards India in the mid-fifties of the nineteenth century, Arnold's novel is a highly relevant work. It contains certain seminal ideas regarding the British relationship with India. It is important not only because it represents Victorian attitudes towards India, but also because it puts forward, perhaps for the first time in Anglo-Indian fiction, ideas such as those of cultural incompatibility and the white man's stoic commitment to duty in India. Such ideas were later to be given a distinct shape in the writings of Rudyard Kipling. *Oakfield* may be seen as a serious search for a moral basis to the British rule in India. Throughout the novel, Arnold calls for reform, not of the Indians as suggested by the Utilitarians and the Evangelicals, but of his own countrymen ruling a vast, alien Empire. In his dedication which accompanies the first edition of *Oakfield*, Arnold writes:

> But it cannot be denied that there is a want of earnestness, a want of moral tone, and together with much superficial scepticism that would pass for freedom of thought, a want of liberality, greater than exists in corresponding classes of society at home.12
The bulk of the novel is taken up by Oakfield's relationship with his friends in India. Through these friends, and through the long and introspective letters Oakfield writes to them, Arnold tried to put forward his views on the role of the Englishmen in India and as to what should be the correct attitude towards their country. On landing in India, he finds the land and its people quite an overwhelming experience. To tell the truth he was still "stunned by the wonderful change which a few weeks had wrought for, but not in him. He himself being unchanged, he was perplexed by the entire metamorphosis of all his circumstances." What really overawed Oakfield was not the contact with an ancient civilization of a vast country, but the manifestation of British power everywhere. He and his friends consider their Indian experience to be a painful but necessary one. They all yearn to return to England once they can save enough money to lead a comfortable life back at home. This is perhaps best expressed when Wykham, who is among the closest of Oakfield's friends, tries to impress upon Oakfield's brother in England, Herby, not to come to India. Wykham tells Herby, "I tell you, Herby, you would hate India; everybody does. The best men, such as your brother, who work hard, and it is said, get on, hate it." 

Mr. Middleton of Bengal who is also one of the closest friends of the protagonist impresses upon Oakfield the fact that the European and Indian temperaments have little in common and that sooner this fact is accepted by the British, the easier it would be for them to rule India to the benefit of the Indian
people. He raises the question of cultural incompatibility because for him the recognition of such incompatibility is the first important starting point in building England's relationship with India. He describes England's civilizing mission in India as "humbug in practice." On a journey by steamer in the Ganges, Middleton tells Oakfield what an inconceivable separation is between the English who are making a servant of the Ganges with their steam-engines and paddle-floats and the Asiatics who with their shouts and screams are worshipping the same river. He remarks: "The separation, I say is obvious and quite tremendous. Is there any common ground underneath it?"

The declining zeal in England for reform in India took some years to affect Britain's policy towards this country. It was only after the events of 1857, in the late nineteenth century, that it came to be generally accepted that England's mission in India should be limited to providing a sound and efficient government which would give the country peace and security. This period was marked by the growing acceptance of the fact that India could not be changed and that there was the need to adapt the British Government in India to the changing Indian situation. The sixties and the seventies saw the crystallization of the idea of "the duteous and self-sacrificing British officer hero whose courage and dedication were distinguishing marks of the white man's superiority." The ideal British officer would no longer be expected to fritter away his energies in trying to understand and sympathise with a mysterious land and its people but would be a pragmatist with strong roots at
home; one who would try to master his melancholy with hard work and unswerving loyalty to the Raj. India's traditional, social and religious institutions, instead of being considered as hindrances to British rule, were increasingly used by this set of officials to suit the needs of the Empire. The government's new policy was no doubt motivated by a sense of political expediency, but the impression was sought to be created in England that such a policy enshrined the ideals of toleration and religious liberty and this made it "more palatable to the English conscience." 18

This policy of non-interference in the affairs of the natives has been termed as "neo-conservatism" 19 because it differed both in form and in content from the Conservatism of men like Edmund Burke. This was a Conservatism which had become part of the aggressive Imperialistic spirit of the late nineteenth century and then travelled on to the twentieth century Imperialistic rule. It replaced earlier belief in the possibility of eventual self-rule based on India's traditional constitutional systems. The earlier disturbed conscience and mood as reflected in a novel like Oakfield is no longer there. Instead it is a mood signifying a calm born out of the final acceptance of the fact that Britain's mission in India was primarily to continue colonial rule as efficiently as possible without trying to transform the morals and way of life of the Indian people. Along with this emerged the concept of "the white man's burden" based on racial superiority and a "laissez faire" 20 attitude towards social change in India. The
psychological gulf between the English and the Indians continued to widen and the racial bitterness hardened. This racial feeling, and the Imperial ideology which accompanied it, were not built upon Indian experience alone. They found support and confirmation at home in the contemporary scientific and political thought. In fact, the pseudo-scientific racism of the late nineteenth century and the authoritarian liberalism of J.F. Stephen together gave the new India policy just the theoretical backing which it needed to be respectable in English eyes. These words of Metcalfe give almost a final shape to the British Imperialism in India:

No longer was the racial inferiority of the Indian an emotional sentiment, it was a scientific fact; and the British empire was not something to be ashamed of, but a positive instrument of morality and order throughout the world.  

This formulation of imperialism is perfectly Kiplingesque in its conception and it glorified the imperialistic ideals of the Raj. Therefore, Britain's mission in India was taken for granted and the question of preparing Indians for eventual self-rule based on representative institutions did not arise. The views expressed by the social anthropologists and by men like James Fitzjames Stephen led to the acceptance of certain beliefs about the Indian people - beliefs which continued to mould British attitudes well into the twentieth century and which were reflected in the fiction of Anglo-Indian writers like Flora Annie Steel, Maud Diver and above all of Rudyard
Kipling. The principal tendencies reflected in these beliefs were that the Indians were an inferior race incapable of self-government; and that the British and the Indians were two different races at two different levels of development with little, if any, chance of finding a common ground.

After a historical overview of the British imperialism and its various facets, it is proper to examine the novels which have been selected for the study. In the opening chapters of A Passage to India, E.M. Forster gives us a view of Anglo-India as it was in the twenties and the thirties of the twentieth century. We at once encounter such characters and attitudes, which represent imperialistic thinking as have been discussed in the previous pages. It becomes painfully obvious to Mrs. Moore when she comes out of the club after watching 'Cousin Kate.' The British residents of Chanderpore are completely insular to the Indian reality and it is the common code of conduct for them not to think of it and not to talk of it. Mrs. Moore is rather unhappy when Turton praises her son Ronny Haslop for his dignity. Mrs. Moore was surprised to learn this and Miss Adela Quested learnt it with anxiety, for she had not decided whether she liked dignified men. Since they had freshly come from England, they had no idea how the Britishers conducted themselves vis-a-vis Indians. They were natural and unbiased as any person would be towards another person. They did not know
that something happens on this side of the Suez - the Britishers become sahibs and they have nothing to do with the Indians socially. Miss Adela Quested tried to discuss this point with Mr. Turton, but he silenced her with a good-humoured motion of his hand, and continued what he had come to say, "The long and the short of it is Heaslop's a sahib; he's the type we want, he's one of us."22

When the performance of the play ended, the orchestra played the National Anthem. Conversation and billiards stopped, faces stiffened. "It reminded every member of the club that he or she was British and in exile" (Passage., p.27). It produced a little sentiment and a useful accession of will power. They felt the strength to resist that might come in their way and helped them to establish their group-identity. After this self-assurance and confidence building, they poured out, offering one another drinks. When at this moment Adela announced anew that she was desirous of seeing real India, it struck Ronnie as 'comic'. She became the centre of an amused group of ladies. One of them said, "Wanting to see Indians! How new that sounds" (Passage., p.27).

Ronnie gives another illustration of imperialistic aloofness when he expresses his gratitude that Mr. Turton, the Burra Sahib, has arranged a bridge-party for his guests. He believes, that he does not understand natives better so as to arrange things on his own. The natives know Burra Sahib
and he knows them. They know he cannot be fooled. He thinks he is comparatively fresh. It is important to mark the imperialistic mistrust of the whites when Ronnie remarks that no one can even begin to think of knowing this country until he has been in it for twenty years. Then he gives an example of the mistake he committed by offering a cigarette to a native pleader. He found that the pleader had sent touts all over the bazar to announce the fact and to tell the litigants that they better come to vakil Mahmoud Ali because he is in with the city Magistrate. Ever since then "I've dropped on him in court as hard as I could. It's taught me a lesson, and I hope him" (Passage., p. 29).

Forster's humanistic and rationalistic predispositions have been competently brought out to highlight his critical disapproval of the imperialistic attitudes of the Britishers of Chanderpore. He has been able to achieve this through the characterization of Fielding, the Principal of the college. He is singularly free from the herd psychology of his country men. He did not mind whom he taught; and he did not mind adding Indians to his list whom he would like to teach and help. He did succeed with his pupils, but the gulf between him and his country men, which he had noticed while coming from Bombay to Chanderpore in train, widened in a way. He could not at first see what was wrong. He was not unpatriotic, he always got on well with Englishmen in England, all his
best friends were English. Why was it not the same out here in India? He could not for sometime realize that the Britishers' attitude towards India is that of a ruling class towards the ruled. They are there to do their duty of running the administration of the country. India is not a place where they can mix up with the Indians as equals. They are here on a business and the business is that of imperialism. Therefore, they all suffered from a sense of exile and alienation.

A feeling in Chanderpore grew that Fielding was a disruptive force, because his ideas appeared to be injurious to the imperialistic class in India. Neither a missionary nor a student, he was happiest in the give-and-take of a private conversation. The world, he believed, is a globe of men who are trying to reach one another and can best do so by the help of goodwill plus culture and intelligence. He had no racial feelings, not because he was superior to his brother civilians, but because he had matured in a different atmosphere, "where the herd-instinct does not flourish" (Passage, p.62). The remark that did most harm at the club was a silly aside to the effect that the so-called white races are really pinko-grey. He only said this to be cheery. He did not realize that 'white' has no more to do with a colour than 'God save the King' with God. He has the courage of a humanist whose only commitment is to the people irrespective of the colour of the skin and the nationality. This is how Fielding expresses
his fearlessness:

I can't be sacked from my job, because my job's Education. I believe in teaching people to be individuals, and to understand other individuals. It's the only thing I do believe in (Passage., p.118).

What is important to understand is that the characters like Fielding are a microscopic minority in Anglo-India who do not have racial and collective attitudes. Therefore, they are to be treated rather as exceptions than the rule. As contrasted with the humane and rational attitude of Fielding, we find the stock British attitude towards India and the Indians in the position that the district collector, Turton, took after Aziz was accused of assault on Miss Adela Quested. It is his confirmed imperialistic belief that the English should have nothing to do with the Indians socially. He protests to Fielding that his twenty five years of experience in India has shown that nothing but disaster results when English people and the Indians attempt to be intimate socially. He asserts that everything goes on smoothly so long as they keep their distance. As soon as any one tries to set these traditions aside, the trouble begins and "the work of years is undone" (Passage., p.161).

There is a perfect example of pseudo-scientific racism in the prosecution statement of McBryde, the superintendent of police. He represents the same attitude as that of Ronald Merrick, another superintendent of police in Paul Scott's the 'Raj Quartet'. He makes an elaborate statement on the oriental
pathology. He remarks, "the darker races are physically attracted by the fairer, but not vice-versa" (Passage, p. 213). He puts the whole thing in a matter of fact manner, without any bitterness. He makes it look just a fact which any scientific observer will confirm. Merrick in his conversation with Sarah tells her that the white people are naturally superior to the black and points out that the Indians themselves have this prejudice about paleness. "To them a fair skin denotes descent from the civilized Aryan invaders from the north, a black skin descent from the primitive aboriginals who were pushed into the jungles and hills, or fled south." 23

Another attitude of the Britishers towards India that becomes clearly discernible is their conception of justice and fair play which again bears a theoretical relation with their conception of their imperialistic role in India. They feel a sense of responsibility for governing India on efficient administrative lines; and fair play and justice are believed to be the corner-stone of efficient administration. Adela Quested symbolically represents this aspect of British mind. She wants to be correct in her treatment of Indians, and she has no ill-will towards Aziz after the trial although she had lost on both the ends - the English as well as the Indian. She is anxious that no injustice is done to Aziz and since she does not feel sure whether she was really assaulted by Aziz or not, she prefers to withdraw the charge in the court. A great furor is created
in the Anglo-Indian world, they feel greatly scandalized and let down. But it is her sense of justice and fair-play which prevails upon her. No considerations could be bigger for her than this. Fielding tells her that she has no real affection for Aziz, or for Indians generally. He reminds her that she wanted to see India, not Indians and this is the reason that it had never taken them far. He significantly remarks: "Justice never satisfies them, and that is why the British Empire rests on sand" (Passage, p. 253).

Allen J. Greenberger, in his significant work, *The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism* (1969) has distinguished the three phases of the British rule in India. The first phase is, the era of confidence: 1880-1910; the second is, the era of doubt: 1910-1935 and the third is, the era of melancholy: 1935 onwards. If we go by this chronologically-literary classification, then *A Passage to India* falls in the second category and all the works of Paul Scott belong to the third classification, i.e., the era of melancholy. With the passage of time, as India's struggle for its independence was intensifying, the British Imperialism was changing its faces. Characters like Ronald Merrick, Brig. Reid and Robin White in the 'Raj Quartet' respond to Indian reality in a professional and unemotional way. They understand that the old Raj ideals of playing the father and mother to Indians is no more possible. Indians are politically more
conscious than ever before, and therefore, Edwardian ideals of the Raj are gone for ever. Now they are not sure of their old-time convictions that they have a 'whiteman's burden' to civilize the natives. They are just dragging on as long as they can.

Teddie Bingham, a captain in Muzzy Guides Battalion, appears to be an anomalous character in the post-forties scenario of British India. British officers - both civil and military - are a disillusioned lot and they seem to be packing up to go back to England. Indian nationalism is on the rise and it has penetrated in the Indian Army. I.N.A. is an expression of restless nationalism and its ranks are swelling everyday. Whatever may be the perceptions of the British army officers of I.N.A., it had become a symbol and instrument of Indian people's open defiance of the British rule in India. But Teddie Bingham is still nursing the old Edwardian ideals when the British officers thought of themselves as the 'Man-Bap' of their Indian subordinates. He has a passionate conviction that the British officers like Ronald Merrick who have not been brought up in the proper British Army traditions cannot handle the situation created by the Jiffs (the turn-coats) who have joined the ranks of I.N.A. He still believed in the old-world ideals as Merrick observes:

I told you there was a touch of old-fashioned gallantry in it. All that paternalist business really meant something to him, Man-Bap. I am your father and your mother. It would have been great if he'd gone down there and called as he did and if they'd come out, hanging their heads, and surrendered to him, trusting in the code, the old code (Scorpion., p.404).
It was Teddie's this faith in the old code and the British role in India that he took the fatal step to go with Baksh in search of other Jiffs of his regiment so that they may come back to the regiment as the sons come back to their father and accept whatever punishment is given to them in the system. It is this faith and hope that brings him death as he quietly walks into the death-trap of the Japs and the Jiffs. It is in this context that Merrick says that not the professionals, "it's only amateurs who create legends" (Scorpion, p.405). Teddie was a relic of that long lost class who had a very high notion of their imperialistic role in this country. He was amazed how commonplace and even vulgar people of his race are occupying important positions in the country. It particularly struck him when he was talking to an adjutant who appeared to be a total plebian. "The vulgarity of modern English life suddenly overwhelmed Teddie. It was flowing into India, blighting everything." Merrick does his best to break this myth which Teddie was living before his death. He tells him that myth breaking is a tricky business. His experiences as a police officer have blighted any enthusiasm he ever had for the idea that the simple fellow from the village is "eager to prove his devotion to the Raj" (Towers, p.154)

Therefore, Teddie Bingham's death can be seen as a final burial of the old Raj ideals and the paternal attitudes which the British imperialism assumed and prided itself in.
He is also a 'sacrificial figure' whose death serves to expiate the guilt of the imperialism as represented by its various negative forces. Teddie's death also represents the death of illusions of imperialism and a final reckoning that is already on the cards. Britishers and the Indians have gone too far in their separate journeys and any of the old time ideas cannot hold good.

It would be appropriate to examine the military point of view of Brig. Reid and the civil point of view as given by Robin White, I.C.S. in retrospect in The Jewel in the Crown. Brigadier Reid is insistent that the Indians are not capable of governing their affairs and any talk of self-government is meaningless nonsense which only speaks of Indian leaders' political immaturity. Reid feels strongly about the call of Gandhi for 'Quit India' and believes it is an open invitation to the Emperor of Japan "to walk in and take over the reins of government." Reid is of the view that whatever the faults of the Britishers might have been, they have made sincere efforts in the years before the War to hand over more power to the Indians. But this only revealed the fact that they have not achieved the political maturity that would have made the task of granting them self-government easy. The act of 1935 which envisaged a federal government at the centre, seemed a noble concept, "one that Britain could have been proud of as a fitting end to a glorious chapter in her imperial history" (Jewel., p.288).
Men like Brigadier Reid find no merit in Indian struggle for freedom. He reflects that the Indians are divided into so many narrow loyalties and therefore, they cannot carry on self-government in a responsible manner. He says that he cannot help feeling that the heart-rending cries for freedom sound hollow in retrospect as one watched the scramble and listened to the squabbles that broke out between the Hindus, the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Princes and others. The imperialists like Reid would not concede the fact that the federal structure as envisaged in the Act of 1935 already contained the seeds of discontent and rift and, therefore, the failure of the federal experiment was a forgone conclusion. The Indian National Congress, under the stewardship of Gandhi, had already pointed to this fact but the rulers had their own perceptions on the subject as they had cleverly planned to create a wedge between the different sections of the society. Instead of looking at the Indian point of view, Reid declares that by resigning from the government after the declaration of the War, Indian leaders gave the proof that they have not learnt political responsibility and, therefore, they could no longer count on "leading Indians to take a broad view of the real things that were at stake in the free world" (Jewel., p. 289).

As a matter of fact, the imperialistic forces continued throwing their weight on the Indian reality till it became obvious after the War that it was already too late. Reid
simply cannot understand Gandhi's logic that there is no quarrel between India and Japan and if, the Britishers leave India, the Japanese won't attack her. He cannot understand Gandhi's suggestion that the British should fight their own war with the Japanese and India has nothing to do with it. Gandhi suggested that the British army could stay in India and use it as a base from which to fight the Japanese, and that in ports like Bombay and Calcutta he could promise there would not be any disturbance to disrupt the flow of arms and war material. Such suggestions, though seem eminently sensible, looked so preposterous to the imperialistic point of view of men like Brigadier Reid. He wonders how the country could be left to Gandhi "to be ruled by himself and his colleagues" (Jewel, p.289). He is so proud of the British role in India that he does not find Gandhi's 'peculiar theories' at all palatable. He sums up the imperialistic attitude in these words:

I could not help but feel proud of the years of British rule. Even in these turbulent times the charm of the cantonment helped one to bear in mind the calm, wise and enduring things. One had only to cross the river into the native town to see that in our cantonments and civil lines we had set an example for others to follow and laid down a design for the civilized life that the Indians would one day inherit( Jewel, p.290).

In the light of the British history of Imperialism and expansion in India, it is possible to understand the impatience and exasperation of characters like Reid who view
India's struggle for freedom with great suspicion and hatred. They feel bitter that the country which had benefitted in so many ways from the British rule appears determined to hinder their efforts to save it from invasion at a time when they could least spare the strength. Reid feels that they are fighting with their backs to the wall in the Far East and had not yet been able to regain the initiative and end the stalemate in Europe and North Africa. A Japanese victory in India would have been disastrous. Lose India and the British land contribution to what had become a global war would virtually be confined to the islands of Britain. The British regard India as a place it would be madness to make "an orderly retreat from! Apart from the strategic necessity of holding India there was of course also the question of her wealth and resources" (Jewel., p.305). Therefore, Reid finds Gandhi's call to leave India 'to God or to anarchy' as very offending. Gandhi had alternatively challenged to hold it against a massive campaign of 'non-violent non-cooperation', which meant in effect that the native population would go on strike and in no way assist the British to maintain the country as a going concern from which the British could train, equip, supply and launch an army to chuck the Japanese out of the Eastern archipelago.

On the scale of racist-imperialistic attitude towards India, Merrick is on the one extreme end. He is almost possessed with the belief that as a race the English are
superior to the natives and any one who disputes or argues 
on this point is to be down right condemned whether he is a 
Britisher or an Indian. For him all the efforts of Indian 
National Movement for freedom is nonsense which does not mean 
much to him. For him it is nothing but a law and order problem 
for which he thinks the Britishers are sufficiently equipped. 
He describes Gandhi as a "crazy old man who had completely lost 
touch with the people and was the dupe of his own dreams and 
crazy illusions" (Jewel., p.318). Similarly he has blind 
imperialistic attitude towards I.N.A. and Subhash Chander Bose. 
He believes that Bose suffers from a "delusion of grandeur" 
(Towers., p.132). He has such a high opinion of himself and 
his talents as to believe that single-handed he might achieve 
what the Congress as a whole had not managed as yet at that 
time. Merrick puts Subhash in the category of Hitler, Ribbentrop 
and Goebbels. He declares that it is all sham and hypocrisy 
when liberal-minded Englishmen declare that Indians and the 
Britishers are comrades and they are bound by a brotherhood 
of feelings. He declares it a kind of English corruption when 
they declare their affection for servants, for peasants, for 
soldiers and pretend to understand the Indian intellectual or 
sympathise with their nationalist aspirations. He calls the 
English admiration for the martial and faithful servant class 
"a mixture of perverted sexuality and feudal arrogance" (Scorpion., 
p.308). what they are stirred or flattered by is an idea, an 
idea of bravery or loyalty exercised on their behalf.
On the other hand, Mr. Robin White, I.C.S. represents the imperialistic point of view of comparatively tolerant civil servants who have a far better understanding of the Indian reality than their counterparts in the military and the police service. White’s attitude, though it has to be seen within the imperialistic ambit, is by far the most objective and tolerant one. Its objectivity is further heightened by the fact that he is recaptulating the whole experience in retrospect when he has gone back to England after India’s freedom. There is no rancour or bitterness in his narration of his experiences as the deputy commissioner of Mayapore during the last days of the Raj. Robin White does not approve of the impatience and a sense of urgency which Brigadier Reid always shows in dealing with the problem of law and order in the wake of civil disturbances in Mayapore. He points out to his wife that if the Indians did not start a rebellion, Reid would be forced to invent one just so that by suppressing it he would feel he had done his duty. Robin White points out that essentially it was a question of attitude towards India and its people. People like Reid had an attitude which could be termed as emotional and non-analytical and on the other hand Robin’s attitude was cool, deliberate and rational. He believed that most of the time the English wanted to have peace at their terms and therefore, whenever they talked of sinking their differences in the wake of the
Japanese invasion, they only meant that the Indians should do all the sinking. They should call a halt to their political demands and a status quo be maintained.

Robin's thinking on the subject of Indian freedom movement is clear and unambiguous and he seems to have no confusion as to who is to blame for the prevailing state of affairs. He compares the English in India to a self-appointed owner who has been telling the real owners that he would get out as soon as he is convinced that they are capable of keeping the roof intact and foundation secure and everything in order. This is his only job in life to teach others how to make something of themselves and their property. He has been saying this long enough to believe it himself but ruling the household with a confusing mixture of encouraging words and repressive measures. This unwanted, self-appointed owner has stayed long enough to create factions among the real owners. The existence of various factions suits him a lot for the perpetuation of his occupation:

So he likes nothing better than to give private interviews to deputations from these separate factions and to use the arguments of minority factions as moral levers to weaken the demands put forward by the majority faction (Jewel., p. 340).

Robin White is forthright in confessing that they are in India to get out of it what they could though they prefer to ignore or forget it. It was a confrontation between a tired civilization that was running down under the Moughals
and a comparatively new energetic civilization that had been on the upgrade ever since the Tudors. The second aspect of the British-India affair is the onus of moral leadership which naturally falls on the people who rank as superior.

Robin White’s analysis of this moral aspect of British-India relationship is very perceptive and one is able to understand how out of this moral confusion arose the concept of ‘Whiteman’s burden’. Gradually the Britishers started believing that they are naturally superior to the natives and the power they enjoy is God-given. Now from a higher pedestal they started talking about morality and the special need to uplift the poor and the ignorant. It is precisely at this point in Indian history that a religious resurgence started taking shape in India. The Hindus as well as the Muslims wanted to understand the basic reason of their degradation and they turned back to see what comfort and support they could find in their old philosophies. Observe the relevance of the following remarks in this context:

At almost precisely the same time that the English were developing their theories of the Whiteman’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 (Jewell, p.340).

Robin White as a representative of the Raj has sufficient intellectual sophistication to understand the various components of Indian political reality. He has not only intellectual clarity but also intellectual honesty to
put things straight for himself although he is doing it
only after his retirement from the I.C.S. when he went back
to England after India's independence. He views India's
struggle in a historical perspective from the First World War
down to the Quit India Movement in 1942. He is indignant
that the Britishers after winning World War I with the active
cooperation of India chose to use repressive measures of the
Rowlatt Act. He argues that Indians had every reason to expect
a major advance towards self-government as a reward for
cooperating so freely in the War with Germany. He asks in
great dismay "were we mad? Or plain stupid? Or merely
perfidious? Or terrified? Or just common-or-garden cocky
after victory, thick-skinned and determined to give away nothing"
(Jewel., p.346). He wonders what was the good of declaring
Dominion Status as the British aim for India in 1917 when
hardly a year later they instituted trial without jury for
political crimes. And the result was riots, an atmosphere
of distrust and fear which led to firing in Jalianwala Bagh
in Amritsar.

Robin White gives a touching account of how he came in
contact with his own humanity which he had lost in India. He
confesses that he hated India - "the real India behind the
pipe-puffing myth. I hated the loneliness, and the dirt, the
smell, the conscious air of superiority"(Jewel., p.346). And
then one day when he was touring the district with the land
settlement officer, he all of a sudden fell seriously ill. They were bogged down in some god-forsaken village and had to spend the night in a mud hut. His bowels were in a terrible state. A village woman who saw him in miserable condition brought curds for him and made him eat. White was on his dignity at once and waved her away but she came to the bedside and spooned up a helping of the curds as if he were her nephew or son. She said nothing and White could not even look at her. Afterwards he fell asleep and when he woke up he felt better and wondered whether he had not dreamed it all. Robin White significantly observes:

I felt that I had been given back my humanity, by a nondescript middle-aged Indian woman. I felt that the curds and the flowers were for affection, not tribute, affection big enough to include a dash of well-meant motherly criticism, the suggestion that my indisposition could be overcome easily enough once I'd learnt I had no real enemies (Jewel., p.347).

As it has been seen, the approach of Robin White was humane, reasonable but at the same time he could not go out of his given role of an imperialist bureaucrat. On many occasions he had his serious differences with his superiors but he could not express his views openly. Obviously he was just a cog in the huge machine of imperialism. He had his strong doubts about the wisdom of imprisoning Congress leaders in August 1942. And he was sure there must be many more district officers who thought like him. But they were all at the beck
and call of imperialistic forces that would never grant freedom to India if they could.

So, we find different imperialistic attitudes of the Britishers towards India. There are characters like Fielding in *A Passage to India* and Robin White in *The Jewel in the Crown* who are essentially tolerant and understanding towards the Indians and their political aspirations. Though they cannot really influence the course of imperialism yet they represent that aspect of British attitude which was based on democratic and liberal values as these were practised back in England. Then, there are characters like Turton and Ronny Heaslop who are living tailor-made roles of imperialist bureaucrats and live only in terms of their group-identity. There is another group of characters like McBryde, the S.P. in *Passage* and Ronald Merrick, another S.P. in Scott's the 'Raj Quartet' who are rabid racists. They believe that the racial superiority of the white people is a scientific fact. All these attitudes have been examined in the context of the growth and development of imperialism in India over the years.
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