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2.0. Introduction:

Novel as a form of literature is very closely related to the upheavals in the society. It is impossible to think of novel without its socio-cultural and political dimensions. It comes into existence within real social situation reflecting tensions in the life of the individuals as they face problems in their social life. English novel is known to have emerged as a form with the emergence of the English middle-class, becoming a major vehicle of its intellectual, cultural and aesthetic ideas. We need not think that the writers consciously model their fiction on a particular ideology. However, given the density of socio-cultural life reflected in the fiction, it is directly or indirectly influenced by the ideologies which pervade the whole socio-cultural situation. This is rather true of the Anglo-Indian fiction. As noted at (1.4.0), the writers of the Anglo-Indian fiction were the men and women who were either directly related to the running of the empire or they were close witnesses of what was happening in India. Being British themselves, they could hardly be unaware of the British imperialist policy and the way it affected the English in India as well as the Indians. As a part of the ruling community, they were face to face with the ruled Indian community and had accumulated experiences of India and the Indians, favorable or unfavorable. How far they could maintain aesthetic detachment as artists is another matter, yet their fiction could not have easily escaped the ideological cross-currents of the time.
In this chapter my attempt is to examine the attitudes and patterns of behaviour generated by the colonial situation in India leading to the full blown British Imperialism, which persisted even after decolonization, or as the current idiom goes, in the post-colonial period. These attitudes and patterns of behaviour dictated by the ideologies of Imperialism and Colonialism seriously affected the Indo-British relationship, which we find reflected in the Anglo-Indian fiction.

2.1.0. Imperialism:

Imperialism had a positive and favourable connotation in the ancient and medieval times. Shamsul Islam (1979), for instance notes:

In the ancient and medieval times it meant a federation of States under the universal law and a hegemony, covering the entire known world; it was based on a philosophy of peace order, discipline and internationalism.¹

This was, however, not the kind of imperialism found in India under the British Rule. As said earlier, the British came to India as traders, and their objectives were mainly to win trade concessions from the despotic rulers of India. What they did later was to acquire large territory of India, and expanded it into an empire. Michael Doyle’s definition of empire is more applicable to the British practice in India than what Shamsul Islam says above about a federation of states. Doyle says:
Empire is a relationship, formal or informal, in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society. It can be achieved by force, by political collaboration, by economic, social or cultural dependence. Imperialism, according to him, is simply a process or policy of establishing and maintaining an empire.

An empire does not come into existence by merely conquering the territory of others. It has to be supported by the ideology built upon the notions of the imperial community, about itself and also about the people whose sovereignty it is going to control. J.R. Seeley says that some of Europe's overseas empires were acquired absentmindedly. But in the case of the British, we can say that they were already conscious of their being imperial people. They had tried to justify their conquest of Ireland in the second half of the sixteenth century saying that the Irish, though Christians, were barbarians. Sir Thomas Smith, therefore, argued that God had given the English responsibility to 'inhabit and reform' this barbarous nation. The Irish were considered barbarians because they were a pastoral community wandering from place to place with their cattle. In their act of Irish conquest the British considered themselves to be following the Romans, whose conquest had civilized England. Sir Thomas Smith said, it was their task to educate the Irish 'in virtuous labour and in justice, and to teach them our English laws and civility and leave robbing and stealing and killing one of another'. They became the new Romans whose duty was to civilize the backward
people in the world. The rationale they used to justify the conquest of Ireland was also useful for them to subjugate India. Edwin Arnold, who was the Principal of Poona College (later called Deccan College) is recorded in Dalhousie's Administration (1864), saying:

The mantle of the Romans is descended on us; bringing a larger gift, and better spirit. We have overspread the earth; for our own gain truly, but not for that alone – nor always for that at first. Where we have come, justice, the best we know, is done; benefits the best we possessed, have been imparted.

With Victorian self-complacency Arnold justifies the British rule in India 'for our own gain' claiming that they have imparted justice and benefits to the Indians in exchange of the gains. Though he compares the British with the Romans, the motive of the British was not to establish a Roman kind of empire of federal states, where the states in the federation have relation of equality. The industrialized England needed a colony to sell its goods and acquire labour and raw material from it. In Marxist explanation of Imperialism, it is the highest stage of capitalism. The capitalist state needs non-industrial countries for its own benefit and therefore subjugates them. This need was justified by the British thinkers with an excuse of civilizing the barbarous countries. J.A. Hobson says:

All interference on the part of civilized white nations with 'lower races' is not prima facie illegitimate...civilized governments may undertake the political and economic control of lower races –
in a word – the characteristic form of modern
imperialism is not under all conditions illegitimate. Hobson here adds the dimension of race prejudice to justify the
subjugation of the 'lower races' by the civilized white nations. Sir.
J.R. Seeley in his The Expansion of England (1883) considers India
as the extension of the English State, a Greater Britain:

an empire similar to that of Rome, in which we hold
the position not merely of a ruling but an educating
and civilizing race.8

However, the British Imperialism can be seen in its crude form –
political dominion for economic exploitation – in the dedication page
of History of Hindostan (first published between 1770 and 1772), by
Alexander Dow:

The success of Your Majesty's arms has laid open
the east to the researches of the curious... The
British nation have become Conquerors of Bengal
and they ought to extend some part of their
fundamental jurisprudence to secure their
conquest.9

Dow here talks about securing the conquest and not the civilizing
mission of the British. He further assures that this rule of law will
not infuse a spirit of freedom among the natives:

To make the natives of the fertile soil of Bengal
free is beyond the power of political
arrangement... Their religion, their institutions, their
manners, the very disposition of their minds, form
them for passive obedience. To give them
property would only bind them with stronger ties to our interests, and make them our subjects; or if the British nation prefers the name — more our slaves.¹⁰

To turn the Indians into docile subjects, or better still, slaves, was really the aim of the Imperialist policy of the British.

2.1.1. The British Self-Image:

The self-image of the British as people superior to others was built up through the reign of Elizabeth I, when they felt as one nation as a result of the conflict with France and Spain and maritime victories over the West Indies. Their victories and imperial enterprise made them think of themselves as different from 'others'. The 'others' then were the other European countries, but later, after the conquest of the East, they began to look at the Oriental people as the 'other' who represented for them everything that was evil and barbarous. The Renaissance and Reformation of the sixteenth century had inculcated in them the ideals of Enlightenment, which had made them think of themselves as modern, civilized and secular and they tried to measure the Indians and other oriental people in terms of the ideals of Enlightenment. Boasting about the Englishman's superiority John Strachey says:

The Englishman's ancestors ....have transmitted to him, not only their physical courage, but their powers of independent judgment, the decision of character, the habits of thought and generally
those qualities that are necessary for the
government of men and the discharge of the
various duties of civilized life and which have
given us an empire.\textsuperscript{11}

The self-image of the British in particular and the Europeans in
general as progressive and civilized people needed to be sustained
by the notion of the 'other' beyond the seas, who must be savage
and primitive. Whatever virtues the British attributed to themselves,
they foisted the vices opposite of them onto the Indians or the
oriental people in general. Edward Said in his \textit{Orientalism} says:

\begin{quote}
The European culture gained in strength and
identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a
sort of surrogate and even underground self.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

It is interesting to see how the British created the image of India and
the Indians to establish and justify their imperialist policy.

\textbf{2.2.0. Characterizing the 'Other':}

The British conceived of Indians in terms of oppositions. If
honesty and truthfulness are the British virtues, the Indians are
deceitful and liars. Since they characterize themselves as the
martial race, the Indians are by nature feminine, and so on.\textsuperscript{13} Since
the majority of the Indians were Hindus, they tried to understand
Hindu India in historical perspective. The Asians in general and the
Hindus in particular willingly submitted to the absolute power of the
despots. This notion of oriental despotism made them think that the
Indians were by nature a subject race. Alexander Dow claimed that
under the rule of the Muslim despots the native Hindu became ineffective and submissive. Robert Orme went a step further and characterized the Hindu as the 'most effeminate inhabitant of the globe.'

The degenerate character of the Indians was related to the extreme climatic conditions of India. The heat and humidity have been the characteristic features of the Indian climate. The historians like Dow believed that this enervating climate, together with centuries of subjection to the Muslim depots, had made the Indians lazy and unfit for being free. This view of the historians like Dow and Orme was not however emphasized later because the English realized that their long stay in India could subject them to the same argument. They, therefore, began to trace the Indian character to the cultural and racial characteristics.

The dimension of Race, which was already present in the minds of the English, became a strong notion with the doctrines of Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest which were applied to the study of races. The black and brown people were considered to be naturally inferior lacking physical and mental qualities. The Indians were commonly believed to be physically and mentally degenerate. Macaulay records very harsh judgment about the Bengalis, who, according to him are 'enervated by a soft climate and accustomed to peaceful employments' and further says:
What the horns are to the buffalo, what the sting is to the bee, what beauty, according to the Greek song is to woman, deceit is to the Bengali. Large promises, smooth excuses, elaborate tissues of circumstantial falsehood, chicanery, perjury, forgery are the weapons, offensive and defensive of the people of the Lower Ganges.¹⁴

These vices recounted by Macaulay were attributed to the Indians in general.

The pseudo-scientific account of the racial difference between peoples given by the biologists like Linnaeus and John Burke further strengthened this racial ideology. Linnaeus made a distinction between homo sapiens and homo monstrous, and Burke, in his The Wild Man’s Pedigree (1758) classified the human beings into five types:

a. Wild man. Four-footed, mute, hairy.

b. American. Copper coloured, choleric, erect, hair black straight thick; nostrils wide; face harsh; beard scanty; obstinate; content; free. Paints himself with fine red lines. Regulated by customs.

c. European. Fair, sanguine, brawny; hair yellow brown flowing, eyes blue, gentle, acute; inventive. Covered with close vestments. Governed by laws.

d. Asiatic. Sooty; melancholy; rigid. Hair black; eyes darks; severe haughty; covetous. Covered with loose garments. Governed by opinions.

e. African. Black, phlegmatic, relaxed. Hair black frizzled; skin silky; nose flat; lips tumid; crafty; indolent;
Racial ideologies thus tried to show that social, cultural and intellectual attributes were determined by the biological basis. Even the so-called liberal humanist, Ernst Renan, is quoted by Aime Cesaire to say:

Nature has made a race of workers, the Chinese race, who have wonderful manual dexterity and almost no sense of honour; govern them with justice, levying from them, in return for the blessing of such a government, an ample allowance for the conquering race, and they will be satisfied; a race of tillers of the soil, the Negro..... a race of masters and soldiers, the European race. Reduce this noble race to working in the ergastulum like Negroes and Chinese, and they rebel.....But the life at which our workers rebel would make a Chinese or a fellah happy, as they are not military creatures in the least. Let each one do what he is made for, and all will be well.16

Similar and still harsher racist ideology is advocated by the German anthropologist Theodor Waitz in his Introduction to Anthropology (1859), who has no hesitation to say:

All wars of extermination, whenever the lower species are in the way of the white man, are fully justifiable.17

This racial ideology was directly in contrast with the avowed claim of the imperialism of civilizing the native. If the character of the
native and his cultural attributes are predetermined biologically, there is no question of civilizing the native. In its crudest form, therefore, imperialism meant enslaving the native by force and obliterating his identity as a free man.

Oppositions such as superior / inferior, developed / backward, civilized / barbarian, masculine / feminine, brave / cowardly, logical and rational / irrational and whimsical are interspersed in all imperialistic writings. The oriental 'other' is characterized in the British as well as Anglo-Indian fiction in terms of Laziness, aggression, violence, greed, sexual promiscuity, bestiality, primitivism, innocence, irrationality, etc. But the idea of the 'other' was not always realized in terms of such oppositions. There appear to be hierarchies among the 'others'. For example, according to the British, the Irish were superior to the Indians. And among the Indians, the warrior races like Sikhs and Rajputs were considered superior to the Bengalis. Among the Africans, the Zulus were regarded to be nobler than others. In India, in the actual practice of Imperialism, the British classified the Indians in terms of hierarchies which already existed in the Indian society divided into higher and lower castes.

The coloniser-colonised relationship reflected in the Anglo-Indian fiction is greatly affected by the racial superiority, British self-image and the characterization of the Indians as the 'other', which will be discussed a little later. These imperialist notions grew
very strong after the Mutiny of 1857. The success in putting down
the revolt of 1857 made Trevelyan write:

....the struggle irresistibly reminded us that we
were an imperial race holding our own on a
conquered soil by dint of valour and foresight....\textsuperscript{18}

Apart from the British nationalism and patriotism, the feeling of
solidarity among the Anglo-Indian community became very strong
after the Mutiny. Their resolve to keep their hold on India became
stronger with the confidence generated by the spectacular success
of the handful of British troops. The Mutiny gave a very strong
excuse to the British government to abolish the rule of the Company
and proclaim India to be the part of the British Empire. The British
Prime Minister, Disraeli, got the Royal Titles Bill passed in the
parliament securing for Queen Victoria the title of the Empress of
India. The liberals in England resented this not because they were
against keeping the empire, but because the title evoked bad
association to imperialism of Napoleon and the New German
Empire. India thus became a colony of England, and the
Imperialism of the second half of the nineteenth century graduated
to the Colonialism.

2.3.0. Colonialism:

The terms imperialism and colonialism have been loosely
used in literature frequently using one for the other. However, for
our purpose, we make a distinction here between the two to use
Imperialism for the period of the conquest of Indian territory by the
British during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century and establishing the military rule over it until India was annexed to the British Crown and made a colony in 1876.

Colonialism proper involves consolidation of imperial power, bringing the territory under the administrative control of the civil officers, exploitation of the resources of the colonised country and establishing law and order to govern the colonised population. Ashish Nandi tries to define colonialism:

as a shared culture which may not always begin with the establishment of alien rule in a society and end with the departure of the alien rulers from the colony.\textsuperscript{19}

He argues that in India ‘a colonial political economy began to operate seventy-five years before the full-blown ideology of British imperialism became dominant....\textsuperscript{20} It is difficult to agree with him. He must have in mind the colonial political economy that obtained in Bengal which first came under the British power. Politically Bengal was very much under British rule. Besides, when we use the term ‘colonial political economy’ we presuppose political control operating there. It is however true, as he says, that ‘a colonial situation produces a theory of imperialism to justify itself.’\textsuperscript{21} It is this justification which prepared the mindset of not only the military and civil British officers but also of the British women; and grievously affected the relationship between the English and the Indians. The
justification of imperialism was, therefore, very much a part of the process of colonization.

2.3.1. Justification of Imperialism / Colonialism:

The imperialist dominion over India was contradictory to the British society, which was based on the ideals of democracy and liberalism. How could such a democracy, which in principle accepted that the people have a right to choose their government through election and representation, lay claim to the empire conquered by the sword? Such doubts needed to be dispelled and the empire needed to be justified at home as well as in the international polity, because the British considered themselves morally superior to other empires in their imperial vision.

The British created a number of myths to justify their colonial domination over India and the Indians. As already pointed out, it was argued that on account of the heat and humidity the Indians have by nature become lazy and the lovers of the life of ease and tranquility, and were ignorant and inefficient to administer their own country. It was evident from the fact that they were ruled by the Mughals for more than six hundred years.

The cruelest imperial justification was the right of the stronger. As Edward Said notes:

two central ideas clearly were held over from the past and still hold sway: one was the great power's right to safeguard its distant interests even to the
point of military invasion; the second was that lesser powers were also lesser peoples, with lesser rights, morals, claims.\textsuperscript{22}

Even though the conquering troops were described as the legions defending humanity, individually the war heroes held the conquered people in contempt, and detested any doctrine such as liberalism or Christian Evangelicalism, which pleaded for equality of the colonised. The fundamental right of the coloniser to subjugate the weaker people is stressed repeatedly. When there was \textit{Illbert} Bill being presented in the parliament to confer certain powers on the natives, a letter appeared in the newspaper, signed 'Britannicus' saying:

\begin{quote}
The only people who have any right to India are the British. The so-called Indians have no right whatsoever.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

In Edmund Candler's novel, \textit{Siri Ram : Revolutionist}, a character named Skene remarks:

\begin{quote}
The country is ours after all and we won it as fairly as countries ever have been won. There is no question of handing it over.\textsuperscript{24}
\end{quote}

Justification of colonial or imperial domination is always about power. If you fail to show your strength and power, others will take advantage of it. All idealistic arguments fail in the face of necessity to gain economic and political advantage. In the novel about Herero uprising in the South-West Africa, by Gustav Frenssen, after the merciless killing of the blacks, one soldier explains how the cultural
superiority of the Europeans gives them right to carry out genocide rather than try to teach and civilize the blacks. He says:

God gave us victory because we are more honourable and enterprising than they are. That's not much of compliment when you compare us with the blacks, but we've got to make sure that we stay superior and better prepared than any nation on earth. The world belongs to the stronger and the more energetic. That is God's justice.\(^2\)

India was seen as a land of adventure for the young English men to prove their heroic virtue and manly qualities. Edmund Candler, for example, considered the colonies to be 'the nurseries of cads'\(^2\), the training ground for the English youth. The hardships and suffering in the service of the empire became a challenge to the young men, who wanted to escape the sedate life in Europe. Besides the colonies like India encouraged emigration on a large scale, which was seen as an answer to the question of over-population and unemployment.

2.3.2. Civilizing Mission:

Such justifications for the colonial domination were for consumption at home, for the practical middle classes and the merchants and businessmen. However, it was necessary to justify the empire from the moral point of view. J.R. Seeley in his book, *The Expansion of England* (1883), has pointed out how the ideas of civilization and progress were used for justifying the existence of British Empire in India. Lord Curzon, for instance, declared:
To me the message is carved in granite, it is hewn out of the rock of doom — that our work is righteous and that it shall endure.  

The righteous work was to bring civilization and culture to the barbarous and savage people of India. It was a widely held belief in the nineteenth century England that India was inhabited by dark people who had no ethics and no civilized life. The English had a very noble motive in conquering and colonizing India — to confer the benefits of white man's superior civilization and culture, religion and government on these barbarous people. The British administrators who came to India had a strong sense of this mission to civilize the Indians. Lord William Bentinck declared that his aim was to pursue:

the happiness of the natives of India, the true interests of the East India Company and the justice and honour of the British nation.  

Similarly, the officers like Monstuart Elphinston, Sir Thomas Munro, John Lawrence and others vouchsafed to improve the life of the natives and raise their minds so that when the British went away, they would be able to maintain their institutions. However, as a preliminary to this civilizing mission, it was necessary to establish that India had no civilization and culture of her own. This was difficult because the scholars like William Jones, James Colebrooke and others had studied and highly extolled the ancient civilization and culture of India. It was therefore argued that Indian civilization was degenerated and had no relevance in the modern world. As already pointed out, the armchair historian, James Mill, dismissed
Indian religion, sciences, cosmology, mathematics, etc. and branded Hindu mind as rude and ignorant. His book had played great role in creating prejudices and preconceptions about India and Indians in the minds of the young officers who came to India to administer the country, and was responsible for spoiling the relationship between the English and the Indians.

2.3.3. The Manichaean World of Colonialism:

Frantz Fanon, in his book *The Wretched of the Earth*, describes the colonial world as Manichaean world. He says:

... the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessence of evil. Native society is not simply described as a society lacking in values. It is not enough for the colonist to affirm that those values have disappeared from, or still better never existed in the colonial world. The native is declared insensible to ethics; he represents not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit, the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil.

In the colonial set-up the native is almost dehumanized. In Kipling's novel, *The Naulakha*, Tarvin Brazenly robs the native of his precious possession and thinks that the question of morality is clearly absolutely irrelevant in dealing with 'lesser breeds without law' like Indians. Even W.D. Arnold's hero, Oakfield, though an intellectual, comments that the Indians are 'a deplorably inferior
race.' The army officer Fred Straton in John Masters' novel, *By the Green of the Spring*, says:

Brown-skinned people were inferior to white-skinned. The old sweats in the regiment had told him: the only way to treat a nigger was to kick him in the ares.\(^{32}\)

In this context Homi Bhabha points out the Western tendency to secure fixed points of identification which operate within the poles of a Manichaean opposition — white (positive) / black (negative) — which are constituted as 'natural' in order to produce pleasure for the coloniser and to deny the colonial subject 'knowledge of the construction of that opposition.'\(^{33}\)

2.3.4. Appropriation of Local Knowledge:

In the colonial situation the coloniser is said to produce knowledge through 'discovery', which actually meant appropriating local knowledge from the conquered people. The colonisers were always dependent on the native people for the understanding of the new regions, mapping them, find new springs, locate barren lands and the fertile ones. British engineers had to consult the local people very often in their work of building dams and bridges. Major Arthur Cotton, employed by the East India Company to build bridges, etc., found it difficult to check the rising river bed of the Kaveri Delta, and had to consult the local experts to learn 'how to secure a foundation in loose sand of unmeasured depth... With this
lesson about foundations, we built bridges, weirs, aqueducts and every kind of hydraulic works.\textsuperscript{34}

2.3.5. Colonization and History:

In the process of colonization the coloniser distorts the history, civilization and culture of the colonised people and utterly devalues them as a part of the programmer of colonial dominance. The fact that India has been an ancient civilization with rich culture was inconvenient to the colonial view that India was a barbarous and a savage land without any civilization, ethics and morality. In the eighteenth century Edmund Burke had praised India as 'a civilized polity, possessing laws, institutions and traditions worked out through centuries of effort.'\textsuperscript{35} William Jones had hailed Asia as 'the nurse of sciences, the inventors of delightful and useful arts....'\textsuperscript{36} But this view underwent total change in the mid-nineteenth century through the mischievous books of history by writers such as James Mill. Fanon rightly says:

Colonization is not satisfied merely with holding people in its grips and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it.\textsuperscript{37}

It is the claim of British colonial historiography that India became a nation only through the conquest and administration of it by the British. However, India acquired national identity through its independence movement which brought millions of Indians under the
flag of the Indian National Congress. The movement such as Salt Satyagraha by Mahatma Gandhi was a pan Indian movement. Similarly, in 1942 the Quit India Movement invoked a response throughout India, generating the feeling of nationhood.

It is a colonial tendency to ignore the history and culture of the colonised country and begin to write its history as an extension of the history of the coloniser. Fanon, in the context of Algeria, points out:

The settler makes history and is conscious of making it. And because he constantly refers to the history of his mother country, he clearly indicates that he himself is the extension of that mother country. Thus the history which he writes is not the history of the country which he plunders but the history of his own nation in regard to all that she skims off, all that she violates and starves.  

2.3.6. Colonialism – An Exploitative System:

Colonial regime is often given credit for the economic progress and industrialization of the subject countries. In the case of India, however, colonialism has proved a bleeding process, an exploitative system. Before the British came to India, the economy of India was a great thriving economy. India was one of the main exporters of silk and cotton cloth, spices and a number of other products. It is quite conceivable that industrialization could have occurred in India without the British colonial intervention. India had an efficient traditional system of trade and commerce and there
were a number of classes of people engaged in pre-industrial manufacturing. There were a number of urban centers and a uniform currency to facilitate trade. In spite of a number of despotic rulers and regional power centers, there was a countrywide credit and banking system. It is a known fact that there were financial houses that lent money to the kings for the purpose of war and administration. The studies of Indian economy of the pre-colonial era show that India was on the threshold of industrial capitalism. The colonial rule of the British proved grossly detrimental to the indigenous production and the developing economy of India. They did it to benefit their own cloth mills and other industries, buying the raw material from India very cheap and selling the finished goods in the Indian market enjoying a virtual monopoly.

Aijaz Ahmad in his 'Imperialism and Progress' quotes Marx from a letter written by Marx to F. Danielson in 1881, in which Marx has shown how the colonial rule of the British was bleeding Indian economy:

In India serious complications, if not a general outbreak, are in store for the British government. What the British take from them annually in the form of rent, dividends for railways useless for the Hindoos, pensions for the military and civil servicemen, for Afghanistan and other wars, etc., etc. ... what they take from them without any equivalent and quite apart from what they appropriate to themselves annually within India ... speaking only of the value of the commodities that
Indians have gratuitously and annually to send over to England ... it amounts to more than the total sum of income of the 60 millions, of agricultural and industrial labourers of India. This is a bleeding process with a vengeance.39

Even some English officers were brutally frank about this bleeding of the native country. In Burmese Days, George Orwell points out how hypocritical the claim of the white man's burden is:

I'm here to make money, like everyone else. All I object to is the slimy white man's burden humbug ...living a lie the whole time ...the lie that we're here to uplift our poor black brothers instead of to rob them. I suppose it's a natural enough lie; but it corrupts us, it corrupts us in ways you can't imagine. There is an everlasting sense of being a sneak and a liar that torments us and drives us to justify ourselves night and day.40

Gail Omvedt in her The Political Economy of Starvation: Imperialism and the World Food Crisis points out that the famine ended in the centers of capitalism but in the colonised countries like India the famine was rampant –

10 million dead (a third of the population) in Bengal in 1769-70, only a decade after the initial conquest and plunder of that region ....one million dead in 1866, again in the east; one and a half million dead in 1869 in Rajasthan; five million dead in 1876-78, one million in 1899-1900.41
But surprisingly, the British revenues from these areas exceeded even those of earlier years because there was forcible collection of revenue.

2.3.7. British Educational Policy:

The British made much of their civilizing mission and educating the Indians to make them capable of managing their own affairs. However, their aim in their educational policy was to consolidate their hold on India. Macaulay made it very clear in his report:

We must do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions who we govern ... a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.42

It is clear from this that the British educational policy was primarily for their own colonial power and political and commercial objectives in the present as well as future. They succeeded in creating a class of English-educated Indian gentlemen but they spent very little on the education of the common people in India. The literacy rates in India remained the same throughout the British Raj.

Colonialism of the European countries in general and British in particular is marked by the capitalist exploitation of the colonised countries. It restructured the economy of the colonised countries, utilizing the human and natural resources, transporting raw materials to the metropolis for manufacturing goods and using the
colonies as captive markets for these goods. Thus the European capitalism was facilitated by the colonialism.

The identities of the coloniser and the colonised in the colonial world in general and in India in particular are marked by the racial stereotyping as discussed above and the cultural difference between the two communities. These identities appear to be further strengthened by the political and economic hegemony of the British and their desire to maintain the empire. The colonialist policy of the early nineteenth century turned into the full-fledged colonialism as an ideology, which is reflected in the colonial writings including fiction. This ideology seriously marked the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised in the Indian context.

2.4.0. Post-colonialism:

The terms colonial and post-colonial are temporally related to each other, the latter following the first to characterize the conditions of the once-colonised countries now politically independent. This interpretation fits the countries like India that were under colonial domination and achieved political independence after a long anti-colonial struggle. However, the term post-colonial is now being temporally and spatially expanded to include the countries like the U.S.A., Canada, New Zealand and Australia. It even refers to the prehistoric empires such as Incas so that one part of the world or the other was always under colonial domination and therefore now it is post-colonial. One case in point is the book
Empire Writes Back by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffith and Helen Tiffin (1989). They claim that the literatures of these countries share the themes of the subversion of imperial ideology, subversion also of the metropolitan English in favour of multiplicity of regional ‘englishes’ and the post-colonial experience in general. They appear to downplay the multiplicity of colonial situations in different countries in the African and the Asian continent. The spatial and trans-historical extension of the term postcolonial by Ashcroft et al has rendered it diffuse and meaningless. Both the terms, colonial and post colonial, need to be historically and structurally determinate to study their influence on the life of the communities involved, their culture and literature. Gallagher, for instance, says:

By affixing one label to a multiplicity of literatures that have been produced in a number of markedly different historical contexts by people of different classes, religions, and genders, are we guilty of cultural insensitivity?

He further goes to define postcolonial literature as:

Writing that emerges from peoples who once were colonised by European powers, now have some form of political independence, but continue to live with the negative economic and cultural legacy of colonialism.

The critics like Vilashini Coopan are against the term ‘postcolonial’ without a hyphen. She rejects the term without a hyphen because the nicety of the term:
effectively erases colonialism as a distinct category with its own continuing effects.\textsuperscript{45}

For our purpose, in the context of India and also Anglo-Indian Fiction, we cannot ignore the colonial context of post-colonial, which is dominant in the relationship of the coloniser and the colonised. There are, however, post-colonial critics and theorists such as Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha and others, whose views can be useful to analyse this relationship.

\textbf{2.4.1. The Post-Colonial Theory :}

The post-colonial theory starts with Edward Said's publication of his \textit{Orientalism}, which is a crucial text in the discussion of post-colonial condition. He describes Orientalism as a discourse:

\ldots by which European culture was able to manage... and even produce... the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period.\textsuperscript{46}

The European concept of Orient was not disinterested knowledge, rather it served very well the imperial policy of the West and in the case of India, it served the interest of England. (Said's \textit{Orientalism} minutely describes the strategies of the West to dominate the colonies politically, economically and culturally and paves way for the understanding of the anti-colonial movements in the African and Asian countries.
If the orientalism served the purpose of the colonisers to destroy political, social and cultural identity of the colonised communities, its repercussion in the anti-colonial movement was to refuse the dominance of the coloniser in these areas and refuse the tradition and culture of the coloniser. Fanon, therefore, tells the people not to imitate Europe. He tries to awaken the national consciousness of the people. On the other hand, the post-colonial theorists such as Homi K. Bhabha believe that the territorial nationalism generated by the anti-colonial movements should give way to trans-national post-colonial culture. Their post-colonial studies are preoccupied with the issues such as Hybridity, Creolization, Mestizaje and Diasporas, which according to them, are the tools to deal with the colonial stereotyping.

The concept of hybridity is based on the notion of racial and cultural purity. Bhabha describes hybridity in the following way:

In my own work I have developed the concept of hybridity to describe the construction of cultural authority within conditions of political antagonism or inequity ....the hybrid strategy or discourse opens up a space of negotiation where power is unequal but its articulation may be equivocal. Such negotiation is neither assimilation nor collaboration. It makes possible the emergence of an 'interstitial' agency that refuses the binary representation of social antagonism.47
Bhabha here recommends politics of negotiation to take place of anti-colonialism at the site of the national bases. He is not in favour of nation and race as categories of post-colonial analysis.

We have seen at (2.2.0) above how the colonial discourse tries to establish identities of the coloniser and the colonised in binary oppositions based on racial and cultural differences. These binary oppositions characterize the colonised 'other' – the outsider – and also construct the image of the white European coloniser. The colonial and post-colonial studies uncover the political, historical and ideological implications of these binary oppositions. But such simple binary oppositions cannot explain complex cultural and racial differences. In reality there cannot be determinate cultural and racial identities. There is a racial and cultural mix-up giving way to different kinds of hybridity. Bhabha, who works in the framework of postmodernism, does not believe in fixed or stable identities projected by the colonial discourse. He looks at hybridity as a strategy to fight the legacy of colonial stereotyping.

In the context of colonial India the category of hybridity can be applied to the phenomenon of Eurasian population. The British colonisers in India were very conscious about racial purity and cultural supremacy. Yet when two communities come in contact it is impossible to control their lives and thoughts. The Eurasians in India were the result of the white and the brown communities forming relationship to create racial hybridity. We can see how the
Anglo-Indian fiction is very much preoccupied with the possibility of mixed marriages and also the influence of Hindu religious philosophy. It reflects deep influence of Indian culture and thought on the minds of not only the western scholars but also lay men. Similarly, the Indians too were influenced by the western ideas and socio-cultural thought through the English education. They borrowed western ideas adapting them to the indigenous social and religious tradition.

The intellectual hybridity involves using the coloniser's conceptual tools to counter the colonialism. Bhabha relates the category of hybridity to the image of black skin/white masks in Fanon's book of the same title (Fanon, 1966), since the black colonized wishes to attain the whiteness of the coloniser, but at the same time realizes the impossibility of it. He suggests that neither the colonised nor the coloniser can remain unaffected by each other.

Hybridization of this kind is also the result of the ambivalence of the coloniser. To take example of India again, we have already noted the objective of the British educational policy in India, which was to create:

a class of persons Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect.

The British wanted the Indians to mimic them, but at the same time they knew that the Indians would never be like them. They would
remain 'the other', different. This ambivalence of the coloniser itself is the undo ping of the colonial authority, because the very policy which they adopted to strengthen their colonial power, became a source of strong anti-colonial movement.

In the writings of Bhabha, hybridity, mimicry and the ambivalence are the categories which characterize the post-colonial reality. These categories are supposed to replace the categories of Nation and Race in the contemporary literary, cultural and political analysis. The term hybridity has become almost synonymous with post-colonial theory. The 'interstitial agency' that Bhabha mentions in his definition of hybridity is realized in the form of the Third World migrant population in the First World metropolitan cities like London. The cosmopolitan migrant society in the metropolitan western cities enjoys the 'in-between' position, on one side the post-imperial coloniser and on the other side, the anti-colonial national leaders of the Third World. This 'in-between' society is supposed to reduce the anti-colonial tensions and aggressive nationalism to prepare a ground for global community sans any fundamentalist notions. The popularity of this post-colonial theory is also due to the new logic of globalization, in which nation-states and nationalism have no relevance. In the global economy the nations almost surrender their sovereignty to the global financial institutions like the World Bank and IMF. In this context the category like nation and consequently the nation-based decolonization appears out-of-date.
The categories of Nation and Race, however, cannot be written off so easily. In the African and Asian countries the national spirit was awakened by the anti-colonial movements. But by this time, in the European world, as a consequence of the two disastrous world wars the nationalism was discredited and distrusted, and now in the context of the Third World countries it is associated with fundamentalism. Frederic Jameson in his well-known essay 'Third World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capital' pejoratively refers to the narration of anti-colonial experiences, implying that the Third World literature has just this single formal pattern for its subject matter. This tendency of homogenizing the Asian and African literature is criticized by Aijaz Ahmad:

If this 'Third World' is constituted by the singular 'experience of colonialism and imperialism', and if the only possible response is a nationalist one, what else is there that is more urgent to narrate than this 'experience'? Ahmad criticizes Jameson for his conceptualization of the Third World countries merely in terms of colonialism. The relevance of the category of nation for the Afro-Asian countries cannot be denied because nation is the site for these countries to express a variety of their concerns such as gender, race, religion, caste, language, tribe, class, etc.

Secondly, there is pan-nationalism at work in the post-colonial Afro-Asian countries, which itself is the result of the globalization of
economy. To fight the economic hegemony of the European countries, the groups of nations in Asia and Africa are coming together to form pan-national economic combines such as ASEAN, SAARC, etc.

The coloniser-colonised relationship in these countries is deeply informed by the national spirit generated by the anti-colonial movement. The economic inequality which still persists between these and the European countries and the fear of exploitation in the condition of economic imperialism has the effect of strengthening the national and pan-national feelings. The post-colonial notions such as hybridity and diaspora operate only in the context of cosmopolitan societies in the metropolitan cities in the European countries. But in the countries like India post-colonial condition is fraught with national, linguistic and cultural consciousness.

2.5.0. Aspects of Fictional Representation of the Coloniser – Colonised Relationship:

The relationship between the English and the Indians until the British Raj lasted was a changing relationship. It changed as the British policies and the attitudes towards the Indians changed. It was also affected by the increasing awareness of the Indians, and their realization of being exploited by the British.

Another important factor of this relationship was the question: relationship with which Indians? Because the British broadly divided the Indian population into three classes: the Princes –Nabobs –Raos
-etc., the English-educated middle class Indians; and the peasants. The Princes, Nabobs, Raos and Rajas, etc. were the privileged class of the Indian aristocracy created by Lord Wellsley. After the Mutiny of 1857, the British realized the importance of this aristocracy, which remained loyal to them, and did not support the rebellion. This aristocratic class owed their existence to the British, and the British in turn found it convenient to maintain the princes giving them a semblance of autonomy and controlling them through the British resident officer in each state, who acted as an advisor in every important internal and external matter. The British middle-class bureaucracy identified themselves with this princely class, as rulers, and enjoyed their hospitality. Their relationship with this small minority of the Indian aristocracy was very cordial. It was also a political necessity for the British to keep the princes happy.

The Indian peasantry, by and large, did not come directly in contact with the British, because taxes were collected through hereditary Indian collectors, who were liable for a fixed sum as laid down in the permanent settlement of 1793. Millions of Indians never saw an English person throughout the term of the Raj. The Indian peasants under the tyrannical rule of the Mughal Subhedars might have found the East India Company officials more reasonable to deal with, in the early years of the Raj, in Bengal; and the officers such as Nicholson, Munro, Leyly, and others, who took their civilizing mission seriously, might have won the hearts of the Indian farmers in a few pockets of Northern and Southern India, however,
by and large, the vast uneducated and illiterate population of rural India remained unfamiliar with the Englishmen in India.

The question of the relationship, therefore, figured significantly in the context of the educated middle-class Indians, who mostly belonged to the upper crust of the Indian society, and who were aware of their Indianness as well as their adverse political situation. The educated middle-class Indians accepted government jobs at different levels of administration, and came in contact with the English in their official capacity. White-collar professionals such as lawyers, teachers and doctors and the prominent members of the Indian society in the towns and cities also occasionally came in contact with the English. But their encounter with the English was also formal and only occasional.

When we think of relationship, we think of the social and cultural encounter between two communities. The question therefore is how far the English in India and the Indians in general socially and culturally came together and tried to understand each other. The factors which facilitated or inhibited these social encounters are important for our purpose. Anglo-Indian fiction was written by the English men and women who wanted to express their thoughts and feelings and experiences of their life in India. This fiction can serve as a significant source to cast light on the coloniser-colonised relationship between these two communities.
We are going to examine here the aspects of this relationship reflected in the Anglo-Indian fiction.

2.5.1. The Phases of the Indo-British Encounter:

The first phase of the British encounter with the Indians was restricted to the travelers and trade-ambassadors, who came to the courts of the Mughal emperors. They were astonished by the riches and splendour of the great Mughals and their Subhedars. The accounts they sent back to their country were full of descriptions of the exotic India, with immense possibilities of trade and commerce. It was the picture of the magic orient and its fabulous wealth, but at the same time the land of barbarians, who followed strange customs and religious beliefs. There was no question of their close contact with the common Indians. When, in the second half of the 18th century, the British became a political power in Bengal, they had to deal with the Indians directly. As rulers, it was necessary for them to understand the nature and culture of Indian population. It was also necessary for them to employ Indians to administrate their territory properly.

The Company employees engaged in the work of trade and administration had to stay in India for a long duration. The distance and the climatic conditions precluded bringing their families to India. The Company, therefore, allowed them to take Indian spouses. The Englishmen married the Indian women who came mostly from the low class Indian society. In this first phase of social encounter,
there was no strong racial prejudice. The Englishmen who married Indian women allowed their wives to follow their own religious practices and customs, and even they themselves participated in the religious functions and ceremonies occasionally. During this period they had an opportunity to closely observe Indian social life, customs and traditions. These mixed marriages gave rise to the mixed population, which later came to be known as 'Eurasians', which was also one aspect of the coloniser-colonised relationship in India.

In this first phase, when the Company acquired political power over large Indian territories, the British Government took part in the civil administration and justice. For the first time the scholars such as William Jones, Henry Colebrooke and historians like James Todd, Sir John Malcolm and others came to India and studied Indian civilization and culture. The first phase of the relationship of the English and the Indians was dominated by the commercial interest and the wars. It was not a period congenial for the creation of contemplative literature. Most of the writings of this period were historical and travel accounts. In this phase, in the first century of the contact, the English were preoccupied with consolidating their power, and it was necessary for them to win the friendship of the Indian population. They did not therefore interfere with local customs and authorities. As pointed out earlier the feeling of racial superiority or the fear of racial pollution was not in the air.
The second phase of the Indo-British relationship was dominated by the British Imperial policy and the imperial ideology. After the 1857 outbreak, the fear of being in an alien country and being surrounded by the millions of native savages, there was atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. But at the same time, the British had become confident of their role as the rulers and their racial superiority. In the late nineteenth century, when the Indian National Congress was established and the nationalist movement started taking root, there grew political antagonism between the British bureaucracy and the educated middle-class Indians. There was also increasing realization among the British of the great divide between them and the Indian polity on account of the failure of the British bureaucracy in creating healthy relationship at the sociocultural level. This realization is reflected in the Anglo-Indian Fiction of the Foresterian period, in the first quarter of the twentieth century.

The third phase of the Indo-British relationship is rather turbulent. The British feeling about India and the Indians is complex. On the one hand they resent leaving India but there is also a sense of helplessness. For generations together the British lower middle-class had enjoyed the role of rulers and had been used to hobnob with the Indian aristocracy. Back in their own country, they would be reduced to their mediocre life and the style of living. Many of them were quite used to the life in India and did not want to leave but stay on, which was not possible. The plight of the
Eurasians was still worse. They could not leave India and at the same time they found it difficult to assimilate themselves in the Indian society. These tensions are reflected in the Anglo-Indian fiction of the third phase.

Several factors have affected the relationship between the English and the Indians during these three phases. These factors are related to the ideology of imperialism and colonialism, and the attitudes and behaviour of the British bureaucracy in India. Very prominent of these factors are discussed here as they are reflected in the Anglo-Indian fiction of different periods.

2.5.2. A Sense of Alienation and Being Exiled

The English did not come to India as settlers. They came to India as the employees of the East India Company and later as the officers of the empire. They always hankered after their motherland. Rumer Godden, in her novel *Breakfast with the Nikolides* (1942) compares the Europeans in India as:

.... cut flowers, that's why most of them wither and grow sterile; they cannot live without their roots and so few of them take root.52.

This sense of rootlessness was very strong with them specially because they could not socially and culturally mix with the Indians. They had a feeling that the Indians treated them as pariahs or as outcastes. The high-caste Indians would not allow an Englishman in their kitchen to share food with them. The tea-cups and the plates
used by the English guest were kept separate. The English themselves were not keen to mix socially with the Indians. After the Mutiny of 1857, there was an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. They preferred to live away from the cities and townships crowded by the native population. The English lived in the cantonment area surrounded by the military where the native population was not allowed excepting maidservants and other menial workers. In the novel *The Pink and Brown*, Hugh Atkinson describes the British in India in these words:

> The European community isolated and embattled on the great Indian tapestry, turned in on itself, going the rounds of its clubs and dinner parties in the every diminishing circles ascribed to that mythical bird, which disappeared finally through its own orifice.53

The Englishmen themselves were to blame for this sense of isolation. As colonisers, rulers and administrators, they preferred to live away from the native population. They were always suspicious that the Indians who tried to be friendly with them would take disadvantage of their familiarity. As a result, they studiously kept themselves aloof from the educated Indians. The role of the Englishmen as rulers always came in the way of forming cordial or friendly relationship with the Indians.

2.5.3. A Sense of Being a Besieged Minority:

After the Mutiny of 1857, though the British were successful in overpowering the rebels, they also realized how their existence in
India was precarious but for the support of the native princes and
the ignorant and disunited Indian multitude. William Hunter, a
member of the I.C.S. writes in a letter:

Here we Englishmen stand on the face of the broad
earth, a scanty, pale-faced band in the midst of
300 millions of unfriendly vassals.54

F. Yeats Brown, an Indian Army Officer, confesses:

I had sometimes a sense of isolation, of being a
caged white monkey in a zoo, whose patrons were
this incredibly numerous beige race... White
 overlords or white monkeys...it was all the same
...we were a caste: pariahs to them.55

This sense of being a besieged community is very glaringly
presented by Forster in his A Passage to India, when all the
Europeans assemble in the All White Club of Chandrapore, after the
incident of the imagined rape of Adela Quested.

People drove into the club with studious calm....
for the natives must not suspect that they were
agitated. They exchanged the usual drinks, but
everything tasted different ... They realized that
they were thousands of miles from any scenery
they understood.56

The feeling of being aliens in India and being besieged became
stronger with the increasing nationalist spirit among the Indians.

2.5.4. India as Bad-Lands :

In Kipling and Balestier's The Naulakha, Tarvin, the American
bounder, describes India in these words:
The land isn't fit for rats; its Bad Lands a great big Bad Lands ....Morally, physically and agriculturally Bad Lands. It's no place for white men, let alone white women; there is no climate, no government, no drainage and there is cholera, heat and fights, until you can't rest.57

This was the general impression of the Englishmen about India when they arrived in this country. The Englishmen who came to India were already made aware of what to expect. Mrs. Maryat in With Clive in India (1883), by G.A. Henty, warns her son, Charles, who is going to India:

Where you will most likely die of fever, or be killed by a tiger or stabbed by one of those horrid natives in a fortnight.58

Quite a few Anglo-Indian novels have described India as a land of dirt, disease and squalor, heat and dust and abject poverty. Maud Diver, for example, observes 'dirt and dastur' (customs) to be two great gods of the East. The Anglo-Indian fiction has a number of references to show the adverse effect of the Indian climatic conditions on the English character. Excessive heat creates heaviness of mind and the body constantly needs relaxation. In Rumer Godden's novel Breakfast with the Nikolides, Louise relates the Indian climate to the behaviour of the Englishmen:

No wonder in this country we cannot be reasonable; even the weather is unbalanced, a parabola outside normality... . The country was hyperbole of heat and terror and disease.59
There are innumerable references to dirt and disease, bad smells and squalor, swift and sudden death for which Indian climatic conditions we said to be responsible. But over and above all, it is suggested that the behaviour of the Englishmen in India is greatly influenced by these conditions.

2.5.5. Racial Prejudices:

We have already seen from the discussion of the ideological background how the Indians were branded by the English thinkers and writers, as racially inferior, heathens, prone to violence, incapable of running their own government, lacking intelligence and courage, effeminate and cowardly, fit only for being a subject race and so on. And these characteristics were attributed to the race in general. The British colonisers justified their imperial dominance over India claiming it to be the role of the superior race. The nineteenth century racial view was readily accepted by the British imperialists as well as the Anglo-Indian fiction writers. The white man was depicted in the Anglo-Indian fiction as physically, morally and intellectually superior to the Brown and Black man, who was considered to be incapable of any energetic activity and enterprise. The view of racial superiority was strengthened after the successful quelling of the 1857 rebellion by a handful English officer.

The Indian officers in the Anglo-Indian fiction have mostly been shown to be comic and ridiculous figures. They are shown to be incapable of taking decision at the crucial moments. Kipling
portrays Huree Chunder Mookerjee as a fat, ridiculous Bengali. The native doctor in E.W. Savi's The Devil Drives, is called "dam' fool" and a 'priceless idiot' lacking initiative. Indian officer is shown to be a buffoon, who tries to imitate the English master and becomes a laughing stock in his use of flowery language and roundabout expressions. F. Anstey's Baboo Bungasho Jabberjee, B.A. is one such character.

The Eurasian characters are treated even worse than Indians, because they are the 'chhee-chhee' half-castes, who have all the drawbacks of the Indian blood in them. In Henry Bruce's The Eurasians, the Eurasian is described as:

.....a tar nation bad mixture ....A man of streaks, all striped, like a barber's pole. He isn't a whole man ... The only certainty about a Eurasian is his uncertainty. 60

Even the western education and modernization cannot help the racial inferiority of the Indian or a Eurasian. Brian, the hero in Savi's novel Labelled Dangerous thinks that the Eastern women 'when emancipated became .... ripe for harlotry'. And in another novel, Birds of Passage, by the same writer, one character, Mrs. Hurst says about westernization of the Indian women:

.....it does not seem to improve them... The women don't seem to know where to draw the line once they start being 'modern'. They are born coquettes and flirt disgracefully. 61
We can say that in portraying the Indian and Eurasian characters in their fiction, the Anglo-Indian writers were following the contemporary Imperial view of the British, and generally shared the myths of racial superiority, which proved a strong barrier between the English and the Indians.

2.5.6. Moral or Ethical Views about the Indians:

The British, as the colonisers, treated the Indians suspiciously because they believed that the Indians did not possess moral or ethical values. For example, in E.W. Savi's *Labelled Dangerous*, Brian comments:

> There's their outlook on life, quite apart from the colour question: their ethics ....You can rarely trust an oriental ... they can't trust one another ....They are riddled with corruption ... you can never rely on the truth in the witness box. The fellow can be bought for a few rupees. To lie cleverly is something to be proud of. It's only a fool who will let honour stand in the way of self-advancement.\(^\text{62}\)

In Forster's *A Passage to India*, the newly appointed magistrate, Ronny Heaslop also says the same thing: He says:

> .... (he) worked hard in the court trying to decide which of two untrue accounts was the less untrue .... surrounded by lies and flattery.\(^\text{63}\)

Those English characters, who are unfortunate to have a little trace of Indian blood in them also cannot escape the lack of moral fibre. In Maud Diver's fiction, *Far to Seek*, Roy Sinclair, contemplates...
suicide after the disappointment in love, which was the influence of the 'fatalistic strain in his blood' but 'the voice of the West' prevented him from taking such course of action. Indians in general are supposed to surrender to the physical passion, and Indian women are specially the victims of such passion. Mrs. Rana, an Indian character in E.W. Savi's *Labelled Dangerous* is made to say to Phyllis:

> you have been taught self-discipline or self-control and find it easier than I do to resist things. Your religion too makes some things a deadly sin, while to me; one can't be held responsible when Nature has made us what we are.\(^6\)

On the other hand the Englishmen and women in the Anglo-Indian fiction are always presented as morally upright, having self-control and possessing high moral standard.

2.5.7. Insensitivity of the English Men and Women:

The sense of isolation and the racial prejudices about the Indians in general resulted into complete apathy to all things Indian. The English men and women developed a kind of superstitious contempt for all things Indian. In a novel, *Bound to Exile*, by Michael Edwards, when an English lady is asked what she had seen of the natives, she replies:

> Oh, nothing. Thank goodness, I know nothing about them, nor do I wish to; really, the less one sees and know them better.\(^6\)
In P.C. Wren’s *Dew and Mildew*, Mrs. Burgoyne’s butler shoots himself at a time when she is entertaining some guests in the drawing room. She comes to the kitchen to ask for milk and finds him lying dead there. The narrator says:

She did not shriek, nor faint, nor indulge in hysterics. Instead she poured milk into a milk-jug and returned to the drawing room.\(^6\)

They might have felt more for her dead pet than for the Indian butler. This insensitivity shows that for some English men and women the Indians were less than animals. An English woman would be horrified if any Indian happened to touch her even to save her life. In Rumer Godden’s *Breakfast at the Nikolides*, Shah, the devoted Indian servant, drags Emily inside the gate when a mob of irate students is likely to assault her. Her reaction is typical:

*Why did you touch me? ... I shall report you to the Sahib.*\(^7\)

In real life also there was such ungrateful response to the act of kindness by the Indian. J.R. Ackerley in his *Hindoo Holiday* reports how Mrs. Montgomery was saved by her Indian servant from death by pulling her back as she was about to tread on a deadly krait. She said:

*Of course, if he hadn’t done that I should undoubtedly have been killed; but I didn’t like it all the same and got rid of him soon after.*\(^8\)
2.5.8. Pukka Sahib Code:

One factor which grievously affected the Indo-British relationship was the Pukka Sahib Code that the English bureaucracy had to follow while in India. This code was dictated by the Imperial/Colonial policy followed by the British. In George Orwell's *Burmese Days*, Flory refers to this Pukka Sahib Code which constrained the life of the English officers in India:

> It is a stifling world in which to live. It is a world in which every word and every thought is censored... Every white man is a cog in the wheels of despotism. Free speech is unthinkable...Your opinion on every subject of conceivable importance is dictated for you by the pukka sahib code.\(^69\)

Anyone trying to be friendly with the Indians would be branded as 'soft' and his actions might harm the interest of the empire. The pukka sahib code expected the English officers to keep the Indians at the arm's length and social relationship with the Indians was almost unthinkable. Ronny in *A Passage to India* was on his way to become a pukka sahib once he realized how the Indians might take disadvantage of familiarity with him. Both, English men and women, had a duty to behave keeping the interest of the Empire in mind.

2.5.9. Lack of Communication:

Even though the pukka sahib code operated among the British officers, it was an official policy to maintain communication with the natives, to have cordial relationship with them. Secondly, as a part
of an administrative convenience the British had created a cadre of Indian officials both in the lower and higher ranks. To maintain the facade of cordial relationship, the district collectors used to organize garden parties occasionally, inviting Indian officers with their families and the prominent Indian citizens in the city. But these parties were very artificial affairs. The Indians as a group huddled together and hardly any Englishman came forward to chat with them socially. In Kincaid’s fiction, Durbar, Mrs. Hilton remarks:

I hate these garden parties’, and when her niece, Phyllis, says, ‘they ought to be interesting on account of all the different Indians,’ she reacts: ‘My dear, they are all painfully alike .... I felt like you when I first came to India. Longed to get to know them. Thought that must be fascinating world to explore. You’d only to get behind the rather dreary facade and then ... Oh dear’. One only admits the truth after endless disappointments. One blames oneself was I very gauche? Did I make some hideous gaffe? I seemed to be getting on so well, and suddenly that blank wall. It was only after years that I found out that the blank wall is the end, there is nothing else beyond.70

This experience of the lack of communication and perhaps some kind of inhibition on the part of both, the Indians and the English is illustrated by Forster also in A Passage to India. The party thrown by the collector of Chandrapore, where the Indians and the English keep separate and only Fielding is the one who cares to
talk to the Indians. The English are inhibited by the pukka sahib code, and the Indians perhaps keep polite silence on awkward queries. There could even be some misunderstanding. For example, in Kincaid's Durbar again young Phyllis tries to question Dadabhoy, the old Parsi about the Zoroastrian faith, but he thinks she is only trying to make fun of his religion and its practices, and he suddenly terminates the conversation saying 'I don't know about these things.' The blank wall Mrs. Hilton talks about could be the result of such misunderstanding.

It is observed, by and large that the English hardly referred to the Individual Indians in socio-cultural context. The Indians were always mentioned as groups. In the Anglo-Indian fiction the Indian characters hardly have any major role to play. They are mostly servants, who fill the background of the life of the English in India. This is the case at least in the Anglo-Indian fiction before Forster.

2.5.10. The Fear of Miscegenation:

One factor affecting the coloniser's relationship with the colonised in India was the fear of racial pollution through miscegenation. This aspect came into play especially during and after the second half of the 19th century. After the opening up of the Suez Canal it was easier for the British women to travel to India and they could take place of the Indian mistresses of the English men. By this time the feeling of racial superiority and the necessity of maintaining racial purity had taken hold of the English Imperialist
imagination. When the English family migrated to the colony like India, the Imperial policy required them to maintain racial purity and guard itself against contamination from the native society.

A number of Anglo-Indian novels treat the theme of mixed marriages, which are mostly shown to be failures. The Indian aspiring to marry an English girl is revealed to be unworthy of her, and the young Englishman rescues her in time from the fatal marriage. Colonial atmosphere did not encourage social encounter between the English and the Indian men and women. The Indian was looked at as a potential rapist and the Englishman as the hero who must rescue the English woman.

2.5.11. Political Scene during the late 19th and the 20th Century:

As already pointed out at (2.5.0), the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised in India was really the issue between the English bureaucracy that managed the empire and the educated Indian middle-class, which was seen to be a potential threat to the empire. The nationalist movement which took root after the establishment of Congress in 1885 was very much resented by the English bureaucracy. Most of the Anglo-Indian fiction, influenced by the colonial thinkers, loved to portray that India as a nation did not exist before the British conquest, and the present-day India was the creation of the British. In Maud Diver's Ships of Youtz, Desmond describes India as:
That virtual creation of his country’s casual genius.\textsuperscript{72}

And Christin Weston in her \textit{The World is a Bridge} makes her Indian character, the Rani of Khatakpur, speak:

\begin{quote}
My country? ... No Indian looks at India as his country. Foreigners have always loved this land better than we do... and successfully governed by a handful of people whom could have thrown into the sea a long time ago, if we had really wanted to....\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

The nationalist Indian characters in the Anglo-Indian fiction are ridiculous caricatures. They are shown to be slavishly imitating the British, conceited and having no culture. They are seditionists and are said to have joined the nationalist movement out of disappointment.

These are the broad aspects influencing the relationship between the ruling British and the ruled Indians. There are, of course, a few novels representing the influence of the Indian spirituality and Indian metaphysics on the English character.
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