Chapter 2: The Concept and the Critical Tools

Section I

1. Post Colonialism:

Post colonial literature is a body of literary writings that reacts to the discourse of colonialism. The interpretation and assessment of the present problem is based on Post-colonial theory. Post-colonial criticism involves the analysis of literary texts produced in countries and cultures that have come under the control of European Colonial Powers at some point in their history. Alternatively, it can refer to the analysis of texts written about colonized places by writers hailing from the colonizing culture. Both Nehru and Churchill fit this definition.

Post-colonialism also known as post-colonial theory, post-colonial studies comprises methods of intellectual discourse that present analyses of, and response to, the cultural legacies of colonialism and of imperialism. The researcher has treated the works of Nehru and Churchill. Nehru's and Churchill's works as post-colonial literature in the sense that they react to the discourse of colonization. Post-colonial criticism has been influenced by Marxist thought, by the work of Michael Foucault (whose theories about the power of discourses have influenced the new historicism) and by deconstruction which has "Challenged not only heirarchical, binary oppositions such as west/east and North/South but also the notions of superiority associated with the first term of each opposition."*

In short, Postcolonialism (also Post-colonial theory, Post-colonial studies, and Post-colonialism) comprises methods of intellectual discourse that present analyses of, and responses to, the cultural legacies of colonialism and of imperialism, which draw from different postmodern schools of thought, such as critical theory. In the field of anthropology, post-colonial studies record the human relations among the colonial nations and the peoples of the colonies they had ruled and exploited". To present the ideology and the praxis of (neo) colonialism, post colonial critical theory draws illustrates, and explains with examples from the humanities – history, architecture, anthropology, the cinema, feminism, human geography, linguistics, Marxist theory, philosophy, political science, sociology, religion and theology, as well as post-colonial literature. The researcher has treated Nehru's work from this point of view.

Definition

Post-colonial theory – as epistemology, ethics, and politics – addresses the matters of post-colonial identity (cultural, national, ethic), gender, race, and racism, and their interactions in the development of a post-colonial society, and of a post-colonial national identity; of how a
colonised people's (cultural) knowledge was used against them, in service of the coloniser's interests; and of how knowledge about the world is generated under specific socio-economic relations, between the powerful and the powerless. Identity politics comprise the perspectives of the colonial subjects, his and her creative resistance to the coloniser's culture, and how that resistance psychologically complicated the imperial-colony project for the European man and woman. Hence, among the cultural media to aid colonisation was the anti-conquest narrative genre, which produced colonial literature that ideologically legitimated the imperial domination of a people.

**Characteristics**

post-colonial studies entail the critical destabilization of the intellectual and linguistic, social and economic theories that support the Western ways of thinking (Deductive reasoning, Rule of Law, Monotheism), of perceiving, understanding, and knowing the world; thus is intellectual space created for the subaltern peoples to speak for themselves, in their own voices, and so produce alternative conversations to the dominant "Us-and-Them" discourse, between the colonist and the colonized. Occasionally, the term *post-colonialism* is applied literally – as the period after colonialism – which is problematic, given that the de-colonized world is filled with "contradictions, of half-finished processes, of confusions, of hybridity, and liminalities". Hence does post-colonialism also denote the continuation of colonialism by other means – economic, cultural, and linguistic – by the "Mother Country", which are relationships of colonial power that control the production and distribution of knowledge about the world.

In *Post-colonial Drama: Theory, Practice, Politics* (1996), Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins clarified the denotational functions:

The term post-colonialism – according to a too-rigid etymology – is frequently misunderstood as a temporal concept, meaning the time after colonialism has ceased, or the time following the politically determined Independence Day on which a country breaks away from its governance by another state. Not a naive teleological sequence, which supersedes colonialism, post colonialism is, rather, an engagement with, and contestation of colonialism's discourses, power structures, and social hierarchies ... A theory of post-colonialism must, then, respond to more than the merely chronological construction of post-independence,
and to more than just the discursive experience of imperialism.


The Western Way of thinking about the world usually reduces the de-colonized peoples, their cultures, and their countries, into a homogeneous whole, such as "The Third World", which conceptually comprises Africa, most of Asia, Latin America, and Oceania. Post-colonial studies analyses and criticises such an over-inclusive term, and its philosophic functions, to demonstrate that such a fantastic place as the Third World is composed of heterogeneous peoples and cultures, because the impact of colonialism varied by country, people, and culture. The connections among the "heart and margins" of the colonial empire are demonstrated by analyses of the ways in which "relations, practices, and representations" of the past are "reproduced or transformed", of how knowledge of the world is generated and controlled.

Post-colonial studies recognise that many of the intellectual, cultural, and religious assumptions that underlie the logic of colonialism remain active in contemporary society. Some post-colonial theoreticians, such as Homi K. Bhabha, propose that the individual study of the colonial dominant knowledge of the world and of the Subaltern knowledge of the world, as if they exist in a binary intellectual-relation, perpetuates their existence as homogenous entities, rather than as an ambiguous whole. Hence, the post-colonial world should give value to the hybrid socio-cultural spaces wherein truth and authenticity are displaced by ambiguity, therefore, the condition of hybridity poses the most profound philosophic challenge to colonialism.

Critical Purpose

The critical purpose of Post-colonial Studies is to account for and to combat the residual effects (social, political, and cultural) of colonialism upon the cultures of the peoples who had been ruled and exploited by the Mother Country. As such, post-colonial theoreticians establish social and cultural spaces in their respective academic fields of enquiry for the voices of the peoples of the world – especially the voices of the Subaltern peoples who had been silenced by the dominant ideology (value systems) of the colonial powers; in the European Western world, Academia is the principal and initial place where such socio-cultural spaces are established. In the book Orientalism (1978), Edward Said lucidly described how European scholars – who studied what The West called "The Orient" (usually the Middle East and Asia) – disregarded the intellectual and cultural perspectives of the Asian, Middle Eastern, and Muslim peoples proper, whom the Europeans studied, and, in their stead, substituted their preferred, European interpretations and representations of what is and what is not, and of who is and who is not
"Oriental", to support their self-ascribed intellectual and cultural superiority, which then allowed the European West to name, describe, and define, and thereby control, non-European peoples, places, and things; an attitude of absolute cultural superiority forged and facilitated by colonial imperialism.

Philosophically, post-colonial theory establishes the critical discourses that destabilize the ideologically dominant discourses of the European West, by intellectually challenging the "inherent assumptions... [and the] material and discursive legacies of colonialism." In order to challenge the cultural, intellectual, and philosophic assumptions and legacies of colonialism, post-colonial studies are based upon working with tangible socio-cultural identities, connections, and processes, such as cultural identity in a colonized society; the dilemmas inherent to developing a national identity after decolonization; the ways in which writers articulate and celebrate that identity, often reclaimed from the colonizer, whilst maintaining connections with the colonial Mother Country; the ways in which knowledge of the colonized people was generated and used to solely serve the interests of the colonial power; and the ways in which the literature of the colonial power justified colonialism with cultural representations (literary and pictorial) of the colonized country as a perpetually inferior people, society, and culture. In the event, post-colonialism permits the subaltern peoples' reply to the colonial legacy of the Mother Country by writing back to the center, whereby, using the colonial language, the indigenous peoples write their own national histories, and create cultural legacies, for their own national purposes. In post-colonial praxis, Indigenous decolonization is the intellectual impact of post-colonialist theory upon indigenous peoples, usually manifest in their post-colonial literature.

**Some Issues in Postcolonial Theory**

Post-colonial theory deals with the reading and writing of literature written in previously or currently colonized countries, or literature written in colonizing countries which deals with colonization or colonized peoples. It focuses particularly on

1. the way in which literature by the colonizing culture distorts the experience and realities, and inscribes the inferiority, of the colonized people
2. on literature by colonized peoples which attempts to articulate their identity and reclaim their past in the face of that past's inevitable otherness.

It can also deal with the way in which literature in colonizing countries appropriates the language, images, scenes, traditions and so forth of colonized countries.
The researcher found some of the complexities of the post-colonial situation, in terms of the writing and reading situation of the colonized people, and of the colonizing people.

**The Literature(s) of the colonized**

Post-colonial theory is built in large part around the concept of *otherness*. There are however problems with or complexities to the concept of otherness, for instance:

1. *otherness* includes doubleness, both identity and difference, so that every other, every different than and excluded by is dialectically created and includes the values and meaning of the colonizing culture even as it rejects its power to define;

2. The western concept of the oriental is based, as Abdul JanMohamed argues, on the Manichean allegory (seeing the world as divided into mutually excluding opposities): if the west is ordered, rational, masculine, good, then the orient is chaotic, irrational, feminine, evil. Simply to reverse this polarizing is to be complicit in its totalizing and identity destroying power (all is reduced to a set of dichotomies, black or white,

3. colonized peoples are highly diverse in their nature and in their traditions, and as beings in cultures they are both constructed and changing, so that while they may be 'other' from the colonizers, they are also different one from another and from their own pasts, and should not be totalized or essentialized -- through such concepts as a black consciousness, Indian soul, aboriginal culture and so forth. This totalization and essentialization is often a form of nostalgia which has its inspiration more in the thought of the colonizers than of the colonized, and it serves give the colonizer a sense of the unity of his culture while mystifying that of others; as John Frow remarks, it is a making of a mythical One out of many...

4. the colonized peoples will also be other than their pasts, which can be reclaimed but never reconstituted, and so must be revisited and realized in partial, fragmented waysys. You can't go home again.

Post-colonial theory is also built around the concept of resistance, of resistance as subversion, or opposition, or mimicry -- but with the haunting problem that resistance always inscribes the resisted into the texture of the resisting: It is a two-edged sword. As well, the concept of resistance carries with it or can carry with it ideas about human freedom, liberty, identity, individuality, etc., which ideas may not have been held, or held in the same way, in the colonized culture's view of humankind.
On a simple political/cultural level, there are problems with the fact that to produce a literature which helps to reconstitute the identity of the colonized one may have to function in at the very least the means of production of the colonizers -- the writing, publishing, advertising and production of books, for instance. These may well require a centralized economic and cultural system which is ultimately either a western import or a hybrid form, uniting local conceptions with western conceptions.

The concept of producing a national or cultural literature is in most cases a concept foreign to the traditions of the colonized peoples, who (a) had no literature as it is conceived in the western traditions or in fact no literature or writing at all, and/or (b) did not see art as having the same function as constructing and defining cultural identity, and/or (c) were, like the peoples of the West Indies, transported into a wholly different geographical/political/economic/cultural world. (India, a partial exception, had a long-established tradition of letters; on the other hand it was a highly balkanized sub-continent with little if any common identity and with many divergent sub-cultures). It is always a changed, a reclaimed but hybrid identity, which is created or called forth by the colonizeds' attempts to constitute and represent identity.

The very concepts of nationality and identity may be difficult to conceive or convey in the cultural traditions of colonized peoples.

There are complexities and perplexities around the difficulty of conceiving how a colonized country can reclaim or reconstitute its identity in a language that is now but was not its own language, and genres which are now but were not the genres of the colonized. One result is that the literature may be written in the style of speech of the inhabitants of a particular colonized people or area, which language use does not read like Standard English and in which literature the standard literary allusions and common metaphors and symbols may be inappropriate and/or may be replaced by allusions and tropes which are alien to British culture and usage. It can become very difficult then for others to recognize or respect the work as literature (which concept may not itself have relevance.

There other are times when the violation of the aesthetic norms of western literature is inevitable,

1. as colonized writers search to encounter their culture's ancient yet transformed heritage, and
2. as they attempt to deal with problems of social order and meaning so pressing that the normal aesthetic transformations of western high literature are not relevant, make no sense.
The idea that good or high literature may be irrelevant and misplaced at a point in a culture’s history, and therefore for a particular cultural usage not be good literature at all, is difficult for us who are raised in the culture which strong aesthetic ideals to accept.

The development (development itself may be an entirely western concept) of hybrid and reclaimed cultures in colonized countries is uneven, disparate, and might defy those notions of order and common sense which may be central not only to western thinking but to literary forms and traditions produced through western thought.

The term 'hybrid' used above refers to the concept of **hybridity**, an important concept in post-colonial theory, referring to the integration (or, mingling) of cultural signs and practices from the colonizing and the colonized cultures ("integration" may be too orderly a word to represent the variety of stratagems, desperate or cunning or good-willed, by which people adapt themselves to the necessities and the opportunities of more or less oppressive or invasive cultural impositions, live into alien cultural patterns through their own structures of understanding, thus producing something familiar but new). The assimilation and adaptation of cultural practices, the cross-fertilization of cultures, can be seen as positive, enriching, and dynamic, as well as oppressive. "Hybridity" is also a useful concept for helping to break down the false sense that colonized cultures -- or colonizing cultures for that matter -- are monolithic, or have essential, unchanging features.

The representation of these uneven and often hybrid, polyglot, multivalent cultural sites (reclaimed or discovered colonized cultures searching for identity and meaning in a complex and partially alien past) may not look very much like the representations of bourgeois culture in western art, ideologically shaped as western art is to represent its own truths (that is, guiding fictions) about itself.

To quote Homi Bhabha on the complex issue of representation and meaning from his article in Greenbiatt and Gun's *Redraw the Boundaries*;

"Culture as a strategy of survival is both transnational and translational. It is transnational because contemporary post-colonial discourses are rooted in specific histories of cultural displacement, whether they are the middle passage of slaver and indenture, the voyage out of the civilizing mission, the fraught accommodation of Third World migration to the West after the Second World War, or the traffic of economic and political refugees within and outside the Third World. Culture
is translational because such spatial histories of displacement -- now accompanied by the territorial ambitions of global media technologies -- make the question of how culture signifies, or what is signified by culture, a rather complex issue. It becomes crucial to distinguish between the semblance and similitude of the symbols across diverse cultural experiences -- literature, art, music, ritual, life, death -- and the social specificity of each of these productions of meaning as they circulate as signs within specific contextual locations and social systems of value. The transnational dimension of cultural transformation -- migration, diaspora, displacement, relocation -- makes the process of cultural translation a complex form of signification, the natural(ized), unifying discourse of nation, peoples, or authentic folk tradition, those embedded myths of cultures particularity, cannot be readily referenced. The great, though unsettling, advantage of this position is that it makes you increasingly aware of the construction of culture and the invention of tradition."12"

The literature(s) of the colonists:

In addition to the post-colonial literature of the colonized, there exists as well the postcolonial literature of the colonizers.

As people of British heritage moved into new landscapes, established new founding national myths, and struggled to define their own national literature against the force and tradition of the British tradition, they themselves, although of British or European heritage, ultimately encountered the originating traditions as Other, a tradition and a writing to define oneself against (or, which amounts to the same thing, to equal or surpass). Every colony had an emerging literature which was an imitation of but differed from the central British tradition, which articulated in local terms the myths and experience of a new culture, and which expressed that new culture as, to an extent, divergent from and even opposed to the culture of the "home", or colonizing, nation.

The colonizers largely inhabited countries which absorbed the peoples of a number of other heritages and cultures (through immigration, migration, the forced mingling of differing local cultures, etc.), and in doing so often adapted to use the myths, symbols and
definitions of various traditions. In this way as well the literature of the hitherto colonizers becomes 'post-colonial'. (It is curiously the case that British literature itself has been colonized by colonial/postcolonial writers writing in Britain out of colonial experiences and a colonial past.)

In this regard a silent difference between colonialist literature (literature written by colonizers, in the colonized country, on the model of the "home" country and often for the home country as an audience) and post-colonial literature, is that colonialist literature is an attempt to replicate, continue, equal, the original tradition, to write in accord with British standards; postcolonial literature is often (but not inevitably) self-consciously a literature of otherness and resistance, and is written out of the specific local experience.

Notable Theoreticians:

Frantz Fanon

In *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961), the psychiatrist Frantz Fanon analysed the nature of colonialism and the detrimental effects of imperial European colonialism upon the mental health of the coloured peoples who had been subjugated into economic colonies. Hence, colonialism is a source of physical and mental violence that must be violently resisted by the colonised peoples -- because it is the essential nature of colonialism to systematically deny "all attributes of humanity" of the colonised people. As such, Fanon proposed that violent resistance of colonialism is a mentally cathartic practice that cleanses the psyche, and restores the human self-respect, of the men and women whose political oppression and economic subjugation was established and achieved by means of the dehumanizing epistemic violence of the institutions (social, economic, cultural) of the colonial power; thus did Fanon support the *Front de Liberation Nationale* (FLN) in the Algerian War (1954-62) for the independence of Algeria from Metropolitan France.

The socio-political analyses of the psychologically detrimental effects of colonial subjugation presented by Frantz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth* were preceded, in 1909, by campaigns for *Hind Swaraj* (Indian self governance), by Mahatma Gandhi, which proposed similar analyses of British colonial rule as harmful to the mental health of the peoples of the Indian subcontinent. (See: Benoy Kumar Sarkar). Moreover, such analyses of post-colonialism and its supporting theories, derive from *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1916), by Lenin.
Edward W. Said:

Note (As the researcher has depended on Said's theory, detailed study has been given in the following pages)

Homi K. Bhabha

Homi K. Bhabha (born 1949) is the Anne F. Rothenberg Professor of English and American Literature and Language, and the Director of the Humanities Center at Harvard University. He is one of the most important figures in contemporary Post-colonial Studies and has coined a number of the field's neologisms and key concepts, such as hybridity, mimicry, difference, and ambivalence. Such terms describe ways in which colonised peoples have resisted the power of the coloniser, according to Bhabha's theory, one of his central ideas is that of "hybridisation", which taking up from Edward Said's work, describes the emergence of new cultural forms from multiculturalism. Instead of seeing colonialism as something locked in the past, Bhabha shows how its histories and cultures constantly intrude on the present, demanding that we transform our understanding of cross-cultural relations. His work transformed the study of colonialism by applying post structuralist methodologies to colonial texts. Bhabha's work in post-colonial theory owes much to post-structuralism. Notable among Bhabha's influences include Jacques Derrida and deconstruction; Jacques Lacan and Lacanian Psychoanalysis; and Michel Foucault's notion of dischrisivity. Additionally, in a 1995 interview with W.J.T. Michell, Bhabha stated that Edward Said is the writer who has most influenced his thoughts.

In "The Commitment to Theory", an essay collected in The Location of Culture (1994), Homi K. Bhabha foregrounds the unfortunate and perhaps false opposition of theory and politics that some critics have framed in order to question the elitism and Eurocentrism of prevailing postcolonial debates:

"There is damaging and self-defeating assumption that theory is necessarily the elite language of the socially and culturally privileged. It is said that the place of the academic critic is inevitably within the Eurocentric archives of an imperialist or neo-colonial West."13

What's ironic is that Bhabha himself -- perhaps more than any other leading postcolonial theorist -- has throughout his career been susceptible to charges of elitism, Eurocentrism, bourgeois academic privilege, and an indebtedness to the principles of European poststructuralism that many of his harshest critics portray as his unknowing replication of
"neo-imperial" or "neo-colonial" modes of discursive dominance over the colonized Third World. By means of a complicated repertoire of Lacanian psychoanalyst, Postmodern notions of mimicry and performance, and Derridian deconstruction, Bhabha has encouraged a rigorous rethinking of nationalism, representation, and resistance that above all stresses the "ambivalence" or "hybridity" that characterizes the site of colonial contestation -- a "liminal" space in which cultural differences articulate and, as Bhabha argues, actually produce imagined "constructions" of cultural and national identity.

Bhabha's *Nation and Narration* (1990) is primarily an intervention into "essentialism" readings of nationality that attempt to define and naturalize Third World "nations" by means of the supposedly homogenous, innate, and historically continuous traditions that falsely define and ensure their subordinate status. Nations, in other words, are "narrative" constructions that arise from the "hybrid" interaction of contending cultural constituencies. In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha extends his explanation of the "liminal" or "interstitial" category that occupies a space "between" competing cultural traditions, historical periods, and critical methodologies. Again utilizing a complex criteria of semiotics and psychoanalysis, Bhabha examines the "ambivalence of colonial rule" and suggests that it enables a capacity for resistance in the performatative "mimicry" of the "English book". Discussing artists such as Toni Morrison and Nadine Gordimer, Bhabha seeks to find the "location of culture" in the marginal, "haunting", "unhomely" spaces between dominant social formations.

**Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak:**

The philosopher and theoretician Gayatri Spivak is concerned with the constraining mechanisms of institutional realities that 'discipline' what knowledge is produced and if and how it is disseminated. Chakravorthy suggests that History can only replicate the structure of a progress narrative in which Europe was there 'first' and the Third World, for instance, can only follow. Chakraborty demonstrates that Europe remains the subject of all history whether that history is Indian, Kenyan or Nigerian and recommends on intervention that provincializes Europe.

The definition of the term *Subaltern* is the principal contribution to Post-colonial Studies, by her about which she cautioned against assigning an over-broad connotation, that:

"... *subaltern* is not just a classy word for 'oppressed", for Other, for somebody who's not getting a piece of the pie ...
In post-colonial terms, everything that has limited or no access to the cultural imperialism is subaltern – a space of difference. Now, who would say that's just the oppressed? The working class is oppressed. It's not subaltern... Many people want to claim subalternity. They are the least interesting and the most dangerous. I mean, just by being a discriminated-against minority on the university campus; they don't need the word 'subaltern' ... They should see what the mechanics of the discrimination are. They're within the hegemonic discourse, waiting a piece of the pie, and not being allowed, so let them speak, use the hegemonic discourse. They should not call themselves subaltern." 

Spivak also introduced the terms essentialism and strategic essentialism to describe the post-colonialism; the term essentialism denotes the perceptual dangers inherent to reviving subaltern voices in ways that might simplify the cultural identity of heterogeneous social groups, thereby creating stereotyped impressions of the diverse identities who compose the given group; the term strategic essentialism denotes a temporary, essential group-identity used in the praxis of inter-group relations, discourse among peoples. Moreover, essentialism occasionally can be strategically applied – by the so described group of people – to facilitate the social-communication task of the subaltern, in being heeded, heard, and understood, because a strategic essentialism (a fixed and established subaltern identity) is more readily grasped and accepted by the popular majority. The important distinction, between the terms, is that "strategic essentialism" does not forego inter-group diversity, but that, in its practical function, it temporarily minimizes inter-group diversity to support the essential element of the group identity.

In a development of Michel Foucault's work, Spivak applied the term epistemic violence to describe the destruction of non-Western ways of knowing the world, and the resultant dominance of the Western ways of perceiving, understanding, and knowing the world. Epistemic violence conceptually relates to the Subaltern, wherein the "Subaltern must always be caught in translation, never truly expressing herself", because of the colonial power's destruction of her culture, and the marginalization of her way of understanding and knowing the world.
Spivak further cautioned against ignoring the Subaltern people as "cultural Others", and proposed that the West could progress – beyond the perspective of post-colonialism – by means of introspective self-criticism of the basic ideals and investigative methods that feature a superior Western perspective in the study of non-Western peoples and cultures. Hence, the integration of the Subaltern voice to the field of social studies is problematic, given the criticism, by social scientists, against the idea of studying "others", which thus appeared infeasible; nonetheless, as an intellectual, Gayatri Spivak rejected such an anti-intellectual stance by social scientists, and said that "to refuse to represent a cultural Other is salving your conscience ... allowing you not to do any homework." Moreover, post-colonial studies rejects the colonial cultural depiction of subaltern peoples as hollow mimics of the European colonials and their Western ways; and also rejects the depiction of subaltern peoples as the passive recipients of the power of the colonial country. Consequent to the Foucauldian argument about the binary intellectual relationship of power and knowledge, post-colonial scholars, such as the Subaltern Studies Collective, propose that anti-colonial resistance always counters every exercise of colonial power.

Dipesh Chakrabarty

Dipesh Chakrabarty, writing in the nineties, made a major attempt to chart the subaltern's history of the Indian struggle for independence. In his book *Provincializing Europe* (2000) he seeks to counter scholarly eurocentric views by arguing that Europe should only be seen as "one region among many".

Section II

Edward Said and Orientalism*

The present study follows Said's theory and concept therefore a detailed study of Said's work is given.

The researcher has followed Edward Said's crucial and canonical text of cultural studies orientalism there is brief review of Said and orientalism.

Introduction

A man of great intellect and courage, Edward Said (1935-2003) taught English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. This Palestinian writer and activist was widely respected for his ground-breaking research in the field of comparative literature and on his incisive political commentary. As well, he wrote classical music criticism for *The Nation* and political commentary for such publication as the *Guardian, Le Monde Diploma-
tique, and al-Hayat, the Arab-language daily, which is printed in every Arab capital in the world.

He was born in Jerusalem, and with his family he emigrated (1948) to Cairo, about the time Israel declared its independence and the Arab-Israeli war began. The family moved (1950) to the New York, so that he could attended college. Later, Said studied at Princeton and Harvard, where he graduated Ph.D. in 1964. Most of his academic career was spent in New York as a professor at Columbia, but he was also a visiting professor at many leading universities.

Like Noam Chomsky, he became an intellectual of the first rank. Both activists more or less see the public role of the intellectual in terms of being the outsider, the amateur, and the disturber of the status quo. Both critique the media as impediments to an understanding of what governments actually do behind closed doors, thereby promoting a sense of resistance. He lectured at more than 150 universities and colleges in the United States, Canada, and Europe. Because of his advocacy for Palestinian self-determination and his membership in the Palestine National Council, he was only latterly allowed to visit Palestine.

**Orientalism**


This ground-breaking critique of a set of beliefs known as "Orientalism" forms an important background for such fields as Cultural Studies, Ethnic Studies, and Postcolonial Studies, which have been gaining prominence since the 1970s. Said highlights the inaccuracies of a wide range of assumptions underlying Orientalist thinking; he uncovers the operations of power in the Eurocentric constructions of the "Orient" across many sites of knowledge production, thereby helping us appreciate the global dimensions of "race" and "otherness" (Gray and Mcguigan, 1997, p.2). The researcher has based his study on this theory.

To some extent, the Orient was a European invention; since antiquity, the Orient has been a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, and remarkable experiences. By the mid-seventies, it was disappearing. Perhaps it seemed irrelevant
that Orientals themselves might have an interest in the process. The main thing for the European visitor was a European representation of the area.

In *Orientalism* Said has challenged the concept of orientalism or the difference between east and west, as he puts it. He says that with the start of European colonization the Europeans came in contact with the lesser developed countries of the east. They found their civilization and culture very exotic, and established the science of orientalism, which was the study of the orientals or the people from these exotic civilization.

Edward Said argues that the Europeans divided the world into two parts; that east and the west or the occident and the orient or the civilized and the uncivilized. This was totally an artificial boundary; and it was laid on the basis of the concept of them and us or theirs and ours. The Europeans used orientalism to define themselves. Some particular attributes were associated with the orientals, and whatever the orientals weren't the occidents were. The Europeans defined themselves as the superior race compared to the orientals, and they justified their colonization by this concept. They said that it was their duty towards the world to civilize the uncivilized world. The main problem, however, arose when the Europeans started generalizing the attributes they associated with orientals, and started portraying these artificial characteristics associated with orientals in their western world through their scientific reports, literary work, and other media sources. What happened was that it created a certain image about the orientals in the European mind and in doing that infused a bias in the European attitude towards the orientals. This prejudice was also found in the orientalists (scientist studying the orientals); and all their scientific research and reports were under the influence of this. The generalized attributes associated with the orientals can be seen even today in many ways.

Here is a brief summary of the book, followed by a critique by Malcolm Kerr.²

**Summary of Orientalism**

**Chapter 1: The Scope of Orientalism**

In this chapter, Edward Said explains how the science of orientalism developed and how the orientals started considering the orientals as non-human beings. The orientals divided the world into two parts by using the concept of *ours* and *theirs*. And what was *theirs*. The orients were regarded as uncivilized people; and the westerns said that since they were the refined race it was their duty to civilize these people and in order to achieve their goal, they had to colonize and rule the orients. They said that the orients themselves
were incapable of running their own government. The Europeans also thought that they had the right to represent the orientals in the west all by themselves. In doing so, they shaped the orientals the way they perceived them or in other words they were orientalizing the orients. Various teams have been sent to the east where the orientalists silently observed the orientals by living with them; and every thing the orientals said and did was recorded irrespective of its context, and projected to the civilized world of the west. This resulted in the generalization. Whatever was seen by the orientals was associated with the oriental culture, no matter if it is the irrational action of an individual.

The most important use of orientalism to the Europeans was that they defined themselves by defining the orientals. For example, qualities such as lazy, irrational, uncivilized, crudeness were related to the orientals, and automatically the Europeans became active, rational, civilized, sophisticated. Thus, in order to achieve this goal, it was very necessary for the orientalists to generalize the culture of the orients.

Another feature of orientalism was that the culture.

Chapter 2: Orientalist Structures and Restructures

In this chapter, Edward Said points the slight change in the attitude of the Europeans towards the orientals. The orientals were really publicized in the European world especially through their literary work. Oriental land and behaviour was highly romanticized by the European poets and writers and then presented to the western world. The orientalists had made a stage strictly for the European viewers, and the orients were presented to them with the colour of the orientalist or other writers perception. In fact, the orient lands were so highly romanticized that western literary writers found it necessary to offer pilgrimage to these exotic lands of pure sun light and clean oceans in order to experience peace of mind, and inspiration for their writing. The east was now perceived by the orientalist as a place of pure human culture with no necessary evil in the society. actually it was this purity of the orientals that made them inferior to the clever, witty, diplomatic, far-sighted European; thus it was their right to rule and study such an innocent race. The Europeans said that these people were too naive to deal with the cruel world, and that they needed the European fatherly role to assist them.

Another justification the Europeans gave to their colonization was that they were meant to rule the orientals since they have developed sooner than the orientals as a nation, which shows that they were biologically superior, and secondly it were the Europeans who
discovered the orients not the orients who discovered the Europeans. Darwin’s theories were put forward to justify their superiority, biologically by the Europeans.

In this chapter, Edward Said also explains how the most renowned orientalists of the 19th century, namely Silvestre de Sacy and Ernest Renan worked and gave orientalism a new dimension. In fact, Edward Said compliments the contribution made by Sacy in the field. He says that Sacy organized the whole thing by arranging the information in such a way that it was also useful for the future orientalist. And secondly, the prejudice that was inherited by every orientalist was considerably low in him. On the other hand, Renan, who took advantage of Sacy’s work was as biased as any previous orientalist. He believed that the science of orientalism and the science of philology have a very important relation; and after Renan this idea was given a lot attention and many future orientalists worked of in its line.

Chapter 3: Orientalism Now

This chapter starts off by telling us that how the geography of the world was shaped by the colonization of the Europeans. There was a quest for geographical knowledge which formed the bases of orientalism.

The author then talks about the changing circumstances of the world politics and changing approach to orientalism in the 20th century. The main difference was that where the earlier orientalists were more of silent observers the new orientalists took a part in the everyday life of the orients. The earlier orientalists did not interact a lot with the orients, whereas the new orients lived with them as if they were one of them. This wasn’t out of appreciation of their lifestyle but was to know more about the orients in order to rule them properly. Lawrence of Arabia was one of such orientalists.

Then Edward Said goes on to talk about two other scholars Massignon and Gibb. Though Massignon was a bit liberal with orientalists and often tried to protect their rights, there was still inherited biased found in him for the orients, which can be seen in his work. With the changing world situation especially after World War I, orientalism took a more liberal stance towards most of its subjects; but Islamic orientalism did not enjoy this status. There were constant attacks to show Islam as a weak religion, and a mixture of many religions and thoughts. Gibb was the most famous Islamic orientalist of this time.

After World War I the centre of orientalism moved from Europe to USA. One important transformation that took place during this time was instances of relating it to philology and it was related to social science now. All the orientalists studied the orients to assist their
government to come up with policies for dealing with the orient countries. With the end of World War 2, all the Europeans colonies were lost; and it was believed that there were no more orientals and occidents, but this was surely not the case. Western prejudice towards eastern countries was still very explicit, and often they managed to generalize most of the eastern countries because of it. For example, Arabs were often represented as cruel and violent people. Japanese were always associated with karate where as the Muslims were always considered to be terrorists. Thus, this goes on to show that even with increasing globalization and awareness, such bias was found in the people of the developed countries.

Edward Said concludes his book by stating that he is not saying that the orientalists should not make generalization, or they should include the orient perspective too, but creating a boundary at the first place is something which should not be done.

* * *

**Approach(es)**

The researcher observed three approaches to apply to his study.

We can identify three designations for the term orientalism. These include

**Area Studies**

Note that the anthropologist, sociologist, historian, or philologist uses the term. We think of Oriental Studies or Area Studies. True, specialists regard the term as too vague, if not too general, because it suggests the high-handed executive attitude of 19th century and early 20th century colonialism (p.43).

**a style of thought**

The term Orientalism also designates a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction, as in "the Orient" and "the Occident". Many writers, political theorists, economists, and imperial administrators work with this distinction between the East and the West.

**a discourse**

Since the late 18th century, the term has designated the corporate institution (a discourse) for dealing with the Orient, i.e., a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and exerting authority over it. My contention is that, without examining Orientalism as a discourse, one cannot understand the systematic discipline by which European culture was able to produce and manage the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period (pp.43-44). This book argues
that European culture gained strength as well as identify by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate self (p.44).

**The Terms**

**Key Words**

The researcher derives the following Key Words from Said's *Orientalism*

**The Orient** signifies a system of representations framed by political forces that brought the Orient into Western learning, Western consciousness, and Western empire. The Orient exists for the West, and is constructed by and in relation to the West. It is a mirror image of what is inferior and alien ("other") to the West.

**Orientalism** is "a manner of regularized (or Orientalized) writing, vision, and study, dominated by imperatives, perspectives, and ideological biases ostensibly suited to the Orient." It is the image of the 'Orient' expressed as an entire system of thought and scholarship.

**The Oriental** is the person represented by such thinking. The man is depicted as feminine, weak, yet strangely danagerous because poses a threat to white, Western women. The woman is both eager to be dominated and strikingly exotic. The Oriental is a single image, a sweeping generalization, a stereotype that crosses countless cultural and national boundaries.

**Latent Orientalism** is the unconscious, untouchable certainty about what the Orient is. Its basic content is static and unanimous. The Orient is seen as separate, eccentric, backward, silently different, sensual, and passive. It has a tendency towards despotism and away from progress. It displays feminine penetrability and supine malleability. Its progress and value are judged in terms of, and in comparison to, the West, so it is always the Other, the conquerable, and the inferior.

**Manifest Orientalism** is what is spoken and acted upon. It includes information and changes in knowledge about the Orient as well as policy decisions founded in Orientalist thinking. It is the expression in words and actions of Latent Orientalism.
5. Earlier Orientalism

The first 'Orientalists' were 19th century scholars who translated the writings of 'the Orient' into English, based on the assumption that a truly effective colonial conquest required knowledge of the conquered peoples. This idea of knowledge as power is present throughout Said's critique. By knowing the Orient, the West came to own it. The Orient became the studied, the seen, the observed, the object; Orientalist scholars were the students, the seers, the observers, the subject. The Orient was passive; the West was active.


6. Textual Quotations

The Researcher is guided by the following points discussed in Orientalism. It would be appropriate to quote from the text.

"It is wrong to think that the Orient was (a) essentially an idea (or a creation) with no corresponding reality. In fact, many Western scholars have found the East to be an all-consuming passion (pp.44-45)." In addition, (b) ideas, culture, and histories cannot be understood apart from configurations of power. The relationship between the Occident and the Orient is a relationship of power. One should never assume that (c) the structure of Orientalism is nothing more than a structure of lies or myths. Orientalism is valuable as a sign of European-Atlantic power over the Orient (p.45).

"Antonio Gramsci distinguished between civil and political society, the one made up of voluntary affiliations and the other state institutions (the police say) whose role in the polity is direct domination. We find culture in civil society, where the influence of ideas, institutions, etc., works through consensus (p.46)."

"In any society not totalitarian, certain cultural forms predominate over others, just as certain ideas are more influential than others. Gramsci calls this form of (cultural) leadership "hegemony". This concept is indispensable for understanding life in the industrial West. Hegemony/the result of cultural hegemony gives Orientalism the durability we've been talking about. Orientalism is never far from the idea of Europe, a collective notion identifying "us" Europeans from "those" non-Europeans/Orientalism depends for its strat-
egy on this flexible political superiority, which puts the West in a whole series of relationships with the Orient without losing the upper hand."

my contemporary reality

"I see three ways out of the difficulties mentioned above:
(a) distinguishing pure and political knowledge

Distinguishing pure from political knowledge is never straightforward. It is easy to argue that knowledge about Shakespeare and Wordsworth (say) is not political, whereas knowledge of contemporary China or Russia is. We demand that knowledge be non-political, i.e., scholarly, academic, impartial, but in practice the matter is problematic. Orientalism is not a mere political subject that is reflected passively by culture, scholarship, or institutions; it is a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, romantic, sociological, historical, and philosophical texts; it is an elaboration of a whole series of "interests" (pp.47-48).

Each humanistic investigation must formulate the nature of the connection between knowledge and politics in the specific context of the study/the subject matter, and its historical circumstances (p.49).

(b) methodological question

For some time, I have been interested in a problem that has plagued the human sciences, i.e., formulating a first step, the point of departure, thereby marking off what should be included in a study and what should be excluded. We have to make a beginning for each project in such a way as to enable what follows. We are especially conscious of this problem in the study of Orientalism (p.49).

The idea of "beginning", indeed the act of beginning, involves an act of delimitation by which something is cut out of a great mass of material and which stands for a starting point. Students of texts can utilize Louis Althusser's principle of the problematic, i.e., the concern which unifies a text or a group of texts. In the case of Orientalism, we face not only the problem of finding a point of departure, a problematic, but also the question of selecting texts, authors, and periods." (Said)

What German Orientalism had in common with Anglo-French and later American Orientalism was a kind of intellectual authority over the Orient in Western culture. This authority must in large part be the subject of any description of Orientalism. Even the name Orientalism suggests a serious, perhaps ponderous style of expertise; when I apply it to
modern American social scientists (they do not call themselves Orientalists), I draw attention to
the way Middle East experts draw on the vestiges of Orientalism's intellectual position in
the 19th century (p.49). Authority is instrumental; it is persuasive; it is virtually indistin-
guishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true and from traditions, perceptions, and judge-
gments (pp.49-50).

We can use two methodological devices (critical techniques) to study the authority (or the soundness) of the views expressed in these texts (p.50).

**Strategic location**, which is a way of describing the author's position in a text with
regard to the Oriental material he or she writes about, and

Everyone who writes about the Orient must locate himself or herself vis-a-vis the
Orient; translated into the text, this location includes the kind of narrative voice
adopted, the type of structure built, the kinds of images, themes, motifs circulated
in the text: all of which add up to a deliberate way of addressing the reader.

**Strategic formation**, which is a way of analyzing the relationship between texts
and the way in which groups of texts acquire mass, density, and referential power
among themselves and thereafter in the culture at large.

As well, every writer on the Orient assumes some Oriental precedent, some previ-
ous knowledge of the Orient, to which he or she refers and upon which he or she
relies. The ensemble of relationships between works, audiences, and aspects of the
Orient therefore constitutes an analyzable formation.

With regard to cultural discourse, we must remember the following lesson: What is com-
monly circulated by a culture is not "truth" but "representations" (that is, social construc-
tions); language is a highly organized and encoded system, which employs many devices to
express, indicate, and exchange messages and information (p.50).


7. Comments on "Orientalism"

Said is most famous for describing and critiquing "Orientalism", which he perceived
as the inaccuracies that are the foundation of Western thought toward the East. He claims
in his book, a "subtle and persistent Eurocentric prejudice against Arabo-Islamic peoples
and their culture." He argues that a long tradition of false romanticized images of Asia
and the Middle East in Western culture had served as an implicit justification for Europe
and the US's colonial and imperial ambitions. Said asserts that much western study of
Islamic civilization was political intellectualism bent on self affirmation rather than ob-
jective study, a method of discrimination, and a tool of imperialist domination. Orientalism had an impact on the fields of literary theory, cultural studies and human geography, and to lesser extent on those of history and oriental studies. Taking his cue from the work of Jacquest Derrida, and Michel Foucault, and from earlier critics of Western Orientalism such as A.L.Tibawi, Anovar Abdel-Milek, Maxime Robinson, and Richard William Southern, Said argues that Western writings on the Orient, and the perceptions of the East preveyed in them, are suspect and cannot be taken at face value. According to Said, the history of European colonial rule and political domination over the East distorts the writings of even the most knowledgeable, well-meaning and sympathetic western 'Orientalist' (a term that he transformed into a pejorative):

Said argues that the west has stereotyped the east in art and literature, since antiquity such as the composition of The Persians by Aeschylus. Even more so in modern times, Europe has dominated Asia politically so that even the most outwardly objective western texts on the east were permeated with a bias that western scholars could not recognize.

One can quote Southern,

"I doubt if it is outreversial, for example, to say that an Englishman in India or Egypt in the nineteenth century took an interest in those countries which was never far from their status in his mind as British colonies. To say this may seem quite different from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated by, the gross political fact and yet that is what I am saying in this study of Orientalism."

Western scholars appropriated the task of exploration and interpretation of the Orient's languages, history and culture for themselves, with the implication that the East was not capable of composing its own narrative.

"They have written Asia's past and constructed its modern indentities from a perspective that takes Europe as the norm, from which to "exotic", "inscrutable" orient deviates."

Said concludes that Western writings about the Orient depict it as an irrational, weak, feminised "other" contrasted with strong, masculine west, a contrast he suggests derives from the need to create "difference" between West and East that can be attributed to immutable "essence" in the Oriental make-up. After stating the central thesis, Orientalism consists mainly of supporting examples from Western texts.
8. Criticism

*Orientalism* and other works by Said sparked a wide variety of controversy and criticism. [Ernest Gellner argued that Said's contention that the West had dominated the East for more than 2,000 years was unsupportable, noting that until the late 17th century the Ottoman Empire had posed a serious threat to Europe. ] Mark Proudman notes that Said had claimed that the British Empire extended from Egypt to India in the 1880s, when in fact the Ottoman and Persian Empires intervened. Others argued out that even at the height of the imperial era, European power in the East was never absolute, and remained heavily dependent on local collaborators, who were frequently subversive of imperial aims. Another criticism is that the areas of the Middle East on which Said had concentrated, including Palestine and Egypt, were poor examples for his theory, as they came under direct European control only for a relatively short period in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These critics suggested that Said devoted much less attention to more apt examples, including the British Raj in India, and Russia's dominions in Asia, because Said was more interested in making political points about the Middle East.

Strong criticism of Said's critique of *Orientalism* came from academic Orientalists, including some of Eastern backgrounds. Albert Hourani, Robert Graham Irwin, Nikki Keddie, Bernard Lewis, and Kanan Makiya addressed what Keddie retrospectively calls, "some unfortunate consequences" of Said's *Orientalism* on the perception and status of their scholarship. Bernard Lewis in particular was often at odds with Said following the publication of *Orientalism*, in which Said singled out Lewis as a "perfect exemplification" of an "Establishment Orientalist" whose work "purports to be objective liberal scholarship but is in reality very close to being propaganda against his subject material". Lewis answered with several essays in response, and was joined by other scholars, such as Maxime Rodinson, Jacques Berque, Malcolm Kerr, Aijaz Ahmad, and William Montgomery Watt, who also regarded *Orientalism* as a deeply flawed account of Western scholarship.

9. Supporters

Said's supporters argue that such criticisms, even if correct, do not invalidate his basic thesis, which they say still holds true for the 19th and 20th centuries and in particular for general representations of the Orient in Western media, literature and film. His supporters point out that Said himself acknowledges limitations of his study's failing to address German Scholarship and that, in the "Afterword" to the 1995 edition of *Orientalism*,...
he, in their view, convincingly refutes his critics, such as Lewis. *Orientalism* is regarded as central to the postcolonial movement, encouraging scholars "from non-western countries...to take advantage of the mood of political correctness it helped to engender by associating themselves with 'narratives of oppression', creating successful careers out of transmitting, interpreting and debating representations of the non-western 'other'.

Said's importance in the fields of literary criticism and cultural studies is represented by his influence on scholars studying India, such as Gyan Prakash, Nicholas Dirks, and Ronald Inden, and Cambodia, such as Simon Springer, and literary theorists such as Hamid Dabashi, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak. His work continues to be widely discussed in academic seminars, disciplinary conferences, and scholarship.

10. Influence

Both supporters and critics of Edward Said acknowledge the profound, transformative influence that his book *Orientalism* has had across the spectrum of the humanities. But whereas his critics regret his influence as limiting his supporters praise his influence as liberating. Postcolonial theory, of which Said is regarded as a founder and a figure of continual relevance, continues to attract interest and is a thriving field in the humanities.

*Orientalism* continues to profoundly inform the field of Middle Eastern studies. He was a prominent public intellectual in the United States, praised widely as an "intellectual superstar", engaging in music criticism, public lectures, media punditry, contemporary politics, and musical performance. His breadth of influence is regarded as "genuinely global", resting on his unique and innovative blend of cultural criticism, politics, and literary theory.

Milica Bakic-Hayden based her concept of Nesting Orientalisms on the ideas of historian Larry Wolf and Edward Said's Orientalism. Bulgarian historian Maria Todorova introduced another concept, a concept of "nesting balkanisms", which is related to concept of "nesting orientalisms".

11. The Terms

The researcher has found the following terms useful to analyse Churchill’s attitude to India.

* The Orient signifies a system of representations framed by political forces that brought the Orient into Western learning, Western consciousness, and Western empire. The Orient exists for the West, and is constructed by and in relation to the West. It is a mirror image of what is inferior and alien ("Other") to the West.
* **Orientalism** is "a manner of regularized (or Orientalized) writing, vision, and study, dominated by imperatives, perspectives and ideological biases ostensibly suited to the Orient." It is the image of the "Orient" expressed as an entire system of thought and scholarship.

* **The Oriental** is the person represented by such thinking. The man is depicted as feminine, weak, yet strangely dangerous because poses a threat to white, Western women. The woman is both eager to the dominated and strikingly exotic. The Oriental is a single image, a sweeping generalization, a stereotype that crosses countless cultural and national boundaries.

* **Latent Orientalism** is the unconscious, untouchable certainty about what the Orient is. Its basic content is static and unanimous. The Orient is seen as separate, eccentric, backward, silently different, sensual, and passive. It has a tendency towards despotism and away from progress. It displays feminine penetrability and supine malleability. Its progress and value are judged in terms of, and in comparison to, the West, so it is always the Other, the conquerable, and the inferior.

* **Manifest Orientalism** is what is spoken and acted upon. It includes information and changes in knowledge about the Orient as well as policy decisions founded in Orientalist thinking. It is the expression in words and actions of Latent Orientalism.

12. **Earlier Orientalism**

The first 'Orientalists' were 19th century scholars who translated the writings of 'the Orient' into English, based on the assumption that truly effective colonial conquest throughout Said's critique. By knowing the Orient, the West came to own it. The Orient became the studied, the seen, the observed, the object; Orientalist scholars were the students, the seers, the observers, the subject. The Orient was passive; the West was active.


One of the most significant constructions of Orientalist scholars is that of the Orient itself. What is considered the Orient is a vast region, one that spreads across a myriad of cultures and countries. It includes most of Asia as well as the Middle East. The depiction of this single 'Orient' which can be studied as a cohesive whole is one of the most powerful accomplishments of Orientalist scholars. It essentializes an image of a prototypical Oriental - a
biological inferior that is culturally backward, peculiar, and unchanging -- to be depicted in dominating and sexual terms. The discourse and visual imagery of Orientalism is laced with notions of power and superiority, formulated initially to facilitate a colonizing mission on the part of the West and perpetuated through a wide variety of discourses and policies. The language is critical to the construction. The feminine and weak Orient awaits the dominance of the West; it is a defenseless and unintelligent whole that exists for, and in terms of, its Western counterpart. The importance of such a construction is that it creates a single subject matter where none existed, a compilation of previously unspoken notions of the Other. Since the notion of the Orient is created by the Orientalist, it exists solely for him or her. Its identity is defined by the scholar who gives it life.

13. **Said's Project**

Said calls into question the underlying assumptions that form the foundation of Orientalist thinking. A rejection of Orientalism entails a rejection of biological generalizations, cultural constructions, and racial and religious prejudices. It is a rejection of greed as a primary motivating factor in intellectual pursuit. It is an erasure of the line between 'the West' and 'the Other'. Said argues for the use of "narrative" rather than "vision" in interpreting the geographical landscape known as the Orient, meaning that a historian and a scholar would turn not to a panoramic view of half of the globe, but rather to a focussed and complex type of history that allows space for the dynamic variety of human experience. Rejection of Orientalist thinking does not entail a denial of the differences between 'the West' and 'the Orient', but rather an evaluation of such differences in a more critical and objective fashion. 'The Orient' cannot be studied in a non-Orientalist manner; rather, the scholar is obliged to study more focused and smaller culturally consistent regions. The person who has until now been known as 'the Oriental' must be given a voice. Scholarship from afar and second-hand representation must take a back seat to narrative and self-representation on the part of the 'Oriental'.

14. **Literary Criticism**

After expanding on his thesis to produce his first book, *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography* (1966), Said, swirling with a wealth of ideas he received from studying the works of Giambattista Vico and others, presented his award-winning second

Fascinated, like his postmodern influences, with how people perceive things in cultural contexts, and by the effects of society, politics and power on literature, Said is considered a founder of postcolonial criticism. His work on Orientalism is particularly important, but his interpretations of Conrad, Jane Austen, Rudyard Kipling, Yeats, and other writers have also proven influential among critics.

15. **Conclusion**

Orientalism controlled the nature and shape of knowledge, as well as how it was produced and disseminated. This, as Said argued, was not 'disinterested' knowledge, although much of it certainly operated under that guise. By questioning the distinction between 'pure' and 'political' knowledge and deestabilizing the former, Said highlighted the fact that cultural texts play a part in the great game of colony and empire of race and its deployments "so that the last two hundred years of European imperialism had to be understood vis-a-vis the cultural text that laid the ground work far and butterssed the structures of imperialism. Orientalism Spawned an analysis of literary and other texts which foregrounded their imbrication in the social and political worlds of which they were a part.

16. **Further Reading**

In addition to Said's work, the proceedings of two symposia at Essex University in 1982 and 1984, which were later published in the volumes titled *Europe and Its Others*, included the works of Gayatri Chakrovarty Spivan and Homi K Bhabha. The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe's oldest colonies, the source of its civilization, especially language, its cultural contestant, and recurring image of the "other". In addition, the orient had helped define Europe or the West as its controlling image, idea, personality, experience. Orientalism expresses and represents that part culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctorines, even colonial bureaucracies.
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Publisher : Penguin Books, India : 2010
ISBN 9780670083572

Nayantara Sahgal's biography of Nehru is uncritical, yet thought provoking and fresh. Forty six years after Nehru's death, Nehru's niece Nayantara Sahgal, author of several fine
novels has given a fascinating volume, Jawaharlal Nehru: Civilizing a Savage World. There are references to all the principal pillars of Nehru's legacy to India – democratic institution building, staunch pan-Indian secularism, socialist economics at home and a foreign policy of non-alignment. Sahgal writes with undisguised affection and admiration for an uncle she saw as "a special shining being, than whom all men were lesser men" She outlines Nehru's worldview and his internationalist convictions, drawing not only from his correspondence and speeches but also from more personal sources – her own recollections and those of her mother, Vijayalakshami Pandit who served her brother in a number of key diplomatic assignments. There is no pretence of objectivity; Sahgal is uncritical of Nehru, but her writing is too thoughtful and intelligent to be dismissed as mere hagiography. The book offers many delights. There is an evocative description of the family atmosphere at Anand Bhavan, illuminated with extracts from letters exchanged amongst several of the hyper-articulate Nehrus. There are delightful asides, such as Pandit's account of a conversation with the devout US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles:

"He would have had me believe the Lord himself had blessed America's stand... It was tough explaining that my Prime Minister disagreed with the Lord."

There is Nehru worrying in a letter to his sister about his first visit to the US;

"Which facet of myself should I put before the Indian or the Europe?... I am inclined to think that the best preparation for America is not to prepare and to trust to my native wit and mood of the moment... I go there to learn more than to teach."

There are many touching descriptions, for example, the description of Nehru's concern for the living conditions of his domestic staff. Sahgal also appreciates his openness: "What you saw was what he was. What he said was what he meant... Transparency was his public and private style." The book is highly interesting.

To sum up, the book presents an intimate view of the influences encounters and defining historical moments that forged the vision of India's first Prime Minister. Drawing from the Nehru and the Vijayalakshmi Pandit papers and from Nehru's letter to Sahgal – his niece, this book combines history with personal recollections to show how Nehru helped navigate India's transition.
The Times Literary Supplement wrote about this book "to read Mr. Moraes's book is to understand Mr. Nehru better."
The Hindu wrote: "a substantial contribution to the literature on the history of India's freedom and the part played in it by Pandit Nehru." Frank Moraes, was an editor of many prominent newspapers in Post-independence India, including The Indian Express. He praises Nehru as a national leader, as a writer, as a humanist. This work also traces the history of freedom movement in India. The occasional glimpses of the family life of Nehru, given by Moraes, are enlivening. He was the most remarkable statesman, a man who enthralled everyone with his magical personality, a leader who was literally hero-worshipped and an orator of the order. Here, his colourful and complex personality is viewed through Indian eyes - a fact which makes the book all the more interesting.

This is an incisive new biography of Nehru – the great secularist who – alongside his spiritual father Mahatma Gandhi – led the movement for India's independence from British rule and ushered his newly independent country into the modern world. Tharoor has given a riveting account of a great statesman and a unique public intellectual and provides a crisp idea of the principles that governed the life of Nehru. Shashi Tharoor himself in the preface describes his book as a reinterpretation of an extraordinary life and career of this great leader. Tharoor writes with unsparing objectivity, he states:

"The Indian consensus that Jawaharlal Nehru constructed as the nation's first Prime Minister, has frayed: democracy endures, secularism is besieged non-alignment is all but forgotten, and socialism barely clings on. Nehru seems "curiously dated, a relic of another era. His goal of creating "a just state by just means" has been undermined by the centrifugal forces of Indian religious and cultural divisiveness."
Tharoor's book never lacks for pithy phrases and strong opinion. Tharoor admires Nehru as the Thomas Jefferson of India – a foe of colonialism and adds that he was a statesman of grace and style and a master of uplifting words – but whose leadership failed in forcefulness and whose political heir were without his charm. Overall, this engaging short biography is a scrutiny of a major twentieth century leader from his "Little Lord Fauntleroy" beginning to his transformation into a historic figure wearing a halo in his own lifetime.

Tharoor's analysis of the interwining between an individual's biography and the birth of a nation is masterful. The book stays close to its subject – Nehru, but then ventures to link his biography to many Indian Institutions, including seculiarism, democracy, non-alignment. The book also provides various examples of Nehru's courage. According to Tharoor Nehru was a great blend of idealism and "courage to act" on that idealism.

Book : Nehru – A Tryst With Destiny
Author : Stanley Wolpert
Publisher : Oxford University Press, 1996
ISBN-10 0195100735

The book is well-researched insightful and beautifully written. Stanley Wolpert has written a very honest account and has presented Nehru's good and bad sides without adding or taking away anything.

Historian Wolpert relied heavily on published material to print this warts-and-all portraits of India's brilliant and charismatic first Prime Minister. He convincingly goes beneath Nehru's exalted image to reveal some pesky demons. Nehru's power struggle with his father, his differences with Mahatma Gandhi, and his close, enduring ties to his daughter and political heir, Indira, are well delineated. Treatment of the Edwina Mountbatten liaison, however, tantalize rather than satisfies. The book is strongest on the time period 1918 through 1947, when Nehru's frequent imprisonment for political activities gave him ample time to assemble his written legacy to the world. Wolpert's post-independence era are skimpier. He highlights Nehru's foreign and domastic policy failures and suggests that India's George Washington, through egotism, stubbaruness and emotional blindness, made some tragic mistakes for which his country paid dearly. The book is quite informative and analytical.
Book: Jawaharlal Nehru: A Biography. (3 volumes)
Author: Sarvapalli Gopal
Publication: Harvard University Press, 1976
Oxford India
Paperbacks, 2004: Abridged

Gopal's biography remains the most scholarly as well as authorized work to appear on Nehru. The researcher was benefitted by its comprehensiveness as well as close look at how Nehru's mind was shaped by Indian politics, by colonialism, and by his birth within an elite professional class.

Sarvapalli Gopal, Professor of History, Jawaharlal Nehru University and Fellow, St. Antony's College, Oxford, has written truly a great biography. He writes with thoughtfulness. He tells about the joys and pains in Nehru's life in a original fashion. The insightfulness and portrayal of characters are appealing.

Vol.1 covers period from 1889 to 1947. The first volume of this triology on the life of Nehru brings us upto the transfer of power on the night of 14th August 1947 and ends with a quotation from the "Tryst with Destiny" speech. The author also deals extensively with the freedom struggle. Originally published in 1980 by Harvard University, Vol.2 covers the period from 1947-1956 deals with Kashmir and Hyderabad issues, the shaping of foreign policy domastic pressures and twelve other sections are full of first hand information. The third and final volume describes the last eight years of Nehru's life and Prime Ministership.

Nehru's private papers and the author's firsthand knowledge of Nehru form a laudatory account of life, education, personality and political career of India's first Prime Minister. Gopal's biography remains the most scholarly as well as authorized work to appear on Nehru. Its value lies in its comprehensiveness. Gopal stood out among the historians of his generation. Gopal is a fine stylist, and has a sense of humour, too.

Churchill on India
Churchill's biograhers have observed his magnanimity, his pursuit of social justice and Churchill's own statement:

"I hate nobody except Hitler –
and that is professional"
is often quoted. Yet it is unfortunate that Churchill had a blind spot about India. There are several occasions where his bias and negative stand is apparent.

He was never halfhearted in his pursuit of social justice and improvement in the general standard of living "There was", he argued, no virtue at all leveling down, but the miracle of science should be used to provide a bountiful supply of Victorians*¹ and Churchill had the idealism of both the liberals and Victorians. But not for India.

The present study analytically discusses Churchill's attitude towards India. Churchill's mind having racial superiority, the Raj ego, colonialism, and typical imperial effect reflect his bias attitude forming the "power" ego, as against Nehru's ever fresh sensitive and sympathetic view of brotherhood that reminds us of his rich ancient heritage.

As Foucauldin theory*² suggests, it is the narrative that weilds the power of history, and the memoirs are Churchill's narrative, so far Churchill's impression of India is concerned, he is to be held accountable.

*Europe Unite* (1950) is a collection of Churchill's speeches between 1917-1948. The book embodies moving address to the Congress of Europe at the Hague in 1948 and other topics. It contains the escalating violence in Palestine, up and down relations with America and the Soviets, conscription, nationalization, the grim economy and above all Britain's precipitate post war decline.

But nothing more typefies the last than India, for which Churchill has often been excoriated as a die-hard imperialist, determined to preserve the Raj.

In the following pages the researcher has attempted to present factual evidence to diagnose Churchill's attitude.

First and Last Exception
(Churchill's Sympathetic Attitude)
Ramchandra Guha wrote in *The Hindu*:

"Winston Churchill's first and last statements about India were notably sympathetic to nationalist sentiments. But his record in-between was 'truly dreadful'."³

In April 1919, a group of soldiers led by a man named Dyer fired at a crowd of unarmed Indians at the Jallianwala Bagh in Amritsar. Speaking in the House of Commons, Winston Churchill described this as:

"However we may dwell upon the Difficulties of General Dyer during the Amritsar riots, upon the anxious and
critical situation in the Punjab, upon the danger to Europeans throughout that province, ..... one tremendous fact stands out – I mean the slaughter of nearly 400 persons and the wounding of probably three to four times as many, at the Jallan Wallah Bagh on 13th April. This is an episode which appears to be without precedent or parallel in the modern history of the British Empire .... Let me marshal the facts. The crowd was unarmed, except with bludgeons. It was not attacking anybody or anything. It was holding a seditious meeting. When fire had been opened upon it to disperse it, it tried to run away. Pinned up in a narrow place considerably Smaller than Trafalgar Square, with hardly any exists, and packed together so that one bullet would drive through three or four bodies, the people ran madly this way and the other. When the fire was directed upon the centre, they ran to the sides. The fire was then directed to the sides. Many throw themselves down on the ground, and the fire was then directed on the ground. This was continued for 8 to 10 minutes... If the road had not been so narrow, the machine guns and the armoured cars would have joined in. Finally, when the ammunition had reached the point that only enough remained to allow for the safe return of the troops, and after 379 persons had been killed, and when most certainly 1200 or more had been wounded, the troops, at whom not even a stone had been thrown, swung round and marched away ..... we have to make it absolutely clearly .... that this is not the British way of doing business... our reign in India or anywhere else, has never stood on the basis of physical force alone, and it would be fatal to the British Empire, if we were to try to base ourselves only upon it.:*^4

(Speech in the House of Commons, July 8, 1920 "Amritsar" at the time Churchill was serving as Secretary of State for War under Prime Minister David Llyod George.)
He described it strongly: as "a monstrous event", "a great slaughter or massacre upon a particular crowd of people, with the intention of terrorising not merely, the rest of the crowd, but the whole district or country."\(^5\) "This was most likely his first public utterance on Indian affairs. His last such utterances date to the mid 1950s when he and Jawaharlal Nehru were both Prime Ministers of independent nations. Now, Churchill expressed much admiration for Nehru as a man who "conquered two great human infirmities: fear and hate. In one fanciful moment, he even saw his fellow Harovian as the "Light of Asia", who was shaping the destiny of hundreds of millions of Indians and playing an "outstanding part in world affairs"\(^6\). This is first and last expression about India which are compliments but between these two the study focuses on what was said or written by Churchill.

Two Phases

Churchill's tirades against India and its peoples is found in two phases. The first phase ran between 1929 and 1932, when the Gandhian movement for freedom was going strong. The second one in 1940 and after when he wrote reminiscences of his military and unjustly expressed his opinion on Indian army.

Churchill in India

In early October, 1896 he was transferred to Bombay, British India. He was considered one of the best polo players in his regiment and led his team to many prestigious tournament victories.

In 1897, while preparing for a leave in England, he heard that three brigades of the British Army were going to fight against a Pashtun tribe in the North West Frontier of India and he asked his superior officer if he could join the fight. He fought under the command of General Jeffery, who was the commander of the second brigade operating in Malakand, in the Frontier region of British India. Jeffery sent him with fifteen scouts to explore the Mamund Valley; while on reconnaissance, they encountered an enemy tribe, dismounted from their horses and opened fire. After an hour of shooting, their reinforcements, the 35th Sikhs arrived, and the fire gradually ceased and the brigade and the Sikhs marched on. Hundreds of tribesmen then ambushed them and opened fire, forcing them to retreat. As they were retreating four men were carrying an injured officer but the fierceness of the fight forced them to leave him behind. The man who was left behind was slashed to death before Churchill's eyes; afterwards he wrote of the killer, "I forgot everything else at this
moment except a desire to kill this man. However the Sikhs' numbers were being depleted so the next commanding officer told Churchill to get the rest of the men and boys to safety.

Before he left he asked for a note so he would not be charged with desertion. He received the note, quickly signed, and headed up the hill and alerted the other brigade, whereupon they then engaged the army. The fighting in the region dragged on for another two weeks before the dead could be recovered. He wrote in his journal: "Whether it was worth it I cannot tell." An account of the Siege of Malakand was published in December 1900 as *The Story of the Malakand Field Force*. He received 600 Pound for his account.

A year after Indian Independence Churchill's curious complex about India was still highly evident. It was a complex which he developed when stationed in Bangalore, as a subaltern in the Queen's Hussars, from 1896-1899. Throughout his time in India, he had been more concerned with the prestige this position offered (horses and Polo Playing being the outward trapping of health) and the possibility that it would lead to a political career, than what he could learn from India, or the Indian Army, itself. His refusal to learn Hindi, which he believed a quite unnecessary as all natives here speak English perfectly and I cannot see any good in wasting my time acquiring a dialect which I shall never use. This shows that he could not enter very fully into the thoughts and feelings of the Indian troops which he encountered. But this does not stop Churchill from presuming that "there was no doubt they liked having a white officer among them. Men fighting --- they watched him carefully to see how things were going, if you grinned, they grinned. So I grinned". As year after he had arrived in India, Churchill was warned about catching Indian fever as it was very difficult to get rid of. The fear never left him, Churchill never recovered and India would always be his 'blind spot'. When it came to writing his memoirs, Churchill's almost obsessive sentiment about India often affected his opinion on the Indian Army too.

About India he was obliged to give way by the sheer strength of the opposition. Churchill was in opposition to the Government of India Bill in the 1930s when he did his utmost to destroy Mr.Baldwin's liberal move in the direction of giving India increased self government. Clearly, Churchill had a blind spot about India.

In conversation to Leo Amery, Secretary of State for India, the following quotation is widely cited as written in "a letter to Leo Amery":

"I hate Indians. They are a beastly people with a beastly religion."
Phase I

The Emperial Churchill Against India's Independence

In 1930, the Labour Party began negotiation with India for Home Rule. When the Conservatives supported Labour. On this issue, Churchill resigned from the Shadow Cabinet of Stanley Baldwin because this decision was not compatible with his concept of the British Empire. In his attack on the Labour Position in India, Churchill was the leader of malcontents in the Conservative Party. His role with the group, while it kept his name in the paper through the 1930s hurt his influence in the party, and the nation.

In 1933, Churchill finally lost in his bid to lead the Conservatives against the India bill, and this defeat was the subject of an editorial in The New York Times contrasting Churchill's duplicity with Baldwin's steadfastness.

In October 1929, when the Viceroy (Lord Irwin) suggested Dominion Status for India, Churchill called the idea –

"not only fantastic but criminally mischievous in its effects".*11

As an ambitious politician currently out of power, Churchill thought it necessary to marshal "the sober and resolute forces of the British Empire" against the granting of self-government to India. Over the next two years, Churchill delivered dozens of speeches where he worked up, in most unsober form, the forces hostile to the winning of political independence by people with brown (or black) skins. As the historian Sarvapalli Gopal writes, in these speeches Churchill "stressed not only the glory but also the necessity of empire". The glory was to India, as in his view, without the Raj there would be little peace and less prosperity. And the necessity was to England, for if the Raj ended, then "that spells the doom of Lancashire". Churchill seriously feared an economic recession if access to Indian markets and goods was denied.

Speaking at the Albert Hall in 1931, he claimed that "to abandon India to the rule of the brahmins (who in his view dominated the congress party) would be an act of Cruel and wicked negligence". If the British left, "India will fall back quite rapidly through the centuries into the barbarism and privations of the Middle Ages".*12

Staneley Baldwin became Prime Minister again in 1935. Churchill did not seek nor received a Cabinet Post or Ministry in Baldwin's government. The state of the British Empire now dominated House of Commons debate and the press headlines. The "Crown jewel" of the Empire was India. Baldwin and his Viceroy in India, Lord Halifax, had worked out a
settlement to give India its political freedom, in response to mounting protests and riots led by Nehru and Gandhi.

From the back benches, Churchill roared his opposition. India, he said: "India was not a political but geographical term". There were "fifty different Indias" and only Britain could hold the balance between them. He predicted that as many as a million people might be killed in religious conflict between the Hindus and Moslems. In his attack against the government bill, Churchill charged:

"Democracy is the argument the government uses, but aristocracy would be the result – and India run by Brahmin born elites like Nehru & Gandhi, whose caste treatment of the 'untouchables' the lower classes, is brutal in their harshness".

But there was more to Churchill's opposition than concern for "the untouchables". In Churchill's mind, losing India was the first step in dismantling the Empire. Britain without an empire to Churchill, was like Samson shorn of his locks; The Empire was the source of Britain's strength as a world power. With hindsight, Churchill's prewar opposition to Indian independence can be characterised as reactionary. In fairness, though, he truly believed that a people with no tradition or history of civil liberties would experience corruption and strife if exposed to democracy prematurely.

**Churchill's View on Gandhi**

Churchill opposed Mohandas Gandhji's peaceful disobedience revolt and the Indian Independence movement in the 1930s, arguing that the Round Table Conference "was a frightful prospect". Later reports indicate that Churchill favoured letting Gandhi die if he went on a hunger strike. During the first half of the 1930s, Churchill was outspoken in his opposition to granting Dominion status to India. He was a founder of the India Defence League, a group dedicated to the preservation of British power in India. Churchill brooked no moderation. "The truth is", he declared in 1930, "that Gandhi-ism and everything it stands for will have to be grappled with and crushed." In his speeches and press articles in this period he forecast widespread unemployment in Britain and civil strife in India should independence be granted. The Viceroy Lord Irwin, who had been appointed by the prior Conservative Government, engaged in the Round Table Conference in early 1931 and then announced the Government's policy that India should be granted Dominion Status. In this the Government was supported by the Liberal Party and, officially at least, by the Conservative Party. Churchill denounced the Round Table Conference.
At a meeting of the West Essex Conservative Association specially convened so Churchill could explain his position he said, "It is alarming and also nauseating to see Mr. Gandhi, a seditious Middle Temple lawyer, now posing as a fakir of a type well-known in the East, striding half-naked up the steps of the Vice-regal palace...to parley on equal terms with the representative of the King-Emperor." He called the Indian National Congress leaders "Brahmins who mouth and patter principles of Western political system." He used to say "that old humbug Gandhi and his hunger strike." Indeed, his prediction of violent religious conflict came true after a Labour government finally granted India its freedom in 1947. "In time, of course, India proved Churchill wrong; although cultural and religious unrest continues, the country remains the world's largest democracy. But in 1935 Churchill's fervent opposition won the day. The government bill to grant India autonomy was defeated."

Churchill permanently broke with Stanley Baldwin over Indian independence and never again held any office while Baldwin was prime minister. Some historians see his basic attitude to India as being set out in his book My Early Life (1930). Another source of controversy about Churchill's attitude towards Indian affairs arises over what some historians term the Indian 'nationalist approach' to the Bengal famine of 1943, which has sought to place significant blame on Churchill's wartime government for the excessive mortality of up to three million people. While some commentators point to the disruption of the traditional marketing system and maladministration at the provincial level. Arthur Herman, author of Churchill and Gandhi, contends, "The real cause was the fall of Burma to the Japanese, which cut off India's main supply of rice imports when domestic sources fell short ... [though] it is true that Churchill opposed diverting food supplies and transports from other theatres to India to cover the shortfall; this was wartime." In response to an urgent request by the Secretary of State for India, Leo Amery, and Viceroy of India, Wavell, to release food stocks for India, Churchill responded with a telegram to Wavell asking, if food was so scarce, "why Gandhi hadn't died yet." In July 1940, newly in office, he welcomed reports of the emerging conflict between the Muslim League and the Indian Congress, hoping "it would be bitter and bloody."

It seems that the passion which ruled Churchill's mind was colonizer's superiority and racism. Guha notes, "through the late 1930s, Churchill thought and spoke little about India. But then in 1940 he became Prime Minister and had to confront the question as to what would happen to Indians after the Allies had won a war ostensibly fought to preserve
freedom. As the diaries of his Secretary of State for India, Leo Amery, makes clear, Churchill was implacably opposed to all proposals for Indian self-rule.

In 1944, Amery wrote that "I am by no means sure whether on this subject of India, he (Churchill) is really quite sane ..."**20**

Guha appends the comment of Lord Wavell, who as Viceroy of India between 1943 and 1945, concluded in his diary, that the British Prime Minister (Churchill) "has a curious complex about India and is always loth to hear good of it and apt to believe the worst."**21**

Phase II
Indian Army Portrayal by Churchill
(Churchill on India)

It is old adage that history is always about power. But, as, Alun Mauslow, writes, if the 'past exists for us only as it is written up by historians' what then happens if that historian is less than scrupulous?**22** The same applies to Winston Churchill's portrayal of the Indian Army's contribution to the Second World War as found in his six volume opus The Second World War. This chapter will offer reasons as to why Churchill almost totally ignored the Indian Army; reasons that go beyond the overly simple explantion of Churchill's inherent racism. (Unless otherwise stated the term Indian Army is used in this chapter to refer to Indian Army Units which were part of the British & Commonwealth force). It seems the advent of Indian independence was so painful an experience for Churchill that it tainted his portrayal of the Indian Army when the time came to compose his historical narrative. The present study examines to what extent, his narrative influence subsequent official histories and why did Churchill pay such little attention to the history of the Indian Army's achievement in the Second World War.

Although aptly described by A.J.Balfour "Churchill's autobiography disguised as world history"*, Churchill learnt how history could be manipulated and serve as a platform for both self-vindication and self-justification*. Having secured imperical Britain's discomfiting retreat from India, Mountbatten returned to England in 1948. Attending a party thrown by Anthony Eden in his honour, he encountered Churchill, Churchill approached him, pointed to him and declared: "What you did in India was like whipping your riding crop across my face!"*25*

A year after Indian independence Churchill's curious complex about India was still highly evident*. It was a complex which he had developed when stationed in Banglore, as
a subaltern in the Queen's Hussars, from 1896-1899. Churchill probably spent a total of twelve months in India as his four year posting was interpersed with various sorties as a war correspondent in the Sudan and then South Africa and with several trips back to London. As it has been noted earlier, throughout his time in India, he had been more concerned with the prestige this position offered (horses and polo playing were his favourite activities), and the possibility that it would lead to a political career, than what he could learn about India, or the Indian Army, itself. He refused to learn Hindi, which he believed it "quite unnecessary as all natives here speak English perfectly and I cannot see any good in wasting my time acquiring a dialect which I shall never use." This means he was not in a mood to familiarise fully into the 'thoughts and feelings' of the Indian troops which he encountered. But this did not stop Churchill from presuming that. "there was no doubt they liked having a white officer among them when fighting ... they watched him carefully to see how things were going, if you grinned, they grinned. So I grinned industriously". A year after he had arrived in India, Churchill was warned about catching Indian fever as it was 'very difficult to get rid of'. When it came to writing his memories, Churchill's almost obsessive sentiments about India often affected his opinion on the Indian Army, and vice versa.

Ancestral Prejudice :

Churchill briefly acknowledged the presence of the Indian Army in the trenches of Northern France, during the First World War, when he wrote that, "the steadfast Indian Corps in the cruel winter of 1914 held the line by Armentieres." In reality, Indian troops had served with distinction in the trenches of Northern France as well as Mesopotamia and each of the major theatres of the First World War. Churchill's low opinion of the Indian troops had been reinforced by his parents who, in turn, had been influenced by their elders who had experienced the Mutiny of 1857. His own experiences in India had done little to reverse this, and the Singapore Mutiny of 1915 did nothing to dispel Churchill's already low opinion of the Indian Army. Yet he never looked at the reverse; that the overwhelming majority of the 80,000 Indian Soldiers who saw action in France, Mesopotamia, Palestine or Africa had fought valiantly alongside their British Officers and counterparts and had remained loyal to the King. It seems his imperial feeling was stronger than his sense of historical fact.

It seems Churchill is led away by racism.
Racism & Churchill

Oxford Dictionary defines racism as 'prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism directed against someone of a different race based on the belief that one’s own race is superior.

Churchill seems to believe that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that racial differences produce an inherent superiority. As Hitler’s declaration of his belief in a "master race" was an indication of the inherent racism of the Nazi so also Churchill believed that there is a casual link between inherited physical traits and traits of personality, intellect, morality and other cultural behavioural features and that the British are innately superior to natives (Indians).

It is clear that Racism was at his heart when he reviewed Indian Sepoys. In fact, the idea of RACE was inverted to magnify the differences between people of European Origin and those of Asians. By viewing Asians as lesser human beings, the English justified colonial rule and Churchill wanted to maintain this system of exploration while at the same time portraying the British Empire as a bastion and champion of human freedom.

The next mention Churchill made of the Indian Army is telling. As he reminisced about his return to the Admiralty in 1939, Churchill included a copy of a memo he submitted to Prime Minister Chamberlain in which he recommended that the "only way in which our force in France can be rapidly expanded is by bringing the professional troops from India, and using them as the Cadre upon which the Territorials and conscripts will form"*36. What Churchill alluded to, was that the British Officers of the Indian Army and not the Indian Officers were the professional soldiers. In one sentence he had cast aspersions about the nature, ability and professionalism of the small numbers of Indian officers that existed, let alone Indian soldiers. Further, Churchill writes that ‘in principle, 60,000 Territorials should be sent to India to maintain internal security and complete their training.’*37 This means in Churchill's opinion India was good enough to be a training ground for troops from Britain, yet Indian troops themselves were only capable of maintaining internal security. This point clearly illustrate how Churchill only referred to the Indian Army, and to the Indian troops themselves, when and if it served his own purpose. He tenaciously refused to alter his late nineteenth century view of the Indian Army during the war, but by including it in his memoirs it proved that it was a view he maintained long after the fact.

In fact Churchill’s opinion of India influenced his opinion of the Indian Army and his opinion had neither softened nor moderated ever.
Throughout the first two volumes of his memoirs, Churchill intimated that Indian troops, like their 'native' African counterparts, were not to be trusted, ill-disciplined, inefficient and not as professional as their British counterparts. Churchill discarded the status of Indian troops to no more than relief soldiers when he wrote that 'a ceaseless stream of Indian units' should be sent to Palestine and Egypt because 'India is doing nothing worth speaking of at the present time. Churchill viewed them as inferior to both the Australian and New Zealand soldiers who he thought were, in turn, below the standard of the British troops. He also wrote that 'native' troops were to be mixed together so that 'one lot can be used to keep the other in discipline'*.38

Churchill's depiction of the Indian troops varied to meet the needs of his narrative. Of course, General Archibald Wavell did not share Churchill's views on Indian troops. In November 1942, Wavell encouraged Churchill to consider 'sending a special message to armed forces in India command' as this token of his appreciation would 'greatly hearten them'. The belief in the superiority of the British soldiers over the Indian soldiers proved itself to be outmoded and mistaken: "gone were the days when it had been supposed that the example of British troops was needed to fire Indians to valour"*.39

In short, when it came to composing his memoirs, Churchill was still overly emotional when it came to the subject of India*.40 It was proved at the time of Quit India movement, and the horror of the devastating Bengal famine from 1943 onwards.

It was in the fourth volume of memoirs that Churchill made the noticeable distinction between the British and the Indian Army Unit. Until then, Churchill had described the Indian Army as the 'British Indian Army'. Using what Raymond Callahan described as a 'clumsy locution.' Churchill's use of the term 'British-Indian Army' spoke volumes about what he thought of the Indian Army (even if his writing did not)*41. For Churchill, the Indian Army was essentially British, albeit including Indian soldiers. This was, perhaps, general perception of the British Army Officers about Indian Army.

Churchill had been humiliated by the relative ease with which Japanese troops had invaded and occupied Burma. But even more humiliating for Churchill was the fact that victory over the Japanese was won by the Indian Army, an army that Churchill had always regarded as inept, disloyal and nothing more than an armed Frankenstein's monster*.42 Churchill was reinforcing his notion that all the Indian Army needed was 'a white officer among them when fighting'*.43
Again, as work on the fifth volume of his memoirs progressed, he wrote a note which stated that he would not spare more than 3,000 words... on the struggle in Burma.*44 This self-imposed word limit enabled Churchill to gloss over the significant contribution made by the Indian Army to the war in Burma. The brief chapter in which Churchill portrayed the campaigns for the reconquest of Burma, 'Burma and Beyond', is located towards the end of the fifth volume, 'Closing the Ring'. At this stage of the reconquest of Burma, March to May 1944, some of the fiercest battles against the Japanese were being fought. The aim of the Japanese offensive, U GO was to destroy the British and Indian forces around Kohima and Imphal, advance up the Dimapur pass, and forge ahead across to India. Churchill allocated less than two pages to his descriptions of the battles for Imphal and Kohima. He mentioned the 5th and 7th Indian Divisions and how they were flown into Imphal and Dimapur respectively.

Churchill also mistook, according to the Burma Star Association's battle histories, the units of the 2nd Indian Division for units of the 2nd British Division.*45 The Eighth Army received several mentions, as did Alexander, Wavell and the American troops. But no mention was made of the Armies fighting in Burma, let alone specific mentions of Indian or African troops. Churchill maintained this silence in his memoirs.*46 It may be surmised that Churchill did not include the troops in Burma because they were a constant source of humiliation for him. After all, they had, to use Slim's phrase, turned defeat into victory with very little help compared to the other theatres of war and, above all, it had been the Indian Army which had been in the majority.

To include them by name, to remember the forgotten, would mean Churchill would have had to revise his opinion of Indian troops. In fact, any post war discussion of Burma would not only include the virtues of the Indian Army, virtues which Churchill could not accept, but also it would reveal how Burma had been the 'tale of the rejection of one strategic plan after another's due to the divergent and opposed American and British purposes.*47 Prasad succiently encapsulated the American and British perspectives on Burma:

"One seeking to utilise India for the object of keeping China in the war and hitting Japan directly therefrom, the other keen to get back their old empire in South-East Asia."*48

When the pivotal contribution that the Indian Army had made resurfaced in the chronology of his tale, it became one more issue that Churchill gladly glossed over. No doubt the advent of Indian, as well as Burmese, independence contributed to Churchill's
childish shuffling of the Indian Army's achievements, but Burma had exposed a mass of raw nerves for Churchill. The Indian Army had proved itself to be a formidable lighting unit. An army which quickly adapted to unfamiliar terrain and an army that learnt from its mistakes and became adept at improvisation. Whilst Churchill's ignominious dismissal of the Indian Army, and especially their role in the reconquest of Burma, was blatant throughout his memoires. It may not be wholly fair to blame subsequent official histories for a similar lapse.

**Quasi-Historian**: It is not enough to cite his dismissal by way of his imperialistic, racial assumptions. After all, he changed his mind regarding the Japanese soldier, from non-threatening throughout 1939 and 1940 to a vicious, brutal and dedicated professional soldier by 1943, yet he did not change his mind regarding the Indian soldier.

It seems compiling and editing his memoires was a world in which he wanted to remain at centre stage. As the 1950s dawned, his reputation and status was enhanced by his portrayal of his history of the Second World War. Churchill once said to a young research assistant of his,

"give me the facts .... and I will twist them
the way I want to suit my argument"*49

This illustrates the little respect he thought history as a discipline was due. One can say that Churchill's narrative of the contribution made by the Indian Army to the Allied victory of the Second World War is not going to be an example of responsible history. We can have the factual, accurate record in *The Tiger Strikes. The Story of Indian Troops in North Africa And East Africa*. The Indian Tiger had struck, it had killed, and it had triumphed.*50 The wartime history was there for Churchill to include, and expand upon. For various reasons, he chose not to. The reason being long history of colonization. The following pages will examine how Churchill's attitude was formed as natural off shoot of colonialism.
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