Chapter-I

INTRODUCTION

General Survey of Historical Novel

English literature goes back some thirteen hundred years. It has preserved how people have seen the world and a record with a talent for story telling, dramatic representation and verse making. Today in the twenty-first century, the answers to the big questions about life and living and perhaps some thoughts of relevance in the writings of the past can be found (www.uni-bielefeld.de).

Ruth Fleischmann in A Survey of English Literature in its Historical Context, illustrates that:

There is a good deal of religious verse: the monks used the popular pagan genre to instruct and win converts. Listeners used to Beowulfian monsters and horror landscapes must have admired one re-telling of the story from Genesis about the fall of Lucifer and creation of hell. There are poems on the heroic exploits of the saints, and an account of Judith’s killing of the tyrant Holofernies presenting her like a Celtic warrior queen. Quite different is The Dream of the Rood in which the cross on which Christ was crucified tells the poet of its terrible duty (p. 9).

Writing is a process of constructing identity through language. The discursive resources for identity formation are cultural in character. For social or political identity, historisisation of the past is essential. Narrative space enacts its role in relation to time. As Jerome De Groot, in The Historical Novel brings closer in understanding the specifics of the historical fiction stating that “An early example of historical prose fiction is Luo Guanzhong’s 14th century. Romance of the Three Kingdoms, which covers one of the most important periods of Chinese history and left a lasting impact on Chinese culture”
Narratives, literary or historical, are fictional in representing objective reality. George Lukas, in his *The Historical Novel*, argues that

Scott is the first fiction writer who saw history not just as a convenient frame in which to stage a contemporary narrative, but rather as a distinct social and cultural setting. His novels of Scottish history such as *Waverley* (1814) and *Rob Roy* (1817) focus upon a middling character who sits at the intersection of various social groups in order to explore the development of society through conflict (p. 35).

Lukas continues:

His *Ivanhoe* (1820) gains credit for renewing interest in the Middle Ages. Victor Hugo’s *The Hunchback of Notre Dame* (1831) furnishes another 19th century example of the romantic-historical novel as does Leo Tolstoy’s *War and Peace*. In the United States, *James Fenimore Cooper* was a prominent author of historical novels (p. 95).

Geetha Ganapathy, in her scholarly work, *The Post-colonial Indian Novel in English* mentions:

History of literature always offers us examples of creative writers who have been critics. African critics would propose the Nigerian Chinua Achebe’s *Things Fall Apart* published ten years later for the title of the inaugural work of literary post-colonialism. This multiple and shared origin with reference to the British Empire signifies that post-colonialism is a trend that traverses literature at different moments (p. 13).

The Civil Disobedience Movement launched by Gandhi in 1930 sets the tone of Indian writing about England and Englishness. M.K. Naik and many other historians regard the 1930s as the period of the flowering of the Indian English novel—a reflection of “the epoch-making developments in Indian life” and the “miracle that was Gandhi” (Naik, *History of Indian Literature*, p.118). In both fictional and non-fictional prose, the critical re-assessment and evaluation of the contemporary Indian situation and Western historical record could be effectively offered.
Historical Novel in Indian Writing in English

The Indian novel in English has had an amazing success in the Western world. The increased visibility of the Indian writer in English has led to a slew of articles and books on the subject. Most books choose a critical angle, a particular aspect through which to read a set of novels. One of the most common subjects has been the examination of the rise of nationalism and the independence movement as depicted in the Indian novel.

D. Ashok in his research paper *The Post-colonial Perspectives in Indian English Novels* supplements that

The outcry of east-west encounter becomes prominent in fiction. Sehgal’s *Into Another Dawn*, Bhattacharya’s *Music For Mohini*, Rajan’s *Too Long in the West*, Jhabvala’s *The Nature of Passion* portray the same theme. The socio-political problems of India are also pictured in Bhattacharya’s *So Many Hunger*, Sehgal’s *Storm in Chandigarh*, etc. The contemporary Indian reality takes its significant mode in the writing of the golden trio, Mulk Raj Anand, R.K. Narayan and Raja Rao. Anand’s *Untouchable*, Rao’s *Kanthapura* and Narayan’s *The Guide* reveal the better stand depicting such reality. Narayan is regarded as the father figure in post-colonial Indian English fiction. Ancient Myth, fables and rituals deal with the relevance for the contemporary reality. The recreation of events and situations are rightly reflected in the different fictions. Khushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan*, Rajan’s *The Dark Dancer*, Malgonkar’s *The Distant Dream*, Chaman Nahal’s *Azadi* and Attiah Hussain’s *Sunlight on a Broken Window*, etc., offer a sense of nostalgia sustaining the event of partition of India. The post-colonial Indian English fiction upholds the Indian spirit at large. Some women novelists like Kamala Markandaya, Ruth Prawar, Anita Desai, Santha Rama Rao, Attiah Hussain including Nayantara Sehgal contribute to post-colonial fiction in a blooming mode (p. 5).

Indian English Literature occupies great significance in the world literature. It has won for itself an international acclaim. A number of Indian writers in English have contributed substantially to Modern English literature.
M.K. Naik in *Dimensions of Indian English Literature* remarks “... one of the most notable gifts of English education to India is prose fiction for though India was probably a fountain head of story-telling, the novel as we know today was an importation from the West” (p. 99). It is essential to capture the spirit of the past and turn it into living documents on the part of the author. Leo Tolstoy in *War and Peace* believes:

As long as histories are written of individuals only of Caesars, Alexanders, Luthers, Voltaire and so forth who have taken part in given events, and not histories of all persons without exceptions who have participated in them, no description of the movements of humanity will be possible without the conception of some such force as compels men to direct their activities to a common end (p. 434).

In order to recreate particular historical events the author attempts to deduce some truth. Such creation attempts the possibilities of understanding.

For a better understanding of the process of the British occupation of India a brief history of the East India Company’s encounter both with European rival powers as well as with the Indian regional powers is essential. As Ram Chandra Pradhan observes in *Raj to Swaraj*, on colonialism and nationalism in India.

The East India Company was set up by a Charter with a privilege to carry on trade in the area east of the Cape of Good Hope. It was a shareholders company to be governed by 20 elected members who constituted its Court. In the initial years, it concentrated on its trade with the Spice Islands. But very soon, it came to discover that some products, primarily textiles, could be used as barter for the South-East Asian spices-making its entire business exceptionally profitable (p. 9).

The Portuguese were the first European power to enter into the arena of Indian trade after the opening of the Atlantic route. In 1498, after discovering a new sea route through the Atlantic to India Vasco da Gama of Portugal had reached Calicut. In the West, Indian trade was dominated by the Arabs on an account of their control over the Mediterranean Sea route as well as the land route. The Portuguese dominated the Indian
trade throughout the sixteenth century, as they were the first to open factories in India. In the middle of the seventeenth century the Dutch opened a number of factories in India. The third power that competed with the British was France. The British succeeded in eliminating all the three major European rivals from India which left a free field for them.

The British colonial rule spread its network of political and economic tentacles throughout the length and breadth of India. The cup of India’s misery was full by the time Oudh (Awadh state), a princely state in the Awadh region during the British Raj was annexed in 1856. The East India Company on one pretext or the other had already swallowed smaller states. Peasants, craftsmen, landlords, sepoys, princes and nawabs were disgruntled by the autocratic behaviour of the company’s officials. R.C. Majumdar points out in *British Paramountacy and Indian Renaissance* on ‘The History and culture of the Indian people’, “All classes of people in India were thoroughly discontented and disaffected against the British. The events of 1857 were neither unforeseen nor unpremeditated. The character of British rule made it inevitable” (p. 477). According to the historian Bipin Chandra in *Nationalism and Colonialism*, “the early nationalists were to help the process of unifying. The Indian people into nation and to introduce modern politics based on the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people and the notion that politics is not the preserve of the ruling class only” (p. 127).

The product of a new educational system based on English medium instruction developed a pan-India character, which enabled them to formulate and articulate the new themes of discourses at an all-India level. All this provided them with a new opportunity to plan an all-India organisation with more pronounced political and economic programmes.
The deteriorating economic condition of people which had assumed gigantic form in the last quarter of the nineteenth century created a psychological base for the emergence of the Indian nationalism. Government of India Act 1935 was passed which contemplated India as a federation of British Indian provinces and the Indian states, and though it was opposed at the Congress session held at Faizpur in 1936, elections were held and the Congress won with thumping majority. Consequently, in July Congress Ministries were formed in Madras, Central Provinces, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and North-West Frontier Province (N.W.F.P.). They continued working till October 1937.

The Congress working committee met at Wardha and adopted ‘Quit India’ resolution on 6 July, 1942. Gandhiji in the journal ‘Harijan’ interpreted it as ‘open rebellion’. On 9th August, all-important leaders were arrested. Gandhi gave his last message to the nation ‘We get our freedom or die’. News clipping reporting the Madras Resolution states that:

The Congress leadership had tried to exploit the difficulties of the British to wrest power for itself but it had refused to acknowledge the demands made by the Muslim League. A section of the Congress realising the causes of their failure to compel the British and realising the danger to India’s defence from the advance of Japanese armies, decided to reconsider the question of Pakistan with an intention to arrive at a settlement with the Muslim League without which there could be no political advance in India. Rajagopalachari, an elderly statesman, accepted in principle the Muslim League demand for Pakistan and passed, Madras Resolution, calling upon the Congress High Command to negotiate with the Muslim League on the question of Pakistan with the object of establishing a national government in India to organise the defence of India (The Glasgow Herald, Tuesday, April 28, 1942).

Towards the end of April 1942, in a meeting of the All India Congress held in Allahabad, the Madras Resolution was rejected and the Congress leaders made angry and fiery speeches against Jinnah and his concept of Pakistan. The Hindu Press took the cue from
the All India Congress Committee and launched a virulent hate campaign against Jinnah and the Muslim League, holding Jinnah responsible for blocking the path to India’s freedom and meanest of all, accusing him of playing the British game. “The Congress decided to launch its final assault on British imperialism in the movement that came to be known as the ‘Quit India’ movement. Gandhi called upon the people to take initiative and ‘to do or die’ in a last struggle for freedom, throwing off the initial pretences of non-violence. He did not consult the Muslim League or any other party and went ahead with his plans in the hope that the momentum of the mass movement would take violent forms and would involve all parties and sections of the people of India” (m-a-jinnah.blogspot.com).

The Government swooped down upon the leadership and locked up them all in jail, including Gandhi. There was turmoil in parts of India for about three months. The rail communications were damaged, police stations were attacked, sacked and burnt, and the Congress Socialist Party and other terrorists got busy doing everything they could do to paralyse the war effort, destroy the agencies of the Government and spread anarchy. After a short span, the Government was able to suppress the movement.

To the Congress slogan of ‘Quit India’, the Quaid’s answer was ‘Divide and Quit’. When the Muslim League Working Committee met in Bombay on 16 August, 1942, there were many who wanted the League to plunge blindly into the struggle, while others went to the extreme of giving full and unconditional support to the British and crushing the Congress. The Quaid wisely advocated a middle course avoiding both the Congress and the British traps and concentrated more on building up the Muslim League organisation and removing some of its inherent weaknesses.
Jinnah received several threats of murder in June and July 1943 from the Khaksars. The threat to Jinnah’s life almost materialised on the afternoon of 26 July 1943. A Khaksar named Rafiq Sabir Maznavi walked up to the Quaid’s residence and attacked him with a large knife. Jinnah defended himself by catching hold of the assailant’s hand. This softened the blow and Jinnah escaped with no more than a wound on his chin and some cuts on his hand.

In the autumn and winter of 1942-43, Bengal suffered a dreadful famine. The official estimate was that one and a half million died of starvation or by its after-effects. No one knows how many starved to death or died of disease during these months of horror. “The shortage of the rice crop would have been overcome by purchases from Burma or Thailand, but these sources were under Japanese control at that time. The provincial government was inefficient and imprudent and allowed the situation to get out of hand, while the central government under Linlithgow did not assert itself effectively. It was not until Wavell took over as Viceroy on 20th October 1943 and took a vigorous interest in the tragedy that anything worthwhile was done to alleviate the suffering” (www.quaid.gov.pk).

Serious riots erupted all over India resulting in much loss of life and property. Tarachand in *History of Freedom Movement* observes “. . . to its (Government’s) surprise, the movement of 1942 had nothing in common with the previous Civil Disobedience campaign. So in great alarm it just struck widely almost panic stricken” (p.520).

The Quit India movement dispelled the British illusion that their Empire was morally justified and that majority of the Indians were loyal and desired continuation of
their rule. Many Indian businessmen were profiting from heavy wartime spending and did not support to Quit India. Many students paid more attention to Subhas Chandra Bose, who was in exile and supporting the axis. The only outside support came from the Americans, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt pressured Prime Minister Winston Churchill to give in to Indian demands.

Sitaramayya in his historical writing, *The History of Indian National Congress*, illustrated that:

By 1943 Jinnah was almost a dictator, the masses followed him, the educated class, especially the students, adored him, the propertied class supported him and the men of power were afraid of him. On the other hand, the Government was all out to belittle the Congress and defame the Mahatma. Even the Labour leader Atlee told the House of Commons “I object to the dictatorship of a reputed saint quite as much as the dictatorship of a notorious sinner” (p. 498).

Even the best of Muslims could say that Jinnah did not mean it and was using it only as a bargaining weapon. Maulana Azad was deadly against it. H.V. Hadson cited in his *The Great Divide*, a major contribution to contemporary history Jinnah rejected C. Rajagopalachari’s formula to solve the political deadlock between the All India Muslim League and Indian National Congress. On independence of India from the British saying that it offered “A shadow, a husk and a maimed, mutilated and a moth-eaten Pakistan” (p.113). He refused to see any reason in the arguments of the Mahatma and obstinately stuck to his demand without knowing its full implication. In January 1946, the Simla Conference called by Lord Wavell who intended to set up an Executive Council of political leaders failed on the question of communal representation.

The League block had entered the Government with the avowed object of holding the Congress in check, lest anything should be done which might prejudice the settlement
of the long-term issues. Nehru accused the League for taking help from the British Government and opposing the national struggle, and the British trying to make League into the King’s party. After the Second World War, it became essential for the weakening British imperialism, for its economic requirements and for its strategic plans.

Atlee announced the Cabinet Mission on 23 March, 1946, which stirred the Muslim League to start Propaganda for Pakistan with fresh zeal as could be seen from the fire spitting speeches of Jinnah and Firoz Khan Noon.

S. Gurubachan Singh Talib in *Muslim League Attack on Sikhs and Hindus in Punjab* cited

Jinnah at a convention of Muslim Legislators set the tone “. . . There can be no compromise on the issue of Pakistan as a totally sovereign state . . . we will fight for it, and if necessary die for it, but take we must or we perish” (p. 34).

Feroz Khan Noon incited,

“. . . If the British force on us an Akland (United) Government the destruction and havoc which Muslims will cause will put to shame the needs of Halaku Chengiz Khan” (p. 34).

The Mission arrived in India on 5th June. Despite dissension’s the Congress and the League accepted the Cabinet Mission proposals conditioned by their own interpretations of the Congress made certain unfortunate observations which made the League withdraw its acceptance on 27 July, 1946, and August 16, 1946, was declared as ‘Direct Action Day’. A new slogan got currency ‘Lar Ke Lenge Pakistan’ which resulted in the infamous Calcutta killing.

Accepting the Cabinet Mission plan The Congress Working Committee’s resolution was submitted for ratification to the All India Congress Committee, which met in Bombay on 6th July 1946. The leaders of the Socialist Party expressed a strong
opposition, but the influence of Gandhiji and of the working Committee prevailed. It was ratified. Nehru took over the Congress presidency, at this session, to which he had been elected, from Azad. V.P. Menon in *The Transfer of Power in India* cited Nehru’s conference:

... as far as he could see, it was not a question of the Congress accepting any plan, long or short. It was merely a question of their agreeing to enter the Constituent Assembly and nothing more than that. They would remain in that Assembly so long as they thought it was injuring their case. ‘We are not bound by a single thing except that we have decided for the moment to go to the constitutional Assembly’ (p. 280).

Menon continues with regard to the question of grouping, Nehru said:

The big probability is, from any approach to the question, there will be no grouping. Obviously, section A will decide against grouping. Speaking in betting language, there is a four to one chance of the North-West Frontier Province deciding against grouping. Then group-B collapses. It is highly likely that Bengal and Assam will decide against grouping, although I would not like to say with every assurance and conviction that there is going to be finally no grouping there, because Assam will not tolerate it under any circumstances whatever. Thus you see this grouping business, approached from any point of view, does not get us on at all (p. 281).

Defence and Communications embraced a large number of industries by dealing with the powers of the proposed Union Centre. Secure full Indian co-operation and support for the efforts made by the British government in World War-II, the Cripps Mission was an attempt in late March 1942. A senior left-wing politician and government minister in the War Cabinet, Sir Stafford Cripps, headed the mission.

On several counts, the Cripps Mission marked an important milestone on the road to a negotiated constitutional settlement between the British Government and the people of India. For the first time, the British Government clearly accepted the principle of self-determination for the people of India, as it conceded their right to frame their own constitution, which was a long-standing demand of the Indian national movement.
Besides, it was the first major attempt of the Congress leadership to enter into a detailed negotiation with the British on their own: on all other earlier occasions, it was Mahatma Gandhi who had negotiated with the British. Moreover, the Cripps proposals for the first time clearly conceded the right of the British provinces and the Indian states to opt out of the Indian union and thus opening a wide road towards the vivisection of India.

On 20 February 1947, Prime Minister Atlee announced that necessary steps would be taken to effect transference of power to responsible Indian hands by a date not later than June 1948. This announcement was a turning point in Indian history. It gave a fresh impetuous to the Muslim demand for Pakistan which is corroborated by Major William Hodson & Tarachand. The statement of 20th February, 1947 in the contest of Indian politics, was thus an open license for Pakistan in some form or the other. The political developments of Punjab infuriated the Muslim Leaguers; they spread lawlessness and rioting all over Punjab and N.W.F.P. The Congress could sense collusion between the Muslim league leaders, the British and Muslim official in fanning the communal frenzy.

Penderel Moon, an I.C.S. officer in the British government that ruled India, analyses the partition describes the manifestations of communal frenzy and the breakdown of government in his book, *Divide and Quit* that:

As early as 1946 at the Lucknow session of the Congress Nehru asserted “There is a mental alliance between the League and the senior British Officials”. Of several British officers the story was told, that appealed to by panic stricken Hindus for help and protection, they referred the petitioners to Gandhi, Nehru and Patel (p. 79).

Lord Mountbatten’s arrival in India made the political atmosphere electric. He had been authorised to take own staff to India. The administration was infected with communalism, the economy was deteriorating, the Indian states were in a state of
suspense, and the Interim Government was divided into two factions, determined not to co-operate with each other. There were British bureaucrats in every department of the state who was found to be mortgaging India’s interest in the course of their routine duty. Pyarelal cited in *Mahatma Gandhi: Last Phase* that “The way we have been preceding would lead to disaster. We would have not then have one Pakistan but several. There would have been Pakistan cell in every office” (p. 152).

To solve the deadlock between the Hindus and the Muslims, Gandhiji suggested that Jinnah should be entrusted with the responsibility of the Government. But, in an atmosphere reeking with communalism the Congress Working Committee failed to approve the proposal. Consequently, Gandhiji withdrew from the negotiation. Leonard Mosley, British Journalist, historian, biographer and novelist in *Last Days of British Raj* cited:

> Mountbatten and his advisors Lord Ismey and Abel soon realised that what they were doing was not as much as handing India her freedom but washing their hands off her, and once the mood of disillusionment was upon them they would listen to no voices which counselled calm reflection and deliberation (p. 110).

Lord Mountbatten took charge of his office in India on 24 May 1947. He had been authorised to take own staff to India. After consulting Indian leaders and reviewing the situation daily with his staff Mountbatten came to the conclusion that partition of India was inevitable. Nehru accepted the partition not because he has won the charms of Mountbatten but because of the arguments of V.P. Menon and the irritating attitude of his League colleagues in the Government. Mountbatten overcame Jinnah’s objections by telling him that it might ‘jeopardise the reaction of Pakistan itself’. It was Mountbatten’s practice that every day after breakfast he would confer the current problems. Within a
few days he was able to prepare his scheme, which was called ‘Dickie Bird Plan’ for Indian Independence. ‘Dickie Birds’ evoked criticisms from Gandhi, Jinnah and Nehru as well. V.P. Menon prepared a fresh plan in a matter of four hours, which got approval of Nehru and others and in turn sealed the fate of Pakistan.

Pyarelal in his *Mahatma Gandhi: Last Phase* cited that “Patel commented “I agreed to partition as a last resort when we had reached a stage when we would have lost all” (p. 154). Cited Nehru “The Muslim League can have Pakistan, if they wish to have it, but on condition that they do not take away other parts of India which do not wish to join them” (p. 159). The acceptance of Mountbatten’s plan by the Congress and the League closed the bitter controversy about the unity of India. Freedom was at the doorstep but the long-cherished dream of India’s unity lay shattered. The Mahatma felt defeated.

Pyarelal continues:

Gandhiji said Anarchy was better than partition enforced with the bayonets of the British army. Chaos and Civil war were not too great a price to pay for averting the division of India. My life’s work seems to be over. I hope God will spare me further humiliation. I can see nothing but evil in the partition plan”. Still he lent his support to the resolution passed by the Congress Working Committee and saved the face of his dearest lieutenants - Nehru and Patel (p. 17).

Greatest supporter of partition was Sardar Patel. He threw his weight in favour of partition out of irritation and injured vanity.

By 20th February the Muslim League intensified its activities in Punjab. As the Governor of Punjab took over the administration fires of violence burst forth and raged furiously in Lahore, Amritsar, Multan and Rawalpindi. As while the Rome burnt Nero fiddled, observed Tarachand, Jenkins, and the Governor of Punjab either lost nerves or
deliberately left the communal antagonists to fight it out. Nehru too observed this laxity on the part of the British officials. Azad in his work *India Wins Freedom* cited that Nehru said, “Where there were Congress ministries disturbances were brought out under control where the British exercised authority there was chaos” (p. 206).

Maulana Azad was deadly against the partition as it was accepted on the basis that in both India and Pakistan the minorities would be looked upon as hostages in order to safeguard the security of the minority in the other state. And Azad unsuccessfully appealed to Mountbatten not to hurry with the plan of partition. With the shadow of impending partition, individual cases of stabbing and arson cascaded on a frightening scale. Tempers of the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs alike were frayed. Delhi was appeared of the gravity of situation in Punjab; each time from weariness, for lack of foresight or from aversion to have another clash with Jinnah, Mountbatten chose to look the other way.

Though the partition was announced in May 1947, no plans for dividing the Indian army were made till June 1947. People were deliberately kept in ignorance as to which country they belonged until two days after Independence. The Radcliff Award spelling out the partition satisfied none. The Hindu press described it as self-contradictory, anomalous, arbitrary and unjust to the Hindus of Punjab and Bengal. The Muslim press declared that Pakistan had been cheated and that the Award was an act of shameful partiality. Nevertheless, the Award was accepted. As the partition was affected and Jinnah left for Karachi, the Muslims in India, at long last realised that they had, through their own foolish actions, created anger and resentment among the Hindus with whom they had to live in India.
Mosley in *The Last Days of British Raj* states “Tarachand feels ‘that General Auchinleck’s reluctance and Mountbatten’s and Jenkin’s failure to read correctly the signs of the coming disaster resulted in the neglect of any planning to meet the situation” (p. 138).

Bipin Chandra in *India’s Struggle for Independence 1857-1947* states that the years 1938-39, in fact, stand out as years of a new awakening in the Indian States and were witness to a large number of movements demanding responsible government and other reforms. *Praja mandals mushroomed* in many States that had earlier no such organisations. Major struggles broke out in Jaipur, Kashmir, Rajkot, Patiala, Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore, and the Orissa States (p. 358).

The Quit India Movement launched in August 1952 got considerable response especially from the youth.

Bipin Chandra continues

Though arrests of the main leaders, including Swamiji, prevented an organised movement from emerging, many people all over the State offered *Satyagraha* and many others were arrested. On 2 October 1942, a batch of women offered *Satyagraha* in Hyderabad city, and Sarojini Naidu was arrested earlier in the day. Slogans such as ‘*Gandhi Ka Charkha Chalana Padega, Goron ko London Jana Padega*’ (Gandhiji’s wheel will have to be spun, while the Whites will have to return to London) became popular. In a state where, till a few years ago even well-established leaders had to send their speeches to the Collector in advance and accept deletions made by him, the new atmosphere was hardly short of revolutionary (p. 370).

Most of the nationalists were clamped to jail as they supported The Quit India Movement. A number of mutinies broke in the armed services. Jinnah’s two-nation theory was for the formation of a separate nation for the Indian Muslims. The Hindus and Muslims failed to maintain harmony and unity among themselves.

The interim Government, failed to control this situation hence the leaders of India accepted the proposal of Pakistan and thus the draft of Pakistan plan. It was accepted by
both the organisations. Thus the English Government passed the Act of 1947 and India was partitioned into two independent states, the Indian union and Pakistan on 15th August 1947. It resulted in one of the greatest forced migrations in human history. Women of all ages, ethnic groups and social classes were victimised, tortured and raped. The associated bloody riots inspired many creative minds in India and Pakistan to literary depictions of this event.

The theme of the partition has attracted a large number of scholarly works and a fierce debate around it is still on. The partition of India and the associated bloody riots inspired many creative minds in India and Pakistan to create literary or semantic depictions of this event. The internal dynamics of the political structure in India presents to a creative writer almost an inexhaustible material for scrutiny and analysis. There is a remarkable mix of situations, incongruent and facile, of affluence and poverty, splendour and squalor, commitment and frivolous pretence, ideals and hypocrisy.

Paul Scott’s enlarged way of thinking provides to explore the theme of dehistorisation of literature. The incidents are based on Indian history from 1942-1947. But the places, characters and situations are fictionalised as the author began to write *The Raj Quartet* in June 1964 starting with *The Jewel in the Crown* and the remaining novels *The Day of the Scorpion* (1968), *The Towers of Silence* (1971) and *A Division of Spoils* (1974). The author offers a magnificent portrait of attested accuracy of the heart of the British Empire. Scott said in 1968 that ‘If I write about Anglo-India in 1942 I do so not only because I find that period lively and dramatic but because it helps me to express the fullness of what I’m thinking and feeling about the world I live in’ (*India : A Post-Forsterian View*). Literature is a mere play of imagination like a new novel. Scott’s
unique contribution and vision of imperial history is significant. The structure of *The Raj Quartet* perfectly reflects how the British distorted India. The novels try to establish an identity between public events and the private experiences of its characters. Anglo-Indian literature documents the Indians response to the colonial rule.

**Image of Anglo Indians in Literature**

The long rule of British in India produced two types of literature namely “Indo-Anglian” and “Anglo-Indian”. Anglo-Indian literature comprises the works written about India. Much of the Anglo-Indian literature represented a growing racial consciousness amongst the British. The British contact with India has been the interesting point of study from the historical political, anthropological and sociological standpoints. These Anglo-Indian writers lived in India and had first-hand knowledge of the country and its people. In trying to understand the Indian situation the narration suffered from a bias. The imperial attitude, which developed simultaneously with the conservative approach towards India, was primarily dominated by the need to hold the empire. The imaginative response evoked in the writings of the Anglo-Indians has formed the subject of many interesting works published. A survey of the critical works on Anglo-Indian fiction is supposed to begin with the writings of Kipling, Steel and Maud Diver.

In accordance with the changing attitudes to British imperialism, Greenberger has divided the whole gamut of Anglo-Indian fiction into three phases. “The authors of the Era of Confidence 1880-1910; the Era of Doubt 1910-1935; and the Era of Melancholy 1935-1960” (p. 5).

In the last years of the nineteenth century, British imperialism in India reached its zenith. Indian history witnessed an evolution through a variety of political forms and
styles of rule, ranging from monarchical, republican and feudal to the imperial. However, the overall structure of the society remained, by and large, ‘apolitical’ till the advent of the British. Ashis Nandy has aptly pointed out in his Journal of Asian Studies: “when the first impact of the Raj started bringing parts of an apolitical social order within the compass of politics toward the end of the eighteenth century, it initiated the first stage of India’s politicalisation” (p. 58).

The British Indian Empire, British Raj, is the period from 1858 to 1947. The region included the princely states ruled by individual rulers under the British crown and areas directly administered by the United Kingdom. Prior to 1858 Britain’s possessions in India had been administered by the British East India Company, which operated in India as an agent of the Moghul Empire. Later, the British government assumed direct responsibility for ruling its Indian territories. A policy of expansion followed and brought whole India within the Empire.

Known, as the “Jewel in the Crown” of the British Empire, India Empire was over the years a source of wealth for Britain, although the Raj’s profitability declined in the years before independence was finally granted. On the other hand, railway, transport and communication systems were built that helped to knit the previously independent regions of India into a whole, which actually aided the Indian independence struggle under the leadership of the Indian National Congress (www.newworldencyclopedia.org).

Allen Charles Raj, in A Scrapbook of British India illustrates

The Raj’s policy has been described as one of ‘divide and rule’. This partly refers to the way in which much territory was acquired, by playing one Indian ruler against another. And to the way in which the British stressed what they saw as intractable differences between different religious communities, arguing that it was only their presence in India that prevented a blood bath (p. 26).
Anglo-Indian literature instantiates the conflicts and contradictions of a community whose internal coherence appears as tenuous as their comprehension of the country they govern. Narratives represent reality indirectly. Post-modernism raise questions about the relationship between history and reality. It deconstructs the process of writing and the identity itself. Historical narratives search for relative and subjective truth, which is different from absolute truth. So narratives are fictional in representing objective reality. Based on the evidences available to a historian the past is constructively represented. *Raj* has been universally acclaimed as a rare combination of finely interwoven history and fiction.

Chaman Nahal in *Writing a Historical Novel* opines:

> It was while writing *Azadi* (1975) that I became aware of the potentiality of a historical novel. Writing *Azadi* made me realise how a novelist could use history as a metaphor. I’m here treating history as mere chronicle. For historical fiction to carry a deeper meaning, it must succeed at the realistic level first. Consequently, every historical novel has to move at two levels, if not more: realistic and metaphorical. Indeed, this is the only genre in which the artist cannot dispense with realism. In other types of novels, the artist can create his own milieu, and even if it be a nightmarish milieu of fantasy and hallucination, like a spider the novelist can live within the dream world created by him (p.36).

The interaction of historical and fictional characters is the most challenging part of writing a historical novel. An interpretation of history presupposes an approach to time and temporal sequences. The novel as a genre is directly associated with society.

As K.R. Srinivas Iyengar in *Indian Writing in English* illustrates that coming to modern times, Tagore’s *The Home and the World* presents the issue between ends and means in politics in the contest of the revolutionary movements of the twentieth century. Mulk Raj Anand’s *The Sword and the Sickle* and K.A. Abbas’s *Inquilab* both roughly cover the politics of the twenties. Two of the best novels about the Gandhian civil
disobedience movement in the early thirties are K.S. Venkataramani’s *Kandan the Patriot* (1932) and Raja Rao’s *Kanthapura* (1938).

Iyengar adds:

The Second World War period in India, the growing chasm between the Hindu and Muslim communities and between India and Britain, the Bengal hangers, the ‘Quit India’ movement, and the mounting frustration and misery are covered in novels like N.S. Phadke’s *Leaves in the August Wind*, R.K. Narayan’s *Waiting for the Mahatma* (1955) and Kamala Markandaya’s *Some Inner Fury* (1957). One of the more satisfying imaginative records of the Partition is Kushwant Singh’s *Train to Pakistan* (1956). Manohar Malgonkar’s *A Bend in the Ganges* explores more fully the origins of the two-nation theory and presents in some detail the sheer frenzy that possessed people in the Punjab in August 1947 (p. 324).

History traces the essence of the past. Historian formulates events and issues that are factual. All these novelists have sought to explore and interpret India significantly by treating the contemporary themes imaginatively. The historical narrative, which is a blending of fact and fiction, engages itself with a fictionalised form of history. The old facts get transformed through new knowledge systems and dehistorisation took place.

Richard Trenner, in *E.L. Doctorow: Essays and Conversations*, a book on Literary criticism:

History is a kind of fiction in which we live and hope to survive, and fiction is a kind of speculative history . . . by which the available data for the composition is seen to be greater and more various in its sources than the historian supposes. Since many historians have used the techniques of fictional representation to create imaginative versions (p. 120).

As an attempt to revisitualise the past different forms of history are synthesised in the text like history as myth, history as memory and history as fiction. The expansion of historical imagination has paved way for innovative techniques and practices. In the post modern era literary historiography is challenged for various reasons. Issues of reality and representation are the challenges as history is being dehistorised.
The Indian novel in English falls into two groups: one, the novels written by the Anglo-Indian writers of the Colonial India having Indian setting, Indian ethos and environment with several European and few Indian characters. The second, written by Indo-Anglican middle class novelists with many Indian and few British characters set in Indian locale. One notices that Indo-Anglian novels have very few European women characters and Anglo-Indians very few Indian women characters. Depicting the interaction of the two people culture, social, political, and racial disparities made almost impossible to meet or appreciate on an equal plane. Consequently, there was a lack of understanding, a mental block which prevented from depicting the women characters of the either race feeling. The colonial reality and the things they understood were focused.

Mark Spilka and Flesher in *Why the Novel Matters: A Post-modern Perplex* illustrates that “Swinden is very right in stating that soon after 1960s. The publication of Richard Hughes’s *The Fox in the Attic* (1961), V.S. Naipaul’s *In a Free State* (1971) and Paul Scott’s *The Raj Quartet* (1971) changed the entire fate of the English novel, what Huges, Scott and Naipaul had achieved” (p. 389). According to Swinden a revivification of the novel of history used as a means of interpreting contemporary problems-of competing nationalisms, colonial exploitation and distress and clashes of race, class and ideology. These novelists deliberately eschewed myth and fantasy for the realities of history and contemporary or near contemporary politics. The post-modern writing of history and fiction has taught that both historical narrative and fictional narrative are signifying systems in our culture.

The first rebuff to British power was described by British historians as ‘the Sepoy Mutiny’ and celebrated by Indians as ‘the First War of Independence’. With the British
success in quelling the rebellion, the rule of the Company was replaced by the rule of the Crown, heralding a new era of arrogant racism - a period that marked the final flowering of Western imperialism in Asia.

The Anglo-Indian writers hardly recognise the existence of the Indian freedom movement. Most of their novels dwell on the esoteric and exotic aspects of the East with a very grudging acknowledgement of the existence of the Congress or of any agitation for freedom in India at all. The nationalists, in these novels were either treated as plotters and petty intriguers. Most of the Anglo-Indian writers conveniently ignored Gandhi and other prominent nationalist leaders. Novelists like Paul Scott and John Masters, attempted to portray the Indian struggle for freedom in a more objective manner.

Lieutenant Colonel, John Masters, an English officer in the Indian Army known for his historical novels set in India. During the era of British rule he is a prolific and much acclaimed Post-Colonial Anglo-Indian novelist projecting India. John Masters historical novel falls in the tradition of the fiction of Sir Walter Scott and Alexander Dumas. It is to be noted an object of his writing on India in his ‘author’s note’ to *Nightrunners of Bengal*. In *The Ravi Lancers*, a book on British Raj affirms that “My object has been to make the fictional whole present a true perspective of fact and facts of environment, circumstance and emotion. In general, the people actually met with in the story and the places they visit are fictions; the people and places that remain offstage are to be real” (p. 9). John Masters illustrated with his racy and narrative style intertwins with history. He took liberty with history, characters as he imagined and felt. Indians are described from the British point of view. Paul Scott, a British novelist, known for four
volumes sequenced novel *The Raj Quartet*. Like John Masters Paul Scott in his *The Jewel in the Crown* has given a key role to the English man.

Historically speaking national upheavals like The French Revolution and its Napoleonic aftermath, the American Civil War and the consequent recognition of the country, The Third Reich of Germany and the Russian Revolution have all provided novelists with rich material for fiction. Similarly the Indian freedom struggle, too serve as a grand reservoir for the literary activists in India.

The Anglo Indian fiction, in general, is the product of the British writers experience in India. Their experiences are imagined, the writers’ dehistorised literature. L.H. Myers, who had never visited India, but wrote novels on India, which is purely fictitious. M.K. Naik, an Indian academic, who restricted the term Anglo-Indian fiction to the British writers, in his *Studies in Anglo-Indian Fiction* says, “Anglo Indian fiction may broadly be defined as fiction by British writers. Generally a British or occidental protagonist operates mostly in an Indian setting and interacts with Indian and other British or occidental characters” (p. 3).

This connotation conforms to Paul Scott’s *The Raj Quartet*. After the Indian Independence there was a cataract of Anglo-Indian novels by writers such as Paul Scott, John Masters, M.M. Kaye and others. An expansive dehistorisisation and narration of Indian culture belongs to the early decade of twentieth century.

Anglo-Indian literary strivings, despite their mediocrity, must be recuperated as one powerful voice of British identity overseas, of a community in exile, and most importantly of the travails of empire building.
A leitmotif in Anglo-Indian literary production is the constant evocation and production of narratives of interracial desires, largely between Englishmen and native women, and, very infrequently, between Englishwomen and native men. Oaten’s prognosis of the disastrous effects of a literary union between Eastern and Western intellectual traditions is metaphorised. Ipling explicitly approved of the presence of the British in India. It is ipling’s tone of confidence, which prompted Rider Haggard to hail him as the “true watchman” (p. 35) of the British Empire.

As Anglo-India became more established, the differences between the two societies widened. Thus Paul Scott describes that a society trapped, almost embalmed, in an Edwardian past. The various shades of British attitudes towards India reflected in the imaginative writings of British authors who had had a personal experience of India.

Paul Scott’s Predecessors

Rudyard Kipling’s Indian Tales injected at the beginning of ‘Beyond the Pale’, his famous short story on the perils of interracial desire, seems very much in place, as these novels too reiterate the need for “a man . . . to keep to his own caste, race and breed. Let the White go the White and the Black to the Black. Then, whatever trouble fall is in the ordinary course of things-neither sudden, alien, nor unexpected” (p. 703).

B.J. Moore Gilbert in Kipling and Orientalism a book on the historical context writes:

Rudyard Kipling is often assumed to be the founding member of the tradition of Anglo-Indian novel. The Anglo-Indian novel was flourishing by the 1830’s providing Kipling with a store of conventions established by his literary predecessors including John Lang, Henry Kingsley, Sara Jeannette Duncan, and F.M. Crawford. Nevertheless, Kipling’s “success has probably done more than anything else to consign his forerunners to oblivion” (p. 20).
Kipling’s astute observation, his great descriptive power with vivid imagination, the soul of India remains hidden from his eyes. Kipling has been a force in the history of Anglo-Indian fiction. Stories appeared in large numbers of English life in India.

In his introduction to Kim, Edward Said writes that “Kipling has remained an institution in English letters, albeit one always apart from the central strand, acknowledged but slighted, appreciated but never fully canonised” (p. 9).

Of all his fiction, Kipling’s vision of India in Kim is the least troubled and does manage to convey affection for the country that is diluted in his other tales either by overt comment, irony, or peculiarities and tensions of structure and form. On one hand, Kipling and his imperialist views are vilified at the expense of a close examination of his fiction and poetry. On the other hand the equally discreditable imperialism of E.M. Forster’s single novel about India. The critical view has almost obscured the achievements of a younger generation of writers, particularly Paul Scott.

Kipling’s characterisation is exuberant in the novel. A sharp intellect and vigilant in nature Kipling earns the praise. John A, McClure’s Kipling and Conrad: The Colonial Fiction, an argumentative study states that “the colonial fictions of both Kipling and Conrad challenge the romantic image of empire by exposing the inherent contradictions of the colonial situation” (p. 33). Kim’s India is thus not a site of the internal conflicts of earlier stories; indeed the enemies are foreigners or invaders, and are successfully expelled.

Like Kipling’s Forster’s India does not hold true for many Indian readers as they dehistorised literature. G.K. Das, Ph.D. (Cambridge) known for his published work on E.M. Forster and D.H. Lawrence in his work E.M. Forster’s India states that
To a certain extent, *A Passage to India* reproduces the Anglo-India preference for Muslims over Hindus, both in Forster’s selection of Aziz as a main Indian character, and in the relatively approving tone of the “Mosque” section, which contains “direct and straightforward narration” in direct contrast to the “rhetorical and ironical passage on the Hindu theme. Forster as many British did, found Islam to be a more comprehensible religion, compatible with Christianity, as his letters show. His most frequent criticism of Hinduism is that it outrages his sense of taste, is unaesthetic” (p. 100).

M.M. Kaye wrote the best selling historical fiction, *The Far Pavilions*, in 1978. Setting the narrative in late nineteenth century India, she either wittingly or unwittingly allowed her story to fall under the category of a colonial narrative. The story follows the eventful life of a small boy born to British parents in colonized India. His Indian nursemaid, assuming himself to be an Indian raises him. He later finds out about his true identity and thereafter the meaning of life eludes him. He suffers from an identity crisis and falling in love with an Indian princess of mixed blood. Life comes full circle for him in the end as he finds out who he really is. By laying the foundations of her story in such a scenario, Kaye offers yet another orientalist representation of nineteenth century India, of fairytale palaces and kingdoms, of whimsical maharajas, of the elaborate and esoteric caste system and complex ancient rituals such as sati. Such varied colonial rhetoric sets M.M. Kaye’s fiction apart from her British contemporaries who wrote before and during her time. Forster’s *A Passage to India*, Scott’s *Raj Quartet*, Kipling’s *Kim*, revisit the stereotype of characters, themes and objects in their texts, pandering to a largely imperial sentiment. Negative resonance is encountered in the Marabar Caves in *A Passage of India*, and the rape of Daphne Manners in *A Jewel in the Crown*. Whereas in Kaye’s novel, not only is the other question tackled but also explored and celebrated. Kaye’s
novel in post-colonial discourse offers an authentic glimpse of India, almost as fluently as a post-colonial writer, who is writing in a modern setting.

Scott stands close to Henry James in his idea. As V.R. Badiger in his *Paul Scott: His Art and Vision* illustrates that

Paul Scott has a definite idea of the ‘poetic’ novel, according to which he focuses on the complex relationship between the aesthetic form of the novel and the utilitarian function of communicating the author’s version of a particular aspect of human life. James thought only of the textural kinship between ‘idea’ and ‘form’ and again between ‘story’ and ‘novel’. Scott believes in the necessity of a story in the novel, but the story itself is not all for him. For him, the act of rendering the action of a story in terms of images, symbols, metaphors is more important. In his view of the art of fiction, Scott is more serious than James who believed in “rigorously keeping his picture within the limits of a frame and choosing the center of composition”. James could do little by way of symbolism even in his major novels of the later phase: *The Wings of the Dove* (1902) and *The Golden Bowl* (1904) so as to invite comparison with Scott’s handling of a multi-layered symbolism in *The Raj Quartet*. James lacked Scott’s abundant intellectual stamina of creating epic novels of two thousand pages (p. 101).

Scott developed his own idea of the ‘poetic’ Novel as Image. Scott’s symbolism in *The Quartet* is multi-layered. Scott’s immense creativity in working out his vision in *The Quartet* is a vehicle of artistic expression.

Forster was appointed as a Private Secretary of the Maharajah of Dewas Senior. Forster’s experiences with India were first forged in 1912-13 and later in 1921. These experiences provided him with invaluable material as he wrote *A Passage to India*. In all its myriad contradictions and diversity these experiences offered a panoramic and analytical setting of colonial epistemology. As John Colmer, in his critique of the author’s works, *E.M Forster: the Personal Voice* notes:

It (India) offered him new dimensions of history, religion, and philosophy, and gave fresh insights into personal relations. The latter came largely from intimate friendships with Indians but also from observation of the
strain placed on personal relations by the clash between rulers and ruled, Moslem and Hindu (p. 137).

The ebb and flow of British supremacy and native subordination waxed and waned in equal measure for over a century of the Raj’s rule. Rudyard Kipling’s Kim establishes the height of the British Empire, when the natives were most subservient and supportive of the Raj. Thereafter, its decline is incisively chronicled by British novelists who were as equally intrigued by colonialism as Kipling. Their novels focus on the decline of the Empire and its various major catalysts: E.M. Forster illustrates the impact of the introduction of British women into India in A Passage to India. George Orwell demonstrates the significance of burgeoning native dissent and the empowerment of the comprador class in Burma in Burmese Days. Anthony Burgess offers an exhaustive fictional meditation of the zenith of native resistance in Malaysia in The Long Day Wanes. And finally, Paul Scott provides insight into the death of the Empire where the inversion of British and native authority in liberated India has occurred in Staying On. With this last novel, the researcher can see the bitter end of the Empire in what the researcher expect to be the buttress of empiric design for generations, India.

Scott’s Anglo-India

Post-colonial author Paul Scott invented memories of imperial rule. V.R. Badigar, in his book Paul Scott His Art and Vision,

Scott’s parents, Thomas Scott and Frances Scott, belonged to a lower middle-class family of ‘commercial artists’. His father was talented in painting the catalogues of wholesale fursries attractively. Frances, his mother, though she was an expert in modelling the lavish furs, was a woman of letters who had written some novels, most of which she destroyed aftermath of her marriage. Of all her novels, The Keepsake is most remembered by Scott. George and Gilbert, his uncles, were famous commercial artists whose paintings of horses and hunting scenes were sold
at high prices in Southey and Christic auctions. Genealogically the Scotts were direct descendants of Thomas Bewick, the famous eighteenth century naturalist and engraver. Peter, Scott’s younger brother, carried on a part of his famous ancestor’s name (p. 1).

Paul Scott’s life and literary work were shaped by his experience of British India. Called-up to the army in 1940, he was posted to the Subcontinent in 1943, and served in northern India and Burma until demobilisation in 1946. Three crowded years that saw Allied victory over the Axis powers of Germany and Japan and the terrible nuclear dawn at Hiroshima, but also the catastrophic collapse of British imperial rule in Asia. The events Scott lived through during that time, and the massacres he knew were beginning to happen as he left, haunted him for the rest of his life, and drove him to train himself simultaneously as a novelist and imperial historian. The racial discrimination especially the conflict between the British and the Indians may be seen in the narration of Paul Scott.

Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown*, like its predecessor, Forster’s *A Passage to India*, features accusations of rape, race and class conflicts. In *The Jewel in the Crown*, the rape of Daphne Manners, an young Englishwoman, is treated as a concept metaphor for the catastrophic union of the East and West. She falls in love with Hari Kumar, an Indian, and learns to despise colonial rule in India. But her fate metes out tragedy, reiterating the impossibility of East and West ever coming to terms and reinforcing a Eurocentric vision of such a debate. Scott’s novels consistently provide candid glimpses into Anglo-Indian life under the *Raj* that other authors fail to capture in their prose. The author’s devotion of his writing career solely to India enabled him to chronicle the evolution and dissolution of the British Empire there, whereas other writers only intermittently dwelled on the subject. Nevertheless, his *Raj Quartet* and its “post-script or pendant,” *Staying...*
On, provide us with insight into the dynamic lives of both Indians and Englishmen in the waning years of imperial India.

New Series in Mary Stocks’s *Paul Scott: India A Post-Forsterian View* states that:

The true key, as one’s knowledge expands or becomes uncertain, as memories are jogged or prove evasive, is to keep contingency in mind. All the novels of the *Quartet* are about people possessed of or coming to premature judgements, assuming a certitude of factual and usually moral understanding that a later chapter reveals as at best questionable, at worst plainly erroneous or the short-circuit of a bigotry. Even at the end much remains uncertain, morally as factually, for the death of an empire and the birth of several nations are inevitably so, confused, bloody and productive. There is also the sobering thought that though he wrote of the 1940s, Scott wrote for the 1960s and ‘70s, and beyond, reporting with great dedication and intensity a case study he thought critical to understanding himself and his own present, as the 1940s had shaped it. He said in 1968 that ‘If I write about Anglo-India in 1942. I do so not only because I find that period lively and dramatic but because, it helps me to express the fullness of what I’m thinking and feeling about the world I live in’ (p. 116).

Scott’s vision of India is ambivalent. Paul Scott is the first English artist to portray with truth and power the crucial years of Indian struggle for independence. Scott’s appetite for India is remarkable. During his visits to India he visited many prominent cities. This afforded many opportunities of varied and vivid experience and transformed his observations into literary writings. Paul Scott has evinced in *The Raj Quartet* admirable perception of distinctive aspects of Indian life. *The Raj Quartet* is a series of long interlinked novels on the aim to create on a grand scale the political and human clashes between British and Indians during and after the Second World War. His great imaginative achievement portraying the most fascinating relationships won at a high personal cost. *The Raj Quartet* provides a portrait of events in India during the 1940’s, which no formal history can provide. The first of *The Raj Quartet* deals with the events leading up to and the consequences of the rape of a white girl by a group of
Indians at a particular time of crisis, 1942, in the country’s history. Paul Scott’s literature, criticism and theory have an intimate connection with the real world. There may be a remarkable physical and psychological exploitation by the British in *The Quartet*. Ranpur and the Fort at Premnagar are the first two images in the novel *The Day of the Scorpion* that probes and elaborates themes already mentioned in *The Jewel in the Crown*.

The story of the British in India is resumed in the *Towers of Silence*, which focuses on the memsahibs, and officers of the Panot Rifles and a retired missionary Barbara Batchelor. Barbie’s arrangement to live at Rose Cottage with Mabel Layton offends the monstrous regiment of army wives who had other plans for the cottage. *The Raj Quartet* shows that Imperialism perverts the character of the Imperialists as surely as it breeds its opposite nationalism. Scott seems to have been deeply stuck by racial antagonism and his characters reveal it. Hari Kumar, who represents the Indian community is the target of the British racial antagonism. The action of *The Raj Quartet* begins in Mayapore with the launching of the Quit India Movement in August, 1942.