6.0 INTRODUCTION:

Gauri Viswanathan is a Professor of English and Comparative Literature in Columbia University, New York. She has held numerous distinguished visiting professorships, most recently at Berkeley as Beckman professor. Her fields of interest are education, religion, and culture. She also took interest in the 19th century British and colonial cultural studies and the history of modern disciplines. Her recent book, *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief* deals with a major reinterpretation of conversion. Centering on colonial subjects in British India and on minority communities within Britain, she sees in religious conversion both a mode of resistance and an alternative epistemology. She expressed her valuable thoughts on Colonialism, Hinduism, and the problems of Historiography. *Outside the Fold* won numerous prizes, including the 1999 Harry Levin Prize awarded by the American Comparative Literature Association for best book in comparative literature, the James Russell Lowell Prize (1999) awarded by the Modern Language Association for best work of literary criticism, and the 2000 Ananda K. Coomarswamy Prize awarded by the Association for Asian Studies. She has received Guggenheim, NEH, Mellon, and American Institute of Indian Studies fellowships, and is currently research collaborator on a major international project on globalization and autonomy, based in Toronto and Hamilton, Canada.

One of Spivak's colleagues at Columbia is Gauri Viswanathan, whose official title is "Class of 1933 Professor in the Humanities". She travels to
Chennai as regularly as Spivak to Kolkata and, like many of these global scholars, inhabits something inclusive and unhyphenated that could be called East West. Viswanathan became well known with her first book, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (1989), in which she argued that the English-Literary canon in India was an imperial tool, a method by which a collaborating class was brainwashed into accepting the cultural superiority of Britain. Since then she has published an outstanding work of contemporary relevance titled *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief* (1998). This has won several academic awards, including the Ananda K. Coomaraswamy Prize of the Association for Asian Studies. Her Works include:

1. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*

2. *Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity and Belief*


Her numerous articles have appeared in many leading journals and edited volumes. Her current work is on memory, history, and modern occultism.

Her book, *Masks of Conquest* is about the institution, practice, and ideology of English studies introduced in India under British colonial rule. It does not seek to be a comprehensive record of the history of English, nor does it even attempt to catalogue, in minute historical fashion, the various educational decisions, acts, and resolutions that led to the institutionalization of English. The work draws upon the illuminating insight of Antonio Gramsci, writing on the relations of culture and power, that cultural domination works by consent and can (and often does) precede conquest by force. This book sets out to demonstrate in part that the discipline of English came into its own in an age of colonialism, as well as to argue that no serious account of its growth and development can afford to ignore the imperial mission of educating and civilizing colonial subjects in the
literature and thought of England, a mission that in the long run served to strengthen Western cultural hegemony in enormously complex ways. Gauri Viswanathan states that she has two general aims in writing this book: the first is to study the adaptation of the content of English literary education to the administrative and political imperatives of British rule; and the other is to examine the ways in which these imperatives in turn charged that content with a radically altered significance, enabling the humanistic ideals of enlightenment to coexist with and indeed even support education for social and political control. As a description of process, this study is specifically directed at elucidating the relationship between the institutionalization of English in India and the exercise of colonial power, between the processes of curricular selection and the impulse to dominate and control.

The book, Masks of Conquest traces modern English studies to its colonial origin. It reveals that English literary study was established in India well before its institutionalization in England and had its beginnings as a strategy of colonial management. Gauri Viswanathan argues that in the political gamesmanship of colonial administration, the literary text serves as a mirror of the ideal Englishman, removed from the activities of the colonial state. With skill and clarity, the author demonstrates that English literature is inextricably linked to the politics of Empire while challenges contemporary assumptions about canon formation and modern literary study.

Gauri Viswanathan’s Outside the Fold: Conversion, Modernity, and Belief, is the just-so stories told about modernity, one of the most enduring recounts how modernity got to be modern by giving up religion for secularism. Ironically, no one milks this story for more rhetorical effect than those critics who seek to undermine the legitimacy of one or another pillar of modernity, reason, say, or the state, or the commodity, by showing it to be rooted in fundamentally
religious modes of belief and hence to be inimical to some truer kind of progress. A further irony is that such iconoclastic secularism also, in its turn, can be exposed as itself a belief system—as itself an ideology. When the snake of critique thus devours its own tail, it leaves behind a series of intriguing questions. How can one describe modern religion, if not as modernity's evanescent antitype? If the secular state has not been modernizing religion out of existence, what has its historical relation to religion been? What new vision of the histories of subject formation and subjective experience might we achieve were we to plot the genealogy of modernity together with that of religion?

Her book, *Power, Politics and Culture* (interviews with Edward W Said) is a consistent point of reference in Edward Said’s recent career-spanning collection of interviews. This is perhaps unsurprising given that as much as half of Said’s prodigious output has been devoted to advancing the Palestinian cause, a cause which he sees as having much to learn from the South African experience. Said of course is the celebrated author of *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism*, two titles whose unorthodox blend of literary/cultural criticism and politics largely inaugurated the field of postcolonial studies. This overlap of traditional academic activity and more forthright politics has been the hallmark of Said’s originality, and this title replicates such an approach, split as its contents are into sections on theory and criticism.

Gauri Viswanathan has offered an apologia for the intransigent role within modern society of religious belief. Her concern is with its "worldliness": its capacity to force the civil rights of minorities on to the agenda of the secular state. Belief, apparently, has little to do with doctrinal authority. Instead, it derives its power from its character as direct, unmediated reflection on experience in autonomy from the state's attempts to enforce on minorities consensual definitions of their identity. Viswanathan invests "dissent" with a manifest historical destiny not simply to contest ecclesiastical orthodoxies but also, more controversially, to
"unbuckle the consolidating ambitions of the secular state". (1998:47, 213) Dissent fulfils this role because it denies modernity's relegation of religion to the marginal private sphere, most noticeably so when dissenters have arrived at their position via the "oppositional gesture" (1998:50) of conversion. Viswanathan endeavors to combine into a single argument the status of the non-Anglican communities in nineteenth-century England and the debates in India precipitated by religious conversion, whether of a celebrated individual such as Pandita Ramabai or of entire communities, as in the 1901 Census's treatment of the Muslim population as being largely the result of conversion from Hinduism.

6.1 ON BRITISH EDUCATION:

The history of education in British India shows that certain humanistic functions traditionally associated with literature- for example, the shaping of character or the development of the aesthetic sense or the discipline of ethical thinking- were considered essential to the processes of sociopolitical control by the guardians of the same tradition. She points out the hidden aims of British through education policy. They aimed to connect education to literature for values assigned to literature: the proper development of character or the shaping of critical thought or the formation of aesthetic judgment- is only problematically located there and are more obviously serviceable to the dynamic of power relations between the educator and those to be educated. They want to prove through literature the representation of to be educated as morally and intellectually deficient. Here they aim to create the structures of domination that expresses the changing structure of relationships between those for whom educational prescription are made and those who arrogate to themselves the status of prescriber. They tactfully try to employ the structures of cultural domination inherent in the language of educational discourse on colonized society.
Viswanathan also tries to indicate the gap between functions and uses of literary education in England and India, despite the comparability of content at various points. The colonizers did not introduce any Indian literary texts for study in Indian schools and colleges by passing a judgment of their own that they are marked with the greatest immorality and impurity. She further points out that for British India had become an experimental laboratory for testing educational ideas that had been either abandoned in England or fallen victim to insuperable opposition from entrenched traditions and orthodoxies. They also felt that India is a fertile ground for experimentation with untested ideas and observing and recording their effects under controlled conditions.

Gauri Viswanathan argues the difference in educational histories of England and India in following words:

The relation between the educational histories of England and India is best understood as structured on the principle of complementarity. By complementarity I mean a dynamic interaction of interests whose resolution is not necessarily confined to the context in which any given concern originates but extends actively to those contexts that provide the soil for such resolution. (1989:8)

Here Gauri Viswanathan points out that the principle of complementarity is important factor that decides the success or failure of any new policy in a different context. According to her, the introduction of English education was an effort for strengthening the foundations as an instrument of discipline and management. She argues ahead that it is possible to study the ideology of British education quite independently of an account of how Indians actually received, reacted to, imbibed, manipulated, reinterpreted, or resisted the ideological content of British literary education. She also points out the intention of British was to erase the voice of the
colonized and blot out his identity to some extent and must be contented with at the outset.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that to record the Indian response to ideology is no more an act of restoring the native’s voice as not recording it is to render him mute. She highlights the problem of introducing the Bible in Indian schools and colleges as:

Teaching of the Bible was a sensitive issue more from the point of view of the British than the Indians. It was often remarked that the fear of the Bible was really in English, not a Hindu one and had its origins in the objections of Roman Catholics. (1989:13)

Here she asserts that the Bible was not suitable in Indian context as Indians do not response as per their expectation due to their cultural homogeneity. She also records that the growth of Indian nationalism was spurred by the formal training of Indians in the liberal doctrines of Western thought.

Gauri Viswanathan expects two main factors to be observed while introducing any education in following words:

The function of the education remain constant regardless of context or circumstance, so that a humanistic education would have the same meanings and serve the same purposes for both colonizer and colonized, the ruling class and the class it rules; and second, that the curricular elaboration of a given body of knowledge or thought is a faithful representation of that content as it occurs in its free, unbounded, non-institutional form. (1989:17)

Here she points out that this type of experience can be direct or open source of attitudes, beliefs, and ideas. She believes that if these factors work together, it will be rather good for Indians. It will help to reinforce the idea, that English education
had a salutary, emancipatory influence because it released Indians from false consciousness and replaced outmoded styles of thought with enlightened concepts of justice and liberty. If that enlightenment extended to an awareness of British rule as unjust, then it was all the more, to be taken as measure of the success of English education, not its failure. She also argues that the educational policy should observe the exigencies of the political and historical situation, the power relations between educator and educated, and the relations of curricular content to social structure and modes of social organization.

Gauri Viswanathan points out that the English interest in Indian improvement was with their own depredations in India and so when religious sentiment overtook the educational enterprise, no British administer ever lost sight of the original, compensatory reasons for intervention in Indian education. She adds ahead that ‘Orientalism’ formed the mainstay of British rule. She also points out that the reverse acculturation policy was underlying Orientalism, whose goal was to train British administers and civil servants to fit into the culture of the ruled and to assimilate them thoroughly into the native way of life. She further argues that the academic Orientalism expects the ‘right to conquest’. Here the most striking is the intellectual leap, it makes from knowledge that is useful to the state of knowledge that becomes the gain of humanity and the relationship between England and India allow for such a leap. The British considered the acquisition of knowledge about those whom it governs is clearly perceived to be of vital importance to the state for purposes of domination and control. She further talks about ‘Anglicism’ that grew as expression of discontent with the policy of promoting the Oriental languages and literatures in native education. In its vigorous advocacy of the Western instead of the Eastern learning, it came into sharp conflict with the proponents of Orientalism, who vehemently insisted that such a move would have disastrous consequences, the most serious being the
alienation of the natives from the British rule. Finally she expresses her views about Orientalism and Anglicism in following words:

Orientalism and Anglicism not as polar opposites but as points along a continuum of attitudes toward the manner and form of native governance, the necessity and justification for which remained by and large an issue of remarkably little disagreement. (1989:30)

Here she compares Orientalism and Anglicism in a very clear manner. She also expresses that Anglicism tries to overcome Orientalism and vice versa in the course of time.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that British educational policy tries to mold the typical ‘Indian character’ to suit British administrative needs. At the same time the lessons of morality are also possible to be given through literary study. Viswanathan states that Duff objected English literary study for:

“no amount of literary study could possibly contribute toward the moral improvement of the Indians where there was no prior moral instruction. Literature could only shape and enlighten to the degree that the reader was already inherently predisposed to such enlightenment. But to expect literature to perform the work of raising the moral and intellectual level of the reader was to assume that all readers were on a comparable plane of moral development” (Duff: 1939).

Here Viswanathan points out that Duff objects English literature study to be introduced in India for moral development. She states that the pursuit of moral good rather than intelligence was the true object of education. She believes that the efforts of intelligence to create institutions like representative government could not by themselves emancipate people enslaved by religion from the tyranny of its yoke.
Gauri Viswanathan argues that the curriculum designed in British India was quite different than that was in England. She explains the nature and cause of it as:

The religious texts that were standard fare for the lower classes in England could not legitimately be incorporated into the Indian curriculum without inviting violent reactions from the native population, particularly the learned classes. The educational experiments in social control that had been conducted on the English poor had only limited application in India. Yet the fear lingered that without submission of the colonial subject to moral law or the authority of God, the control England was able to secure over the lower classes back home would be eluded in India. (1989:70)

Here she points out that the Indian context could not allow them to implement their ideas as it is. Indians reacted very violently for their educational experiments.

Gauri Viswanathan points out that British tried to restore Christian principle for derogation of Hindu society and religion. They tried to attack the caste system, idol worship, polytheism, and propitiatory rites of Indians. They plead morality, monotheism and monorule. They also pointed out that in India; no single moral code is upheld to enforce positive social behaviour. They tried to establish one single moral code—“One Power, One Mind” as governing society in place of polytheism, caste society of Hinduism (1989). The idea of “One Power, One Mind” had both theological and political harmony, which may fuse it with a hidden appeal for integration of religious and state avoiding polytheism. Gauri Viswanathan refers the views of Charles Grant and states:

The multiplicity of Gods in the Hindu pantheon blurred any sense of a single, universal cosmic law upon whose recognition Grant believed all social harmony rests. Instead of creating a vision of divine principles acting
in uniform concert, the Hindu scheme fragmented cosmic unity and encouraged a system of multiple deities working at variance with each other. Barriers between worshipers of different deities are reinforced and a unitary code replaced by a relativistic one. (1989:74)

Here Viswanathan points out that Grant’s idea of “One Power, One Mind” encapsulated related ideas of cultural hegemony, ethical absolutism, centralized authority, and submission to an overarching law governing all individuals, without which Western knowledge was deprived of all transformative effect.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that British expects to keep Indians at the level of children, innocent and unsuspecting of the meaning of their instruction, for once enlightened, there was no predicting how hostile they would turn toward those who were educating them. She argues ahead that the secularization of Christian truths in the literary education of Indians moves through three distinct but overlapping stages: its direction is set by the relativization of cultural absolutes, producing a heightened emphasis on the intellectual motive in literary instruction, as well as an alignment of the functions of literature with those of history. Here she talks about the British pedagogical use of historical analysis as a method of teaching colonial subjects to identify in their own systems of thought and, simultaneously, confirm Western principles of law, order, justice, and truth. She points out that the British education questioned the political wisdom of an educational policy that directed the learner to truth by blocking our error. Anglicism was especially vulnerable to the charge of depriving Indians of familiarity with their own system of learning. She further points out the intention of British in imparting knowledge to Indians as:

The exclusiveness of a policy that favoured English and eliminated the native languages deprived it of any real political force, for by locating truth in a single cultural tradition to be apprehended solely through direct
instruction in it, the Anglicist doctrine effectively suspended all confrontation with error, disabling serious, critical questioning of the native tradition. The reversal of this situation entailed a conception of truth not as a priori but as a process involving active dialectical effort. Such a conception necessarily demanded a broadening of the content of education and the inclusion of error as an object of instruction. (1989:103)

Here she states by referring the views of Orientalist, John Tytler who expects to promote the study of indigenous language, history, and culture to avoid the degradation of both, British and Indians. She adds ahead that the act of forcing meanings into open comprised is an important aspect of the British ideology of literary education, owing much, to critical readings. The object of an education on Christian principles is to raise individuals from the state of bestial nature in which they are born, toward the spiritual good that is their eternal promise.

The British education was not seeking to assimilate Indians to European model by urging them to cast aside their Indian identity. It was designed in a Platonist sense to awaken the colonial subjects to a memory of their innate character, corrupted as it had become, again in a Platonist sense, through the feudalistic character of Oriental society. She argues ahead that the Indian education commission of 1882 took up the theme introduced by Murdoch of maintaining an appropriate balance between affirming British norms and preserving Indian self-respect. She adds ahead that English education fighting to stave off appearance of imposing an alien culture on native society, gained subtle redefinition as an instrument of authenticity. Viswanathan points out the objectives of British instructions and its importance in following words:

Objectives of British instruction have been internalized by students regardless of whether the statements themselves provide an index to personal conviction. What specifically matters is the successful transference
from ruler to subject, of the view that India will not witness progress unless channels of communication are opened with the West. And the intellectual strategy that enables it is the conjoining of commercial expansion with culture and knowledge to suggest a reciprocal, symbiotic relationship. (1989:140)

Here she reveals the real objectives of British education that is useful for our progress. We could develop a kind of communication with others for our intellectual development. It improves our understanding. It provides a kind of solution for our critical condition by generating resources. Our fellow Indians will be returned to a true self.

Gauri Viswanathan gives reference of the educational position where imparting European culture to the lower ranks of society was strongly objected by aiming to educate them in their stations rather than above them. She also believes that the liberal education gave Indians the illusion that they could be better than they actually were and that they were being empowered to change their personal destiny and affect the course of things. She points out that the value of literary studies in preparing for a specialized society was diminished due to their failure in supplying enough jobs for the numbers receiving liberal education. The British educational policy failed to generate Indian youth which may respect for authority or superiors. English education has made them self-sufficient, and infused into their minds a kind of false independence which knows of no distinction between high or low, old or young. The British education was dedicated to the elevation a so-called effete population by making available to them the advanced knowledge of the West, with its promise of removal of caste and religious barriers, increase social mobility, and enlightened participation in the administration of their own country.
Gauri Viswanathan points out that the objectives of English instruction in Indian education were to achieve an ideal balance between secular and religious policy which, being attainable in the long run or at least promising only very limited duration, opened the way for native interrogation of British ideology. She states the opinion of Macaulay: any course of study in Indian classical languages would only perpetuate the errors that were the cause of the intellectual degradation of the Indian people. He proposed that students be examined in the vernacular languages, which did not yet have a literary tradition comparable to that of the classical languages and through which Western knowledge could be more directly disseminated without having to pass through what he considered the filters of prejudice, ignorance and error.

6.2 ON ENGLISH DISCIPLINE:

Gauri Viswanathan expresses her views on English discipline as curriculum of education. She states that the discipline of English came into its own in an age of colonialism, as well as to argue that no serious account of its growth and development can afford to ignore the imperial mission of educating and civilizing colonial subjects in the literature and thought of England, a mission that in the long run served to strengthen Western cultural hegemony in enormously complex ways. She adds ahead that the young history of English literature as a subject of study is frequently noted, but less appreciated is the irony that English literature appeared as subject in the curriculum of the colonies long before it was institutionalized in the home country. She points out that English literature is in essence an affirmation of English identity. Englishman’s true essence is defined by the thought he produces, overriding all other aspects of his identity—his personality, actions and behaviour. She argues further that the introduction of English literature marks the effacement of a sordid history of colonialist
expropriation, material exploitation, and class and race oppression behind European world dominance. She adds ahead that the English text becomes a mask for economic exploitation. Viswanathan argues that the tension between increasing involvement in Indian education and enforced noninterference in religion was productively resolved through the introduction of English literature. In the beginning, British agreed with the policy to introduce education in native languages. Then they tried to introduce English literature as a symbol of liberal thought. At earlier stage scholars in Arabic and Sanskrit were honoured and respected. Here Arab Maulvis and Pandits viewed the English language and literature as a threat to their own power and influence over the people.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that in the influence of English language and literature proved to be marginal at the Arabic and Sanskrit languages outset as:

In the absence of prior steps to persuade Indians of the need for moral and intellectual improvement, European literature would continue to exert a cultural marginal influence. The Orientalists in sum urged that until such educational strategies were carefully worked out, a policy of difference be adopted to the political, cultural, and spiritual hold of the learned classes of India. (1989:40)

Here she points out that British tried to differentiate Indians into common and elite groups. They gave unequal treatment to both these groups to have a complete hold on India. She also points out that the educational policy must have an ability to control over political, cultural and spiritual activities. Here native languages and programmes may succeed as compared to English language and its literature. In the new education Act (William Bentinck), it was decided that the teaching of English was taken out of the Sanskrit College and the Madarassa and confined to institutions devoted to studies entirely conducted in English. He grounds for doing
so was the charge that the young men learned nothing in the native seminaries and failed to speak English fluently because they had to divide their time between the three languages.

Gauri Viswanathan points out that British decided to dishonour the Madarasas and Sanskrit colleges as mere vehicles of superstition. These colleges were labeled as religious institutions where learners were forced to sink into degradation. She adds ahead that British tried to respect and honour only to those who impart education in their institutions through English language in following words:

By denying learned men any honour or reward or marks of distinction and achievement, British policy virtually doomed these institutions to decay. The erosion of the traditional Indian respect for learning seriously affected its status in Indian society and progressively reduced native learning to an archaic institution. (1989:42)

Here viswanathan points out that British tried to give less importance to native learning. They motivated to acquire education through their institutions if we need respect.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that English Education Act (1835) attracted the people, resulting a great rush for English places by Indians who accepted the study of English as a necessary part of polite education. So this act made English as the medium of instruction in Indian education. She adds ahead that with the formal institutionalization of English as the language of instruction, the stage was set for a new direction to Indian education. She argues further that British Indian curriculum in English was primarily devoted to language studies and so English enjoyed a different status. It was also observed that when English was taught within the same college, the English course of studies was kept
separate from the Oriental courses, and was attended by a different set of students. The entry of missionaries into India precipitated a new role for English literary study: that literary text read as a form of secular knowledge. English study becomes more important with its language purposes, to achieve a high degree of mental and moral cultivation among the bulk of people. She also states that among the more respectable classes of the community there was a grooming desire for acquiring knowledge of the English language; even if it was solely for purposes of securing government positions. The English education turned the Indians against their own religion due to its right reason and judgment. It gave us (Indians) Western training for rational argument and scientific proofs.

Gauri Viswanathan refers the general response to English studies as a secular branch of knowledge observed by Duff in following words:

The new ideas obtained by the study of English literature will undoubtedly weaken, if not destroy, superstitious prejudices; but, on the other hand, the knowledge thus attained tends to produce a supercilious pride and skepticism unless leavened with a large amount of Christian teaching, and this, in the present state of things, it is impossible to give. (Duff: 1939)

She points out ahead that Indian youth, with its attendant substitution of reason for divine will, pointed to a casual relation between secular study of literature on one hand and moral decay and subversion of moral law on the other. In the name of teaching the mechanics of the English language, the British government saw no violation of its own injunction against religious interference by providing religious instruction indirectly. Many of the English scholars present their views as the English literature has more strength than the superiority of Christianity. And it helped to win for English literature a higher cultural status and indeed even a greater pragmatic value. The government enthusiastically supported the teaching of English literature for the purpose of Christian enlightenment. Gauri
Viswanathan states the importance of the English literature for this process could not be exaggerated; as the source of moral values for correct behaviour and action, it represented a convenient replacement for the direct religious instruction that was forbidden by law.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that dissociation of English literature from religion seems to be reactionary response of a cautious British administration, intent on avoiding all imputations of interference in native religions. Here they tried to remove gradually the religion and traditional religious explanations from sphere of knowledge, setting up a secular orientation and autonomous explanatory laws, and ultimately confinement of religion to matters of religious faith alone, excluding even morals. In the eyes of missionaries Western empiricism was invested with extraordinary religious power as an effect of its defying “any man to a state a single proposition relating to maths, physics, metaphysics or morals that does not infringe upon Hinduism”. Viswanathan argues the literature’s relation with Christianity in following words:

Literature’s relation to Christianity undoubtedly stemmed from an awareness of the operational value of English literature’s double stance in reinforcing the validity of the knowledge to be imparted and, by extension, of the authority of those imparting it. Further, literature’s doubleness enabled the validation of Christian belief by the disciplinary techniques of European learning while at the same time deflecting attention from its self-referential, self-confirming aspects. Its power rested on the idea that European disciplines, being products of human reason, were independent of systems of belief based on pure faith. (1989:108-9)

Here she points out the importance of English literature suggested by British. They tell the characterization of English literature as intellectual production implicated a different process of reading, requiring the exercise of reason rather than
unquestioning faith. She further refers Duff who dismissed any comparison of the study of Indian literature with the study of Western literature on the grounds that classical literature was read in Europe as literary production and not as divine authority, as it was in India.

Gauri viswanathan points out the distinction drawn between English and Indian literature in their relation to religion, culminate in a purified, even sterilized conception of literature as constituted entirely by language. Disavowal of religious influence on literature acquires its most severe form in a plan that virtually endorses a classical approach to literary studies, establishing language rather than belief and tradition as a source of value and culture. She adds ahead that the grafting of English literary achievements on to the cultural systems of the colonial begun to bear the fruits of success in the linguistic habits of Indians as: the educated Indians speak purer English than British, for they take it from the purest models, they speak the language of Spectator. Indians were served with a taste for “polite” literature that Englishmen were fast losing. She argues ahead that the filtration theory of Macaulay and Mill, promoting a small elite group through education in English, contributing to the linguistic stratification of Indian society. She argues the profits of English language and literature to Indians in following words:

The discriminations between English and Indian literature in their relation to Christianity and Hinduism respectively yielded a pure, almost severe understanding of English literature as intellectual and linguistic production. As a parallel process to the survival of English culture, Secularization reintroduced a classical emphasis in English studies, strengthening and endorsing the legitimacy and authority of British institutions, laws, and government. (1989:117)
Here she observes in English literature the merging of the aesthetic, the intellectual, and the moral, the means by which intellectual discernment of the rules of composition would lead the mind to an understanding and appreciation of the highest laws of the state or the moral principles that regulate and guide conduct. The cultural power of English literary study lay in its confirming that “knowledge and thought must precede action” and intellect and Christian morality act in concert in shaping man as a public being.

Gauri Viswanathan concludes with her views on importance of English education as:

English education gains subtle redefinition as an instrument of authenticity. English literary instruction, with its pedagogical imperative of nurturing a historically minded youth, places the Indian reader in a position where he renews contact with himself, recovering his true essence and identity from the degradation to which it had become subject through native despotism. Far from alienating the reader from his own culture, background, and traditions, English literature, taught less as a branch of rhetoric than of history, sought to return him to an essential unity with himself and reinsert him into the course of development of civilized man. (1989:141)

Here she asserts that English literary study unduly filled the minds of Indians with thoughts of rising above their assigned position in life. This education played very important role in training Indians in the art of self-expression and self-scrutiny. She argues that with the extended use of English as the language of commerce was brought into existence a much larger class of Indians willing to cooperate with the British in the exploitation of India’s resources. She points out that the highest position that educated young men could aspire to was the merge-paying one of copying clerk, a position that required the mechanical copying of English without understanding. Without honor or reward, these meagre employment prospects
were adversely affecting the traditional Indian reverence for education and the self-esteem that usually accompanied it. She expects that as per Filtration Theory, those who had the time and the leisure to acquire knowledge of the English language and English literature in the classical manner should be encouraged to do so. In the meantime, the rest of the population was consigned to studying their own languages but receiving Western ideas through them at the same time. She expresses her nervousness over the lack of benefitting all Indians by Filtration Theory of the study of English literature as:

The dispatch conceded the success of the Filtration Theory insofar as it had ensured a new generation of Indians trained to a high level of excellence in the study of English literature, but it lamented that these high attainments remained confined only to a small number of persons. (1989:151)

She states referring to Wood’s ‘Dispatch’, that it was impossible to educate the masses in English or even in European thought through vernacular translations due to the scarcity of qualified teachers. Wood has modified education’s cultural objectives by identifying the true discussion of European knowledge with its adaptation to the native culture. He suggested also combining the substance of European knowledge with native forms of thought and sentiment. She argues ahead that in the name of utility, literary education had become merely a mechanical acquisition of knowledge that neither required nor encouraged any of the finer qualities of literary culture or moral discrimination. She points out further that the study of English literature had merely succeeded in creating a class of Babus who were intellectually hollow and insufficiently equipped with the desirable amount of knowledge and culture. According to her, English education came to be criticized for its imitativeness and superficiality and for having produced uprooted elite who were at once apostates to their own national tradition and imperfect imitators of the West.
Gauri Viswanathan argues the great failure of utilitarian educational practices as:

While Christian moralists attacked utilitarianism for its neglect of the spiritual life, Utilitarian educational practice was criticized as strongly in India for not being utilitarian enough, for not steering the native mind away from mundane and useless preoccupations. Even the institutions that had matured with the spread of English education - the literary societies, public lecturers, and debating clubs - had become empty forums. (1989:160)

Here she argues further that the emergence of the discipline of English in colonial India, its rootedness in strategies of sociopolitical control, opens up fresh inquiry into possible implications of empire for current debates on curriculum in general. The curriculum must include its own culture as well as the literature of other cultures. She adds ahead that the British Indian education tries for securing and consolidating power. The acceptance or rejection of other cultures becomes a moot point in the face of the more encompassing motives of discipline and management. She states further that wherever the Eurocentric curriculum is described in the scholarly literature in terms of Western cultural superiority, there is an underlying assumption that superiority is a measure of dominance. She expresses her intention of writing the book, *Masks of Conquests* as:

I have attempted to document British educational enterprise in the 19th century India as an activity, the stratified conferring of cultural power on a dominated society designed to transmute even the faintest traces of mobilized, unified sentiment against British rule into internal schisms. (1989:168)
6.3 ON MISSIONARIES AND CONVERSION:

Gauri Viswanathan expresses her views about the work of missionaries in British India. She states that missionaries played a key role in the drama of consolidation of British interests in India. She gives the credit of expansion of British rule to the missionaries like: Zachary Macaulay, William Wilberforce, Samuel Thornton, and Charles Grant who applied the ethics of concern for reform and conversion. They gave priority to reform the native morals. She also points out that in the beginning, the British government was resisting the missionary work in India with a fear that inhabitants would feel threatened and it will cause trouble for their commercial ventures. Viswanathan argues that the opening of India to missionaries observed new hopes for British in following words:

The opening of India to missionaries, along with the commitment of the British to native improvement, might appear to suggest a victory for the missionaries, encouraging them perhaps to anticipate official support for their Evangelizing mission. But if they had such hopes, they were to be dismayed by the continuing checks on their activities, which grew impossibly stringent. (1989:36-37)

Here she points out the victory achieved by the missionaries with native improvement. She also states that the official support to these missionaries could help to achieve their target.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that some plus points as well as minus points was observed in British missionaries. Some distinct advantages flowed from missionaries to Indians and also their many immoral and disgusting habits too. Missionaries and British rulers were quite sure that it was impossible to promote Orientalism without exposing the Hindus and Muslims to the regions and
moral tenets of their respective faith, a goal of moral and intellectual improvement. They also know that importing the knowledge of the West directly without tampering with the fabric of indigenous regions, would virtually paralyze them. The missionaries assert forcefully to a man in a state of ignorance of moral law, literature was presently indifferent to virtue. The missionaries opposed the importance of sound to meaning in secular pedagogical practice. They also state that the pure sound is totally divorced from meaning and therefore emptied of all intellectual and spiritual content, without which the mind is led astray.

Gauri Viswanathan points out the belief that texts read without any religious or cultural associations, literally left readers adrift like drowning sailors in a shipwreck. She points out the critique of Alexander Duff (Scottish missionary) who strongly expects the urgency of moral and religious instruction through education. She argues further that missionaries imposed the Bible and the other missionary publications, to focus the importance of imagery (images) to regard as arguments, reasons and demonstrations that illustrate and reinforce the truth. She adds ahead that an appeal to the imagination became the best means to conversion. She states that British government and missionary schools adopted two mutually exclusive curricula: One heavily Classical and the other predominantly Romantic, whereas in English public schools, syllabus was designed to foster leadership qualities required of a governing elite, independent thinking, a strong sense of personal identity and an ability to make decisions on one’s own authority. The missionary schools were setup as alternative schools to the existing government colleges and thus relatively free of centralized influence. Here she points out Duff’s philosophy: that morality lay in intention, context, purpose and overall structure of the educational system.
Gauri Viswanathan argues that Duff’s school reflects: ‘Tyranny of the Bible’ and so many parents withdraw their children from such schools. She points out the Duff’s plan as:

Duff had developed an elaborate system for inculcating Christian concepts through close questioning, careful relation of concepts, and association of ideas with their precise linguistic equivalent. The associative technique was used for determining reverence for Brahminical concepts. (1989:58)

Here Gauri Viswanathan indicates Duff’s intention of convincing the Indian students to join his schools to develop the distinguished personalities besides their religious faiths. The missionaries got support from the military officers, who were arguing that a secular education in English would increase the Indians’ capacity for evil because it would elevate their intellects without providing the moral principles to keep them in check. She argues further that the long term effect of the missionary clamor was a redefinition of reason in alignment with notions of duty and social obligation. Missionaries hostile to the basic premises of secular education unleashed every available weapon in their arsenal to prove that the equation of reason with individuality realized truths unwittingly fortified the position of Hinduism. She points out that British believe that education and knowledge would ultimately guide the Indians to Christianity. She states ahead that as long as Indians remained unaware of the connection between the diffusion of knowledge and instruction in Christian principles, the government was content to turn a blind eye to religious instruction. She points out that the meagre faith missionaries vested in literary texts to enhance the moral tone of society sprang in part from the conviction that an unusually high level of mental and moral excellence was first required before English works could truly be enjoined to the moral enterprise. She records the fear of many missionaries as:
Many missionaries feared that far from cultivating moral feelings, untutored and unregulated reading would conceivably cause a closer questioning of moral law, stimulating readers to act against accepted norms. (1989:81)

Gauri Viswanathan states that the missionaries kept the goal of conversion than understanding the literature. So the inclusion of literature in the missionary curriculum was made in many instances for pragmatic rather than philosophical reasons. She states ahead that the successful communication of Christian truths through English literature was affirmed by the observations of clergymen and missionary visitors to the government schools, who frequently were heard to express astonishment at the accuracy and extent of a literature student’s knowledge of Christianity. She argues that despite missionaries success in forcing government to recognize the need for a religious emphasis in education, many missionaries had reservations about the analytical, intellectual approach to Christian themes adopted in government institutions, sensing that conviction was not equivalent to conversion. Gauri Viswanathan argues the importance of missionaries and the Bible in developing natives in following words:

In as much as the missionaries were gratified by the government’s recognition of the need for moral instruction, they must surely have been dismayed to see that the government interest lay less in Christianizing the “natives” than in preparing them for participation in the work of empire. After all, the missionaries’ chief motive in pointing to the shared features of the Christianity and English literature was to draw attention to the fact that a subject already included in the Indian curriculum was the vast repository of Christian values, so where was the harm in teaching the Bible as well? The government listened keenly to the first half of the argument and promptly ignored the second. The discipline that was originally introduced
in India primarily to convey the mechanics of language was thus transformed into an instrument for ensuring industriousness, efficiency, trustworthiness, and compliance in native subject. (1989:91)

Here she points out that the British government understood the value of moral education, expected by missionaries. The missionaries tried to oppose government’s plan of excluding the ‘Bible’ from the curriculum, which is the storage of Christian values. Here natives should not be made dependent but useful for participating in the work of empire. Christianity provides at once the frame of reference and the rules of recognition for the acceptance of its own authority. The relative success of missionaries in providing modern instruction through the vernaculars encouraged Orientalists to believe that the truths of European or English literature and science would be better received by the effect of conviction alone than by withdrawing all support to the Oriental systems of learning in order to make way for the European.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that missionaries had made an argument for error as the basis of instruction in Christian truth and thus unwittingly participated in a shift encouraged by the Orientalists in the direction of a relativistic secularism. She comments further that Western literature is often described in missionary publications as a form of intellectual production, in contrast to Oriental literature, which allegedly set itself up as a source of divine authority. She points out that missionaries resolutely tried to cross the boundary between classes by offering English literary instruction in their institutions. They also accepted the danger by offering special encouragement to the lowest castes.

Gauri Viswanathan highlights the intention of missionaries in spreading Christian religion and its broad approach in considering the human beings. The knowledge of native languages and native modes of thought became the great hurdle to them in fulfilling their aims. So they preferred English literary
study for missionary activities. She records that the missionaries faced problems such as, insufficient funds and lack of required manpower. She points out that though English literature may have been employed to teach the native elements of religion, it is not successful in turning them to a full embrace of its principles. She adds ahead that large-scale conversion of Indians had been reduced to a myth and an illusion, acquiring the force of a painful reality to devoted missionaries who had consecrated their entire life to mission-work in India. So the Christianity to the Hindu remained merely an assemblage of facts to be learned and memorized, not to be experienced or made his own. Here Viswanathan asserts that the number of those actually converting was woefully disproportionate to the efforts expended. She points out the views of the Bishop of Calcutta who tried to overcome the obstacles in the process of conversion:

He did insist that conversion was still a viable goal and that giving the Indians access to our literature and habits of thinking and the familiar use of it would tend very much to dissipate the prejudices and the indifference which now stand in the way of conversion. (Asiatic journal cited (1989:84-85)

Here she points out that conversion was their sole aim in introducing liberal education to natives. They try to impose their habits of thinking through the medium of literature.

Gauri Viswanathan also points out that some realistic missionaries recognized the futility of setting conversion as the goal of literary instruction. So they urged that the goal be remodified to aim for the adaptation of Christian sentiment if not of Christian doctrine. She states ahead that the result of such compromise was the increased importance of the educational function of English literature, which, once freed of the obligation to convey doctrinal truths, took on more moralistic, humanistic functions. She argues further that though literature
continued to be taught ‘Classically’ with the emphasis on the history and structure of the language, its potential usefulness in leading Indian youth to a knowledge and acceptance of Christianity quickly became apparent. She adds ahead that several steps were initiated to incorporate selected English texts into the Indian curriculum, on the claim that these works were supported in their morality by a body of evidence that also upheld the Christian faith.

Gauri Viswanathan skillfully argues that conversion is an interpretive act that belongs in the realm of cultural criticism. She examines key moments in colonial and postcolonial history to show how conversion questions the limitations of secular ideologies, particularly the discourse of rights central to both the British Empire and the British nation-state. Implicit in such questioning is an attempt to construct an alternative epistemological and ethical foundation of national community. Viswanathan grounds her study in an examination of two simultaneous and, she asserts, linked events: the legal emancipation of religious minorities in England and the acculturation of colonial subjects to British rule. The author views these two apparently disparate events as part of a common pattern of national consolidation that produced the English state. She seeks to explain why resistance, in both cases, frequently took the form of religious conversion, especially to "minority" or alternative religions. Confronting the general characterization of conversion as assimilative and annihilating of identity, Viswanathan demonstrates that a willful change of religion can be seen instead as an act of opposition. In her book, *Outside the Fold*, she concludes that, as a form of cultural crossing, conversion comes to represent a vital release into difference. Through the figure of the convert, Viswanathan addresses the vexing question of the role of belief and minority discourse in modern society. She establishes new points of contact between the convert as religious dissenter and as colonial subject. This convergence provides a transcultural perspective not otherwise visible in literary and historical texts.
6.4 ON LITERATURE AND MORALITY:

According to Duff, Morality unquestionably a quality of the reader rather than of literature itself- means a theory of texts whose morality existed independently of the reader. (1858) Gauri Viswanathan points out that the variability of the reader from individual to individual necessitated a programme of instruction aimed at parity and standardization. If it was true to characterize secularism as based on the concept of an innately good human nature, then it was equally true to suggest that its ideal of perfection precluded a moral system because prescriptions are essential to ethics and superfluous when all behaviour contributes to the ideal. She adds ahead that the guiding power of conscience was activated only when the reader had been shaped through prior formative influences for the reception of moral truths and so truth was self-evident only to those equipped both mentally and morally to receive it. She argues that the Western learning had a direct and immediate destructive effect on native superstitions, myths and legends. She talks further that it was true that Western thought possessed the sort of self-evident, irreducible power attributed to it to cause Hinduism to come crashing down, then the educational process that Duff advocated as a form of preliminary ‘mind training’ was simply redundant. She strongly attacks the thought of Duff about Western knowledge: only those who were morally prepared or trained could derive moral value from literature as Western literary knowledge had an intrinsic power to expose the falsity of existing superstitions and doing so, lay claims to moral authority and moral value.

Advanced societies in terms of the closeness of fit between civil and sacred institutions on the one hand and literary and religious knowledge on the other was to render logically true and eternally valid a set of propositions whose variety was otherwise indemonstrable: first, that the concept of secular knowledge in a Christian culture is manifestly an artificial
construction; and second, that in a Christian culture like the English the study and teaching of literature in purely secular terms is not merely a contradiction in terms but an unrealizable and implausible event. (1989:65)

Here she points out two sides of institutions imparting the knowledge for society building on purely secular base. She also states the closeness between civil and sacred institutions and literary and religious knowledge importing institutions.

Gauri Viswanathan argues that if Western scientific and literary knowledge ran counter to Hinduism, which was allegedly based on superstition, ritual and dogma, the minimum condition for an integrated Indian civil society was a religious culture that supported the new knowledge structure. She adds ahead that India though fertile soil for the engrafting of new social formations based on exclusively secular principles, it can not accommodate unwanted aims and ideas as well. She points out the major pitfall in British, understanding that India is the country of the multiple religious and ethnic groups of India are loosely combined to form an amorphous whole difficult to connect corresponding to the English working class. Their policies regarding education or religion were doing nothing but taking colonial India in the direction of anarchy, political discontent and perfidy. She argues ahead that the literature gained considerable importance but it was enlisted as an auxiliary to religious instruction. And the literary understanding was still held secondary to the goal of conversion. So the literary education would not be accepted as a complete substitute for religious instruction. The hostility to a moral emphasis in education coincided with new legislation aimed at stratification of classes. She adds that Macaulay’s minute paved the way for the transition from religions to secular motives in English education.

Gauri Viswanathan expresses her views on the subjects such as, Hinduism, History, Culture and Orientalism in brief, in her critical work. Here she tries to present the impact of British rule on Indians and Indian society in general.
She points out the importance of Hinduism in directing and controlling Indian society in a better way that was disturbed by British rule and Christian philosophy. According to her, Hinduism is the guiding philosophy that brings all Indians on a right track in their life. While talking about historical approach, she states that it fulfills objectives of rousing Indians to a consciousness of the inconsistencies in the native system of society while simultaneously leading them to recognition of the principles of order and justice in the Western. She states that Anglicism is the movement to protect and honour Indian culture. She proves that Indian culture is powerful in the world that develops frank and healthy relationship with the world. Here, are her brief views about these concepts:

### 6.5 ON HINDUISM:

Gauri Viswanathan expresses her views on the concept- Hinduism, a righteous way of life-style of Indians. The Hinduism presents the central value of self-reliance. It develops a false relationship of oneness with the Absolute (God) and demands submission to his righteousness. She states that the Hindu form of worship was no more than intellectual self-adoration. It does not produce morality but complete submission of man to the righteousness of God. Hinduism as a religion expects subordination of self to caste and community. It, as a religion promoted intellectual rather moral worship. Whatever man does, God does; every man is God, but God is not responsible to any and therefore, man, (who is God) can not be responsible to any. British pointed out the usefulness of the legends of Hindu Gods to be taught in the class. So they tried to supersede these tales with the moral texts of Christian England. Gauri Viswanathan argues that Christianity and Hinduism are opposed religions only in a historical perspective. Historically considered, they are part of a single continuum of development, their apparent differences the effect of historical change and movement. Concepts like absolute
truth have no place in the relativized domain of history, where there are only formations, process, and flux.

Gauri Viswanathan states ahead that liberal education could not be imparted without unshackling Hinduism. She gives the reference of French Skeptic, Voltaire, who deliberately cultivated the myth that: “The principles of the Hindus are so good, their moral are so pure, better than our own, in order to discredit Christianity” (1813). Here we can understand the real importance of our principles of life being admired by outsiders.

6.6 ON HISTORY:

Gauri Viswanathan argues that the historical study of English literature was established in university colleges from 1852 onwards and the alliance between literature and history was given institutional expression in 1875 by merging of the chair of English literature with that of history. She points out that the study of literary genres gradually became oriented in literary history. She adds ahead that the reading of literature as an expression of culture and society has an opaque, textured history in British India. She refers the opinion of J. Talboys Wheeler who most clearly and consciously aimed at spreading fact from legend in Indian literature. She also points out that all the histories written by Englishmen were essentially analytic in nature. She adds ahead that Indian youth should have historical consciousness; otherwise they would remain shackled to the tyranny of forms. According to her, the curricular juxtaposition of historical texts with native literature was part of an effort to break through those forms. This juxtaposition offered the means to developing an analytical cast of mind required for dismantling inherited structures and myths.
Gauri Viswanathan points out that ‘History’ was transformed into nothing less than the recasting of myth in a non-literary mode by means of which the discordances of Hindu society were forced into the open. She states that in every respect, the historical orientation to literary study reverses the assumptions and rationale of Christian instruction or, at the very least, provides a new set of terms. The historical approach served the twin objectives of rousing Indians to a consciousness of the inconsistencies in the native system of society while simultaneously leading them to recognition of the principles of order and justice in the Western. She points out the significance of the historical consciousness as:

A historical consciousness was intended to bring the Indian in touch with himself, recovering his true essence and identity from the degradation to which it had become subject through native despotism. Far from alienating the Indian from his own culture, background, traditions, English education gained the image of being an agency for restoring Indian youth to an essential self and, in turn, reinserting him into the course of Western civilization. (1989:134)

Here Viswanathan expresses the importance of historical consciousness to preserve our own identity safe and sound. She also attacks the English education that forced us to forget our tradition and culture and to absorb the Western civilization.

6.7 ON CULTURE:

Gauri Viswanathan talks about the term, ‘Culture’ in brief in her literary work. She comments that Cornwallis who considers native contact is the root cause of declining European morals. So he resolved to exclude all Indians
from appointment to responsible posts, hoping that by this means they could restore the Englishman to his pristine self and rid him once and for all of decadent influences. She points out that this harmed the relationship between Europeans and Indians that was rather frank and healthy. She adds ahead that the Anglicism is considered to be a cultural movement. She also argues that being aware of England’s position in India; they decided to promote native culture to have the strengthened position as a purely defensive measure. They also felt it vital to provide the soil for native tradition and culture growth for a new political society. Here British applied the Filtration Theory predicted on the notion that cultural values percolate downward from a position of power to native elite and to ordinary natives.

6.8 ON ORIENTALISM:

Gauri Viswanathan states that the theoretical and practical considerations made Orientalism a highly appealing cultural programme. She points out further that Hasting’s wholehearted enthusiasm for Orientalism was in large part a response to the volatile and uncertain political position of Britain in India. She states that ‘Orientalism’ represented for them the logical corollary of a precise and meticulously defined scheme of administration. So they applied protectorate governing policy that is in spite of direct rule (British law) through various local functionaries. She states that Orientalism looses its ground to Anglicism as the most favourable cultural policy. This policy helped the government in growing its capacity for generating change and its own vested authority over the natives.

Gauri Viswanathan points out the Orientalist position as:
The Orientalist position was that a Western political tradition could be successfully grafted upon Indian society without having to direct itself toward the transformation of that society along Western lines. But as a theory it found itself at odds with the direction of internal consolidation along which British rule was moving. The strengthening of England’s position in India, as exemplified by the recently coordinated and efficient administrative structure, put the rulers under less compulsion to those over whom they had dominion. (1989:33)

Here she points out that Western political tradition could be easily grafted upon Indian without targeting to transform them. They could establish a strong administrative structure in India with reformist impulse. Here she states that supporting the Indian languages Orientalists were placed in the unenviable position of appearing not only to wish to promote error but to reject Christianity itself. It was an argument the Anglicists had little hesitation in using at the slightest opportunity to discredit their opponents. (1989:102)

6.9 SUMMING UP:

Gauri Viswanathan is known as one of the great literary theorists and critics in the history of Indian literary tradition. Her work is both first-class history and theory that is very important for the general reader as well as for humanists, educators and policymakers. Her book, *Masks of Conquest* can be a good reference book for all those are involved in the field of education. Her style of presenting the thought is noteworthy as she has applied the analytical method. She proved her thorough scholarship and intellectuality. She argues that in the political gamesmanship of colonial administration, the literary text served as a mirror of the ideal Englishman, removed from the activities of the colonial state. With skill and
clarity, she demonstrates that English literature is inextricably linked to the politics of empire while she challenges contemporary assumptions about canon formation and modern literary study. She also took interest in the 19th century British and colonial cultural studies and the history of modern disciplines. Centering on colonial subjects in British India and on minority communities within Britain, she sees in religious conversion both a mode of resistance and an alternative epistemology. She expressed her valuable thoughts on Colonialism, Hinduism, and the problems of Historiography. She argued that the English-Literary canon in India was an imperial tool, a method by which a collaborating class was brainwashed into accepting the cultural superiority of Britain.

Talking about the relations of culture and power, she states that in the beginning the cultural domination works by consent and can precede conquest by force. Her book, *Masks of Conquest* does not attempt to be a “definitive” study of English studies in India. It leaves aside many questions apart from those concerning the effects of literary instruction on individual Indians and the readings that educated Indians gave to the English texts they were taught. In her book, *Outside the Fold*, she recounts how modernity got to be modern by giving up religion for secularism. Gauri Viswanathan expresses her views on the subjects such as, Hinduism, History, Culture and Orientalism in brief, in her critical work. Here she tries to present the impact of British rule on Indians and Indian society in general. She points out the importance of Hinduism in directing and controlling Indian society in a better way that was disturbed by British rule and Christian philosophy.

Gauri Viswanathan gives many references in her work to illustrate the ideas she wants to introduce or explain frequently mars her originality. She proved to be a scholarly reader who analyses works of many critical writers. She is the recognized critical theorist in American scenario though failed here to introduce and generate any new theory of her own. No special influence of any
critic or an author is observed on her mind. Her literary work is useful as a guideline to the scholars involved in the field of education. Her style is simple and easy to understand. She uses simple language to discuss any theoretical points. She established a good record as a professor of English and comparative literature.

Her Book, *Outside the Fold* is an intriguing and wide-ranging set of essays exploring the meaning of conversion. But beyond that, it is a commentary on the transcultural experience of colonialism and modernity. Observing her work everyone may agree that her work is of a dedicated and highly sophisticated thinker.