English or Anglo-Indian?: Kipling and the Shift in the Representation of the Colonizer in the Discourse of the British Raj

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Catherine Elizabeth Hart, M.A.

Graduate Program in English

The Ohio State University

2012

Dissertation Committee:

Clare Simmons, Advisor

Jill Galvan

Amanpal Garcha

Pranav Jani

Abstract

Using Rudyard Kipling as the focal point, my dissertation examines nineteenth-century discourse on English identity and imperialism through literature of the British Raj written in the 1840s through the 1930s. In my analysis of this literature, I identify a shift in the representation of the colonizer between English and Anglo-Indian in four distinct historical moments: pre-Rebellion (1857), post-Rebellion, the *fin de siècle*, and post-World War I. While the term Anglo-Indian can be used as a simple means of categorization—the Anglo-Indian is the English colonizer who lives in and conducts imperial work in India as opposed to one of the other British colonies—it also designates a distinct cultural identity and identifies the extent to which the colonizer has been affected by India and imperialism. As such, the terms Anglo-Indian and English, rather than being interchangeable, remain consistently antithetical in the literature with one obvious exception: the Kipling canon. In fact, it is only within the Kipling canon that the terms are largely synonymous; here, the Anglo-Indian colonizer is represented not only as a positive figure but also as a new and improved breed of Englishman. Kipling's voice, though presumed to be the definitive voice in the contemporary imperial imagination, is an anomaly. By drawing attention to this fact and to the specific historical context within which the colonizer is represented, my analysis changes ideas of colonial masculine identity and contends that Kipling's pervasive effect on imperial discourse overshadows

the complexity of the discourse of the British Raj and contemporary discourses on imperialism, English identity, British identity, and nationalism.

Dedication

To Sadie

Acknowledgments

The completion of this dissertation marks the successful accomplishment of a personal goal I ambiguously set for myself in 2002, and the prospect of finally being done with school after so many years has made me overjoyed, sentimental, bewildered, and grateful. I realize that a few words on a page are petty recompense for all of the encouragement and support I have received over the years from family, friends, colleagues, students, mentors, and faculty, but I will offer them nonetheless.

To my professors and mentors at Western Michigan University—Jon Adams, Gwen Tarbox, Lisa Minnick, Kim Ballard, Charie Thralls, Erin Huskey, Todd Kuchta—thank you for preparing me for my doctoral program and for helping me feel that I have something to contribute to the field. After all, this project began its life as a seminar paper for Todd Kuchta's course on The Literature of the British Empire in the spring of 2006. While it has changed substantially over the past six years, if not for him, this dissertation would not exist. He was the first (of many) to hear my disconnected idea about the difference between English and Anglo-Indian, and the first to encourage me to pursue the idea further.

My dissertation committee at The Ohio State University—Jill Galvan, Amanpal Garcha, Pranav Jani, Clare Simmons—has offered considerable guidance as I have imagined, re-imagined, composed, and revised the various parts of this project. Their

feedback has been invaluable, and I cannot thank them enough for pushing me to improve my argument and my writing. I would also like to especially thank Clare for making me feel more confident in my work and for helping me become better prepared for discussing my work with others.

As any doctoral student will confirm, writing a dissertation can be a lonely business. Thank you to my fellow grad students and friends, Ann Burgoyne, Karin Hooks, Heather Thompson-Gillis, and Meghan Hattaway, for reminding me that I am not alone. Your encouragement, your willingness to listen to me complain, and your friendship has helped me keep my sanity. Also, Meghan, thank you for proofreading the final drafts.

And, last but not least, I would like to thank my family—my parents, siblings, nephews, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and cats. I really could not have gone back to school without your support. To all of my family, both here and elsewhere—Grandma and Sadie, I miss you—thank you for believing in me (and making me believe in myself), for helping me realize what is truly important in life, and for not making too much fun of me for spending almost all of my life in school. I look forward to all the days we have to spend together now that I am finally done. Although, I hate to admit it, especially in writing, you were right, Mom and Dad. I can do this.

Vita

1997.....B.S. Biology, University of Michigan

1999.....M.S. Horticulture, University of Illinois

2005.....B.A. English, Western Michigan University

2007.....M.A. English, Western Michigan University

2007 to present .....Graduate Teaching Associate, Department of English, The Ohio State University

Field of Study

Major Field: English

Table of Contents

Introduction

Reflecting on his experience in the Ceylon Civil Service, Leonard Woolf notes: "The white people were also in many ways astonishingly like characters in a Kipling story. I could never make up my mind whether Kipling had moulded his characters accurately in the image of Anglo-Indian society or whether we were moulding our characters accurately in the image of a Kipling story" (46). While Woolf himself may have found it impossible to definitively answer this question—which came first, Anglo-Indian society or Kipling's representation of it?—he draws attention to what has become a virtually indisputable fact: Kipling is the voice of British India.[1] But how did this happen?

According to Stephen Arata and John McBratney, Kipling's rise to preeminence in the discourse of the British Raj was influenced by the *fin de siècle* anxiety regarding the perceived degeneration of the English race and the concurrent debate on whether the Englishman or the Anglo-Indian was most fit for imperial service. Citing modern life as the cause of English degeneration in England, many looked to Anglo-India, a place free from the contaminating influences of modernity, as the place where the English race could flourish.[2] Significantly, this perception of the Anglo-Indian as the hope of the

---

[1] The term Anglo-Indian refers to "any Briton who spent a large portion of his or her adult life in India" (Brantlinger 86).

[2] According to Lord Curzon, empire was the savior of the English race: "'on the outskirts of Empire…is to be found an ennobling and invigorating stimulus for our growth, saving them alike from the corroding ease and the morbid excitement of western civilization'" (qtd. in Arata 158). See also Froude, *Oceana* (1886) and Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (1883).

English race coincides with Rudyard Kipling's emergence on the British literary scene in the 1880s. For many, Kipling served as the embodiment of the Anglo-Indian as ideal colonizer and as racial savior, and his writing provided evidence of the theory of the positive influence of a non-English, non-modern environment on the Anglo-Saxon race.[3] In fact, Kipling was the *fin de siècle* author most often compared with Dickens and, simultaneously, considered Dickens's successor in the English literary tradition during the 1890s. As Stephen Arata elucidates, "the two writers were made to perform similar critical functions: each was considered to stand for what was best in the English character" (153).

But how did Kipling achieve this feat? What was it about his work that enabled critics to read it as resoundingly and undeniably Dickensian or, to put it another way, English? Ironically, it was his status as an Anglo-Indian. Arata explains, "Kipling was able to embody—his fiction was able to embody—traditional English qualities, [vigor, humor, a confident and a clear-sighted practicality,] because he himself was alienated from England, where such embodiment was no longer possible" (153-154). In such a view, because of the crippling and degrading effects of modern life on the English, the long-presumed link between place and identity—to leave England means to compromise Englishness—was ostensibly reversed. At the end of the nineteenth century, to maintain Englishness requires leaving England and going into Empire, preferably India. Kipling,

---

[3] See Hobsbawm for a discussion of the conflation of race and nation, specifically the English nation as Anglo-Saxon, between 1870-1918. McBratney explains, "A Teutonic tradition that had once been based on the social and religious idea of descent now became tied to a quasi-mythical, quasi-biological notion of race" (*Native Born* 13).

then, as an Anglo-Indian—or, rather, because of being an Anglo-Indian—was an Englishman.

Since the late-nineteenth-century perception of the Anglo-Indian as both the ideal colonizer and the quintessential Englishman is so firmly linked to Kipling, the preeminent voice of British India, the colonizer is generally perceived as a simple character, and Kipling's view of imperialism as a national duty and as a fundamental aspect of national identity becomes entrenched in the national psyche. However, in my analysis of the literature of the British Raj written in the 1840s through the 1930s, I identify a shift in the representation of the colonizer between English and Anglo-Indian in four distinct historical moments: pre-Rebellion (1857), post-Rebellion, the *fin de siècle*, and post-World War I. While the term Anglo-Indian can be used as a simple means of categorization—the Anglo-Indian is the English colonizer who lives in and conducts imperial work in India as opposed to one of the other British colonies—it also designates a distinct cultural identity. [4] As such, the terms Anglo-Indian and English, rather than being interchangeable, remain consistently antithetical in the literature with one obvious exception: the Kipling canon. Only Kipling represents the ideal colonizer as an Anglo-Indian, and only Kipling represents the Anglo-Indian as an Englishman. Therefore, Kipling's voice, though presumed to be the definitive voice in the contemporary imperial imagination, is an anomaly.[5]

[4] See Bart Moore-Gilbert (*Kipling and "Orientalism"*) and Gautam Chakravarty for discussions of manifestations and evidence, both historical and literary, of a distinct Anglo-Indian cultural identity in the decades preceding the Sepoy Rebellion in 1857.

This topic intrigues me for several reasons. The debate on imperial fitness reveals that the imperial experience, from the perspective of the colonizer, is not a static one, a fact which seems to be ignored by critics who use the terms English and Anglo-Indian interchangeably.[6] In fact, I contend that Anglo-Indian is more than an imperial categorization; it connotes difference—the Anglo-Indian is "Other"—and implies that imperial service has some deleterious effect on Englishness. Additionally, the representation of the colonizer provides insight into perceptions of imperialism within a given historical moment. Through my analysis, I maintain that although Britain conceived of itself as an imperial power and as an imperial nation throughout the period discussed, it is only within the Kipling canon and in the direct aftermath of the Sepoy Rebellion of 1857 that the colonizer is represented as a positive figure and as resolutely English. For me, the presence of this shift in representation between English and Anglo-Indian over the period presents the following questions, all of which are crucial to my work. Why does this shift in representation occur? How does this shift impact the representation of empire in Victorian literature? How is imperial identity constructed and perceived? In what ways, if any, does this shift inform the current discourses on English identity and nationalism? If, as Ian Baucom argues, "we are the product of the spaces we inhabit," how does the experience of imperialism, of inhabiting India, affect Englishness

[6] In most cases, the use of English and Anglo-Indian as synonyms is based on the fact that the critic simply uses Anglo-Indian as a descriptor for the English in India. Since the Anglo-Indian community saw itself as distinct from the English in England as early as the 1830s. Bart Moore-Gilbert asserts, "it would be a mistake to assume that Anglo-Indians were simply the British abroad" (*"Orientalism"* 6). An example of an inaccurate usage of the term Anglo-Indian can be seen in Sara Suleri's analysis of *A Passage to India*. Specifically, she refers to Adela Quested as "the Anglo-Indian woman in search of the 'real India'" (138). Within the context of this novel, Adela, a visitor to India, is consistently defined as English and never becomes an Anglo-Indian because she fails to marry Ronny and leaves India. In fact, she repeatedly admits that she is afraid of becoming an Anglo-Indian.

(4)? How and why does Kipling's voice dominate over the other voices in the discourse of the British Raj? Is the colonizer English or Anglo-Indian?

By focusing my scholarly work in this way, I seek to contribute to conversations about empire and identity within the discourse of colonial cultural studies initiated by Bart Moore-Gilbert, John McBratney, Todd Kuchta, Sara Suleri, Stephen Arata, Ian Baucom, Gautam Chakravarty, and Christopher Herbert. By tracing the shift in representation between English and Anglo-Indian through four distinct historical periods, I document how period and setting—the context of the text—and narrative form—particularly who has control of the discourse—inform and shape the representation of the colonizer as either English or Anglo-Indian. Given the focus of this project, gender studies and postcolonial theory are also fundamental to my work. Furthermore, to answer questions of national, cultural, and colonial identity, specifically questions of colonial masculinity, I will align myself with Bart Moore-Gilbert who complicates the binary between "the Orient" and "the Occident" and thus between colonizer and colonized that Edward Said establishes in *Orientalism* (2).[7] Certainly, I do not propose that this binary does not exist or that it is insignificant. Rather, as my reading of the literature of British India from the period extending between the 1840s through the 1930s suggests, this binary, like the Kipling myth itself, does not adequately address the complexities of the imperial experience, especially the complexities experienced by the colonizer, a figure who is both intimately linked and irrevocably divided from both Britain and a clear

[7] Regarding the scope of Orientalism, as defined by Said, Moore-Gilbert contends, "Said is able to include India and Kipling within his purview because he assumes that 'Orientalism' varied little between the regions upon which it operated…[Moreover,] 'Orientalism' attempts to produce the East as a fixed and static reality" ("Orientalism" 1-2). By extension, I argue that the elevation of Kipling has the same effect on contemporary perceptions of imperial discourse.

British national identity by the realities of the imperial experience. Although undeniably performing the work of the nation, the colonizer's actual physical, emotional, and psychological displacement from the British homeland complicates the colonizer's sense of national identity. Belonging to neither India nor Britain, the colonizer exists in a cultural space between these places and as a cultural middleman despite the fact that Kipling imagines this cultural space as a means of solidifying national identity. By drawing attention to this fact, to other voices in the discourse, and to the specific historical context within which the colonizer is represented, my analysis changes ideas of colonial masculine identity. Ultimately, I contend that the pervasive "Kipling effect" on imperial discourse overshadows the complexity of the discourse of the British Raj and contemporary discourses on imperialism, English identity, British identity, and nationalism.[8]

Chapter One, "Englishness Compromised: The Colonizer as Exile," examines the impact of colonial service on Englishness in the decades prior to the Rebellion of 1857. Whereas as evidenced by his poem "A Song of the English" (1899), Kipling contends that Englishness is an inherent attribute unsullied by distance from England—in living in and doing the work of empire, the colonizers are doing the work of the nation and thus are unequivocally English—a look at the literature written before the Rebellion of 1857 shows that Kipling's perception of Englishness was not shared by his predecessors. To illustrate this point, I analyze the representation of returned colonizers in three popular mid-Victorian novels: *Vanity Fair* (1848) and *The Newcomes* (1853-1855) by William

[8] The term "Kipling effect" was coined by Patrick Williams.

Makepeace Thackeray and *Cranford* (1851-1853) by Elizabeth Gaskell. These returned colonizers—Joseph "Jos" Sedley, Colonel Newcome, and Peter "Aga" Jenkyns, respectively—because they have spent a substantial portion of their adult lives in India, are no longer English but are Anglo-Indian; their physical and cultural distance from Britain results in a state of exile that continues even after they have returned "home."

The second chapter, "In the Wake of the Rebellion: The Colonizer, the Empire, and the Nation," focuses on the ways in which the Rebellion of 1857 impacted both the English consciousness and the representation of the colonizer. In focusing on post-Rebellion works, I align myself with Gautam Chakravarty and Christopher Hibbert who see the Rebellion as an event that had profound impact on the way in which the English conceived of themselves and of England as an imperial power. Simultaneously perceived as both a direct attack on and indictment of English imperial ideology and a legitimization for and consolidation of English imperial power, the Rebellion marks a shift in both imperial politics and literary representation; after the Rebellion, the imperial experience comes to mean something different, especially for the English at home. However, while Chakravarty focuses on the mutiny novel—over 70 of which have been written since 1859—to show how this event affected English imperial consciousness, I will focus my attention on texts outside of this genre, specifically George Otto Trevelyan's *The Competition Wallah* (1864), Alfred, Lord Tennyson's "The Defence of Lucknow" (1880), and Kipling's "The Little House at Arrah" (1888).

As evidenced by Trevelyan's epistolary novel and Tennyson's poem, there is a decided shift away from the earlier emphasis on the negative characteristics of the

colonizer as Anglo-Indian to a celebration of the positive characteristics of the colonizer as English in the decades immediately following the Rebellion. Now under direct British rule, India is no longer a marginal territory but the jewel in the imperial crown. Accordingly, the colonizer is no longer a marginal character but a symbol of English imperial power. Interestingly, while Rudyard Kipling shares this perception of the relationship between English colonizer and imperial power in his article about his visit to a Rebellion memorial site, he does not see the Rebellion as a turning point in the representation of the colonizer but as a testament to English perseverance. For him, the colonizer always was and always will be English to the core.

"Loafers in our Midst: The Colonizer in the 'Great Cesspool' of Empire," the third chapter, explores the relationship between colonial masculine identity and colonial work in the stories *The Sign of Four* (1890) and "The Adventure of the Speckled Band" (1892) by Arthur Conan Doyle and "The Man Who Would be King" (1899) and *Letters of Marque* (1899) by Kipling. Significantly, these stories emerge in a *fin de siècle* moment concerned with notions of imperial decline and of racial degradation and a period during which Rudyard Kipling was perceived as the embodiment of the Anglo-Indian as both ideal colonizer and as savior of the English race, a race degenerated by modern British life. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, they share a common character: the loafer, a term reserved for those individuals who fulfill no imperial function because they perform no imperial work. In spite of his staunch advocacy of imperial work, Kipling presents the loafer as a figure free from the confines of imperial bureaucracy and thus better able to explore and "know" India. Doyle, on the other hand,

presents the loafer in a very different manner; the loafer, because he lacks purpose, ambition, duty, and work, is marked by colonial failure. It is this failure, specifically the failure to establish a habit of performing successful colonial work, and not the colonial experience alone, that predisposes these colonizers to criminal activity inside both the colonial space and the metropole. Despite the differences in representation or perception of the loafer offered by these authors, the loafers in question are all resolutely Anglo-Indian. As such, by focusing specifically on the characters as loafers, a colonial class largely unregarded and overlooked in colonial discourse analysis, I draw attention to the way in which the attitude toward the colonizer as Anglo-Indian is significantly dependent upon his location.

Chapter Four, "Being Anglo-Indian: The Colonizer and the Fate of Empire," examines the change in English attitudes toward empire in the years following World War I, a period marked by a multi-faceted debate on the tenability of maintaining the British Empire. Incidentally, the representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian serves as a common vehicle through which authors articulate their perception of the relationship between empire and identity and the future of empire in late-imperial fiction. In "The Son of His Father" (1893-1894/1923), Kipling, taking a pro-imperial stance, presents his most explicit articulation of his belief that the fate of the British Raj rests solely on the shoulders of the Anglo-Indians, specifically those Anglo-Indians born and raised in India, because they know India and Indians better than any English colonizer ever could. Ultimately, for him, Anglo-Indian knowledge ensures indefinite British control over India and thus perpetual British strength. In contrast, Forster and Orwell use the representation

of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian in their novels *A Passage to India* (1924) and *Burmese Days* (1934), respectively, to argue against the legitimacy of the British imperial project.[9] In both novels, the Anglo-Indian is cast as a product of Empire; because of his imperial service, he is not an Englishman, but possesses an identity antithetical to Englishness. While the anti-imperial theme of these novels has been widely acknowledged, the representation of the colonizer and, more specifically, the way in which the imperial experience transforms an Englishman into an Anglo-Indian has been largely ignored. In the role of colonizer, the Englishman loses his individuality and humanity and becomes nothing more than a replaceable part in the imperial machine; he becomes an Anglo-Indian.

[9] These novels have been compared by various critics. According to Praseeda Gopinath, *Burmese Days* is generally considered the lesser of the two (217). However, Malcolm Muggeridge, in his analysis of the three major writers of the British Raj, *Burmese Days* is the better novel: "British rule in India and Burma has left only a very meager literary deposit. There is E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, in my opinion a grotesquely overrated book; there is Kipling; and there is Orwell" (xiv).

Chapter 1: Englishness Compromised: The Colonizer as Exile

The Seven Seas, a book of poetry by Rudyard Kipling published in 1899, opens with "A Song of the English," a poem comprised of seven distinct parts; it is, as the speaker alerts the reader in this first part of the poem, "a song of broken interludes—/ A song of little cunning; of a singer nothing worth" (21-22). While Kipling, the singer, seeks to diminish not only his talents but his significance in these lines—a striking move for a man who has been viewed as both the voice of British India and the writer responsible for giving the British public its first knowledge of India—the poem deserves attention for the claims it makes about the relationship between Britain and its Empire and, perhaps more importantly, the identity of those residing in both Britain's dependent and increasingly independent colonies.[10] Specifically, in "The Song of the Cities," the sixth part of the poem, fifteen cities—Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Rangoon, Singapore, Hong-kong, Halifax, Quebec and Montreal, Victoria, Capetown, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Hobart, and Auckland—describe their individual attributes while aligning themselves to England in fifteen distinct four-lined stanzas.[11] Taken together, the declaration made by these individual cities is that despite that physical distance from the

[10] For example, Mark Paffard argues that it was not until Kipling emerged on the literary scene that Britons had any knowledge of India: "In the sense that he was almost the first writer to use it as subject of serious fiction, Kipling in some measure introduced India to the British public" (30).

[11] Here, Kipling's use of "England" rather than Great Britain can be explained in two ways: 1. it demonstrates the interchangeability of these terms during the period—according to the 1891 Oxford English Dictionary, "*England*… [is] sometimes loosely used for: Great Britain" (qtd. in Kumar 7); and, more significantly, 2. it reflects late-nineteenth century Anglo-Saxonism, which "put the stress on race, language, custom and culture, rather than the formal institution of the state" (Kumar 206). I use England/English rather than Britain/British to remain consistent with Kipling's usage and to explore the ways in which empire was articulated as an English, rather than a British, endeavor.

British mainland, they are all English cities. Fittingly, England responds in the next, and final, part of the poem titled "England's Answer" and confirms the cities' declaration: "Truly ye come of The Blood…/ Flesh of the flesh that I bred, bone of the bone that I bore" (1, 3). In the eyes of England, presented as a mother, these cities are English because they are inhabited and served by the children of her own children; in effect, then, the colonial inhabitants are her grandchildren.

Linked by "The Blood," these cities, despite their distance, are forever English. Moreover, because of "The Blood," a biological and hereditary bond, the cities, and, by extension, their inhabitants retain an English national identity and, thereby, a perpetual ally and protector in England:

> Also, we will make promise. So long as The Blood endures,
> I shall know that your good is mine; ye shall feel that my strength is yours:
> In the day of Armageddon, at the last great fight of all,
> That Our House stand together and the pillars do not fall. (14-17)

With this promise, England, speaking in the first person plural, extends her services to her grandchildren until the end of time. However, this promise clearly relies on one stipulation—"So long as The Blood endures." Ultimately, England's sense of responsibility for and duty toward these cities depends upon the presence of English blood; those who possess English blood must remain in these cities and, implicitly, the English blood must remain untainted. To be English means to be a member of the English race. As such, England, in this response to the cities, clearly defines Englishness as a

racial quality: it is something that a person is born with, not something that can be acquired.

Through the voice of Mother England, Kipling claims that loyalty to England and, more significantly, that English blood—the English race—ensures an English national identity.[12] However, while Kipling contends that Englishness is an inherent attribute unsullied and unaffected by distance from England—in living in and doing the work of empire, the colonists are doing the work of the nation and, thus, are unequivocally English—a look back at literature from the mid-nineteenth-century shows that Kipling's perception of Englishness was not necessarily shared by his predecessors. Specifically, the colonizer in the literature in the decades prior to the Sepoy Rebellion of 1857 and the resulting inception of direct British rule of India in 1858 is a figure characterized by his distance—usually his comic distance—from English culture and, in effect, Englishness.

To illustrate this point, I will focus my attention on the representations of three returned colonizers in three extremely popular mid-Victorian novels: Jos Sedley and Colonel Newcome from William Makepeace Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* (1848) and *The Newcomes* (1853-1855), respectively, and Peter Jenkyns from Elizabeth Gaskell's *Cranford* (1851-1853).[13] While these characters are very different, they do share four common traits: they spent most of their adult lives in service in India; they eventually

[12] It is worth noting that English identity, especially as Kipling refers to it, is more of a racial, than a national, identity: "*Other* nations have nationalism; the English, it has been conventional to say, have patriotism, royalism, jingoism, imperialism—but they do not know nationalism" (Kumar 18). However, within the multi-national state that is Great Britain, an English identity is a national identity.

[13] While it may seem a trivial matter, the popularity of these novels to mid-Victorian audiences is a significant fact. While Paffard may be correct in his contention that Kipling created India for the British, the returned Anglo-Indian colonist had been a common character to British audiences since 1772, the year of Samuel Foote's production of *The Nabob* (Singh 32).

return to and reside in England; they provide financial security for their families; and, most significantly, they are perpetual exiles from English culture. Through my analysis of these characters, then, I will show that the colonizer's claim to Englishness and an unambiguous English national identity is fundamentally undermined by the colonial service which, for Kipling, exists as its inherent guarantee. Interestingly and ironically, these returned colonizers, or Anglo-Indians, both because of and despite doing work ostensibly for the nation's benefit, are exiles.

Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of the Anglo-Indian

But why? How does colonial work translate into permanent exile? One way to understand the impact of empire on identity during this period is to take India or, more accurately, British perceptions of India into account. While India was considered the jewel in the imperial crown by the late nineteenth century, it was not always viewed in such a positive light. For instance, Vicesimus Knox, a clergyman, in his aptly titled collection of sermon-like essays *The Spirit of Despotism* published in 1795, points to India, because of its lack of liberty and independence, as a place where despotism thrives. In this environment, English men are corrupted by the submission of the natives: "they treat the Europeans, who go among them to acquire their riches, with a respect similar to the abject submission which they pay their native despots" (16). While this corruption is an evil in and of itself, the corrupted English compound the problem by bringing this corruption back to England with them. Accustomed to being treated like royalty, the returned English expect equal treatment in England, and in their quest to achieve this desire work to create a social system at home that both elevates and distances them from

the poor. The spirit of despotism that motivates their actions threatens to undermine English liberty. As such, Knox calls upon the uncorrupted, who are unsullied by Indian experience, to defend English liberty "against the incursion of oriental pride" (19). To protect England, these Englishmen must distance themselves and, thus, protect Englishness, from the returned colonizers.

Knox, of course, was not alone in his perception of returned Anglo-Indian colonizers as a threat to England and English liberty. The most famous instance of this rhetoric, which predates Knox by six years, is displayed by Edmund Burke in his "Speeches on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings" delivered in 1789. For Burke, failure to prosecute Hastings, the first Governor-General of India (1773-1785), for misconduct, including mismanagement and corruption, will unleash a tide of despotism over England:

> Our liberty is as much in danger as our honour and our national character…Do we not know that there are many men who wait and who indeed hardly wait, the event of this prosecution, to let loose all the corrupt wealth of India, acquired by the oppression of that country, for the corruption of all the liberties of this, and to fill Parliament with men who are now the object of its indignation? (60)

While Burke and Knox share a belief in the fragility of English liberty in the face of corruption embodied in the figure of the returning Anglo-Indian, they disagree on one crucial point: the source of this despotism. For Knox it is India, but for Burke, who conjures the image of a teeming and anxious horde of Anglo-Indians hell bent on

invading England and destroying English liberty, it is the greed and corruption of the Anglo-Indian. Of course, the fact Burke emphasizes the number of Anglo-Indians—"there are many who wait"—suggests the true source of corruption may actually be the system under which the wealth is gained—the East India Company—rather than a single Anglo-Indian.[14] However, in specifically identifying Hastings, a perpetrator of corruption, as the source of despotism, Burke can draw attention to the problems of colonialism—identified here as Anglo-Indian suppression of liberty first in India, then in England—without actually opposing colonialism. As Sara Suleri articulates it, Hastings becomes more than a defendant, he becomes a tool for colonial reform: Hastings, "by functioning as a repository of ill-doing, could simultaneously protect the colonial project from being indicted for the larger ill of which [he] was simply a herald" (45). Ultimately, then, in Burke's estimation, impeachment of Hastings marks the only means of saving both English imperial interests and England from the tyranny of the Anglo-Indian, a figure made despotic by the corrupt practices of the East India Company.

Thus vilified as a national threat, the returned Anglo-Indian becomes a marginalized figure. However, it should be noted that while Burke and Knox seek to exile the Anglo-Indian, the Anglo-Indian himself, by choosing to make a career in India, chooses a life of exile that is more personal and psychological than it is political. Samuel Johnson, for example, remarks, "a man had better have ten thousand pounds at the end of ten years passed in England, than twenty thousand pounds at the end of ten years passed

[14] According to Suleri, "if Burke's rhetoric were followed to its logical conclusion, the trial would not end with the impeachment of Hastings alone but could further threaten the future of the East India Company" (54).

in India… [because] you must compute what you *give* for money; and a man who has lived ten years in India, has given ten years of social comfort and all those advantages which arise from living in England" (qtd. in Nechtman 61). From Johnson's perspective, in choosing the wealth to be gained in India a man deprives himself of an invaluable treasure: living in England. Once the choice is made to go abroad, the man must realize that there will be consequences to pay upon his return. He will be an exile from English culture even after he returns home.

While Kipling may be the most famous voice of British India, he is certainly not the first, as evidenced by the very existence of Bhuphal Singh's *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction* published in 1935. Perhaps predictably, Singh presents this survey with Kipling securely both at and as the pinnacle of Anglo-Indian fiction. All other authors and titles falling in one of two categories: before Kipling or after Kipling. Of the authors who came before Kipling, most of whom warrant little attention in Singh's estimation, Thackeray stands out largely for a fact over which he had no control: he was born in India. Moreover, several generations of his family lived and worked in India for various periods of time, and because of this family history, Singh argues that Thackeray "had Anglo-Indian blood in his veins" (38). Unlike "The Blood" England repeatedly alludes to in Kipling's poem as forever and inherently English, though, Singh's use of the qualifier "Anglo-Indian" suggests that the experience of India, especially the experience of India over generations, changes "The Blood" in some fundamental way. The fact that Thackeray only lived in India for the first five years of his life seems beside the point; his early experience—and his family's experience—forever connects him to the land of his

birth.[15] Despite the reality of this link to India, Gordon N. Ray, Thackeray's most frequently cited biographer, argues that Thackeray's time in India was too short for it to make a distinct impression on his art: "The direct effect of the years that he spent there was small enough. He departed too young to retain the kind of detailed familiarity with the subcontinent that later enable Kipling to write *Kim*" (Ray, *Adversity* 66-7). For Ray, lack of experience prevented Thackeray from beating Kipling to the punch: if only Thackeray had more experience of India, he would have written about India, would have created India for the British reading public, a half century before Kipling ever got the chance.

Implicit in Ray's claim is the notion that knowledge of India inevitably leads to writing about India. Certainly, lack of experience in and knowledge of India could explain Thackeray's inability to engage with India consistently through his work. But, as Patrick Brantlinger elucidates, Thackeray's relative inattention to India remains in keeping with English attitudes about India at the time: "significant though it is, India remained *background* for Thackeray in both biographical and fictional terms. From the vantage point of the rulers, the Empire was in some sense always mere background, the periphery not the center of attention" (75). In adopting what Patrick Brantlinger refers to as the ruler's perspective of India, Thackeray presents himself as a thoroughly English writer who just so happens to possess a personal connection to the Empire. Fittingly,

[15] For Singh, Thackeray failed to respect the significance of this connection; therefore, he identifies Thackeray's failure to return to India as an impediment to the development of his Anglo-Indian characters: "They are in most cases mere caricatures, but they show what he could have done for India had he, like Kipling, returned to the land of his youth" (40). Paradoxically, regardless of the failure of his Anglo-Indian characters, Singh believes, "Thackeray has created a few Anglo-Indian characters who even today [in the 1930s] remain as models for Anglo-Indian writers to copy" (35).

then, just as India figured at the periphery of the nation's attention in the decades prior to the Sepoy Rebellion, Jos Sedley and Colonel Newcome, the returned colonizers in *Vanity Fair* and *The Newcomes*, sit at the periphery of the novels in which they appear, an appropriate position for men exiled physically, psychologically, and culturally from the nation of their birth by the colonial work they perform for this same nation. Of course, the experience of these characters is not merely a fictional phenomenon. As Gordon Ray points out, the returned Anglo-Indian, a figure Thackeray knew well—his step-father and mother were returned Anglo-Indians, after all—struggled in their return to England: "The humiliations endured by returned 'Indians,' whom half a lifetime of arduous service had sometimes made into personalities of formidable strength and eccentricity, gave them a detached and critical perspective from which to view the structure and customs of English society" (*Adversity* 67). However, while actual Anglo-Indians, as Ray suggests, openly voiced their frustrations to the English society which surrounded yet ostracized them, Thackeray refrains from allowing his characters to engage in a similar critique by keeping these characters on the periphery—neither character serves as protagonist nor narrates his own experience and impressions—of the novels in which they appear. Despite their existence on the margins of both the novels and the societies within the novels, their very presence directs the readers' attention to the experience of the returned Anglo-Indian and issues of colonial identity—who is the returned colonizer? who is the returned Anglo-Indian?—within the confines of these Victorian domestic novels.

The Dandy: A Consumer on the Periphery of Englishness

Vanity Fair: A Novel Without a Hero opens with a glimpse behind the curtains of

the performance that will be the novel to come: "As the Manager of the Performance sits before the curtain on the boards, and, looks into the Fair, a feeling of profound melancholy comes over him in his survey of the bustling place…not a moral place certainly; nor a merry one, though very noisy" (5). Thackeray's narrator, the Manager of the Performance, makes abundantly clear that *Vanity Fair,* an allusion to John Bunyan's *Pilgrims Progress* of 1678, concerns itself with morality or, more accurately, the absence of morality in society. Moreover, D.J. Dooley contends, "the chief thing about Vanity Fair is the insubstantiality or emptiness of what it has to offer" (704). However, despite or maybe because of this inherent lack, its inhabitants, rather than seeking gratification elsewhere, continue searching for meaning, gratification, and value where there is none to be found.

Set against the backdrop of the Napoleonic wars and imperialism, *Vanity Fair* situates itself firmly within the milieu of early nineteenth-century middle-class culture or, as Gordon Ray describes it, "'ready-money society'" (*Adversity* 395). In this society, where money equals power and possessions represent personal worth, consumption and gain stand out as both accomplishments and the foundation of one's social standing. This narrative focus on amassing and displaying wealth, though shared amongst many Victorian novels, is, according to Andrew H. Miller, most pronounced in *Vanity Fair*: "more than any other Victorian novel, Thackeray's book imagines the fetishistic reduction of the material environment to commodities, to a world simultaneously brilliant and tedious, in which the value is produced without reference either to the needs or to the hopelessly utopian desires of characters" (*Novels* 9). In this commodity-driven fictional

culture, a mirror of the real nineteenth-century commodity-driven culture in which he lived, Thackeray presents a series of characters consumed by the desire to consume, to possess, to attribute value to the self through the market value of commodities they purchase and accumulate. Of the many characters that inhabit the novel, one, Joseph "Jos" Sedley, stands out, through his personal appearance and habits, as the embodiment of nineteenth-century English consumer culture. For Sandy Morey Norton, consumption provides the key to understanding Jos's character: "Jos literally embodies the consumption of commodities…and by extension he serves as an emblem for commercial colonial power in nineteenth-century England" (126). Significantly, however, due to the fact that he is a member of the East India Company's Civil Service, Jos, the presumed embodiment of middle-class Englishness, is marked as "Other" throughout the text: he is a fat, effeminate, dandified Anglo-Indian. Through Jos, then, we see the contradiction inherent in the position of the returned colonizer. Although born in England and inherently English in his middle-class notions of class position and consumption, Jos's colonial experience distances him socially and psychologically from his English peers. Ultimately, he becomes an exile from England within England; as an Anglo-Indian he is forced out onto the periphery, rather than into the heart, of Englishness despite the fact that as an avid consumer, he is English to the core.

Although never stated in these terms, perhaps it is this paradox—that Jos, as returned colonizer, is simultaneously at the center and on the margins of English identity—that draws so many critics' attention to him. For Gordon N. Ray, the biographer, the conundrum of Jos can be explained by the links between fiction and real

life. According to Ray, Jos is more than a mere fictional character; he is the fictional representation of an actual person, Thackeray's cousin George Trant Shakespear, a noted but beloved eccentric in the family (*Buried* 42-5). This emphasis on the link between Thackeray's fiction and his life is in keeping with general perception of his work—at least with Ray's perception of Thackeray's work—that his inspiration came from real life and that, as such, he was making a comment on the world in which he lived through his fiction. On the other hand, though, social and cultural critiques can be made in fiction regardless of how closely a character is drawn from an actual human model. For instance, Bhupal Singh reads Jos as "a skit on Indian civil servants" of the mid-eighteenth century (39). By referring to the character of Jos as a skit, Singh asserts that Jos, as character, is a composition of stereotypes of the Anglo-Indian of an earlier time produced for humorous effect. Assuredly, Jos is one of the funniest characters in the novel, not because he is a great comic wit but because he is ridiculous; he is a selfish, fat, effeminate dandy, after all, more concerned with his appearance and his possessions than anything else. Yet, while he does bear the stereotypical hallmarks of the returned Anglo-Indian—he returns wealthy, yet detached from the English culture in which he lives—he also, as previously mentioned, epitomizes the middle-class British consumer. For this reason, he cannot be a type in the way that Singh imagines him. Rather, if he is to be read as a type at all, he is, as Brantlinger clarifies, "a type in moral terms but not in Georg Lukács's sense of typifying a social class or movement" (92). Not only does Brantlinger's clarification more aptly describe Jos's character, it also provides evidence for Brantlinger's claim that Thackeray uses Jos not as a wholesale indictment of British rule in India, but as a

statement on imperial fitness: “Thackeray may not mean his Jos Sedley to typify British rule in India, but he surely does see in Jos one sort of imperial parasite—exactly the wrong sort of individual to conquer and tame a wilderness” (93). As Brantlinger presents it, the issue explored through the character of Jos is not whether Britain should have an imperial presence in India but who should conduct the imperial work on behalf of the British nation. Given his numerous flaws, Jos is not presented as the best representative of Britain; he is not fit for the job. That said if Jos, motivated by the promise of wealth, is the wrong sort of man to be in the business of colonial service, the question remains: who should be conducting the work of empire? Although easier asked than answered, as evidenced by its repetition throughout the period of British rule in India, this question leads to other, more specific questions: Has Jos always been a parasite or has he become one during his colonial services? How has the experience of India, of being a colonizer, changed Jos? What is the difference between being English and being Anglo-Indian?

Jos is introduced, to both the reader and to Becky Sharp, Amelia Sedley’s friend and the novel’s closest approximation to a heroine, in the third chapter. Although Amelia’s older brother and, therefore, a supposedly close member of her immediate family, the effect of his experience as a civil servant, which has kept him from home for the past twelve years, makes them strangers to one another and makes Jos feel ill at ease in his parents’ home. For instance, when Amelia and Becky enter the room which provides the setting for Jos’s debut appearance in the novel, he literally cowers into his neckcloths when confronted with the spectacle of two teenage girls in his midst. Amelia’s reaction to this—“‘It’s only your sister, Joseph’”—shows the reader that she perceives

his cowering as a skittish over-reaction to her presence; she is just his sister, after all, not a ghost or a ferocious animal (25). The fact that he cowers from his sister and her friend, that he attempts to disappear into his clothes much like a cartoon ostrich seeking invisibility by putting its head underground, indicates that he is self-conscious, introverted, and unaccustomed to being in the company of others, let alone in the company of women. Jos's response confirms this analysis: "'No, never, upon my word,' said the head under the neck-cloth, shaking very much—'that is, yes—what abominably cold weather, Miss;'—and herewith fell to poking the fire with all of his might, although it was the middle of June…puffing and blowing the while, and turning as red as his yellow face would allow" (25-6). In this response, which is both halting and lacking in context, Jos reveals himself as a man uncomfortable around others and out of place in England. His time in India, signaled by his yellow complexion, has accustomed him to warmer temperatures and to isolation, and he struggles to acclimatize himself both physically and socially to the situation.

In contrast to Jos's retreating behavior and stuttering speech stands his large, elaborately dressed person. Jos is: "A very stout, puffy man, in buckskins and Hessian boots, with several immense neckcloths that rose almost to his nose, with a red-striped waistcoat and an apple-green coat with steel buttons almost as large as crown pieces (it was the morning costume of a dandy or blood of those days)" (25). The narrator, perhaps because Jos wears so many different articles of clothing, describes his ensemble in

detail.[16] Importantly, as Christopher Lindner notes, "the description focuses not so much on the person it proposes to introduce but, rather, on the catalogue of material ornaments that adorn him" (51). Inside these clothes, the actual person that is Jos—stout and puffy and thereby, physically significant, as he may seem—virtually disappears. He exists as little more than a (rather large) dressing form on which these ornaments, as Lindner refers to them, are displayed. It is the clothes that define him, and the excessive amount of clothes he wears speaks to his penchant for excess in all forms. Through the excessiveness of his clothes, we see a character defined by his desire to consume and by his desire to display his wealth; as the narrator parenthetically reveals, Jos is a dandy.

Of course, being a dandy forms only one part of his identity. Jos is also a returned colonizer. After navigating Jos through his awkward interaction with Amelia, the narrator steps back from the scene at hand to offer the following details:

> He was in the East India Company's Civil Service, and his name appeared, at the period of which we write, in the Bengal division of the East India Register, as collector of Boggley Wollah, an honourable and lucrative post, as everybody knows….Boggley Wollah is situated in a fine, lonely, marshy, jungly district…He had lived for about eight years of his life, quite alone, at this charming place, scarcely seeing a Christian face except twice a year, when the detachment arrived to carry off the revenues which he had collected, to Calcutta. (28)

[16] It is also possible that the narrator spends so much time describing his clothes because "they," as was the case with George IV, "are the grave incidents of his life" (Thackeray, *The Four Georges* 85).

While a famously "honourable and lucrative post," being a collector is not without its disadvantages. Namely, the collector, Jos, is entirely alone, at least in regards to the Christian, which is used here as a synonym for British or white, population of India. Isolated from members of his own Christian culture, he is presumably surrounded by non-Christians, in other words, natives. However, the narrator fails to mention this fact. Instead of describing Jos's interactions with the native population of Boggley Wollah, he merely states that Jos was alone, which suggests that either this native population is not worth mentioning or that no number of native acquaintances could substitute for Christian companionship. Isolated both physically and socially from Anglo-Indian culture in India and English culture in England, his purpose in life lies in his ability to take in money and pass this money on to the Company. He is a middle man; no one cares who he is or what he needs, they just care about what he does. Perhaps for this reason, he is consistently referred to in terms of his Company position throughout the novel—he is only what he does.[17]

From the narrator's perspective, colonial service and the consumption of goods define Jos. Significantly, it is the effects of consumption on the body, and not an earned leave, which brings Jos to London from Boggley Wollah: "Luckily at this time he caught a liver complaint, for the cure of which he returned to Europe, and which was the source of great comfort and amusement to him in his native country" (28). This unspecified liver complaint, which has been read as "a product of the Indian climate, high living, and a

[17] When not referred to as Jos, he is referred to as a civilian. This emphasis on the intersection between profession and identity is consistent in the text. For example, Jos's father, Mr. Sedley, is referred to as the British merchant.

mighty disinclination for exercise," rather than a source for concern, affords Jos the opportunity to go home to his "native" country (Stuart 50). Given what we learn about Jos's living habits in his "native" country, it seems unlikely that this complaint will be cured in England; the only difference in his circumstances seems to be the climate and the medicine that he gets from his physician. In other words, he does nothing to change his eating or exercise habits to ameliorate the effects of the complaint. In fact, being in England again seems like an opportunity to continue in his consumptive practices:

> Before he went to India he was too young to partake of the delightful pleasures of a man about town, and plunged into them on his return with considerable assiduity…On returning to India, and ever after, he used to talk of the pleasure of this period of his existence with great enthusiasm, and give you to understand that he and Brummell were the leading bucks of the day. (28)

In England, he engages in the high life: he eats and is entertained. He lives the life of a dandy, and, by aligning himself with Beau Brummell, it becomes obvious that he sees himself not only as a dandy, but as *the* dandy.[18]

Jos's inclination to perceive and define himself as a dandy exists as a fundamental aspect of his character. However, to completely understand the implications of this mode of self-representation on Jos's part, some insight into the subject of early nineteenth-century dandyism, especially within the context of Thackeray's view of class interaction and competition, is in order. According to Sarah Rose Cole, Thackeray, in both *Vanity*

[18] According to Sarah Rose Cole, Beau Brummell, a contemporary of George IV, was "the model of dandyhood for all time" (138).

Fair and *The Book of Snobs*, "mischievously suggests that the Victorian bourgeoisie was driven not by utilitarian calculation or domestic ideology, but by the desire for aristocratic status—a desire that turns ordinary middle-class men into lesser versions of Beau Brummell" (138). For Thackeray, then, the dandy embodies British middle-class desire to elevate itself into the upper echelons of the British class structure. In Jos, but also, most obviously, in Becky, we see this desire played out to both comic and disastrous consequences, effectively contradicting John Peck's claim that "contempt, of one class for another, pervades the novel" (4). For the dandy and like-minded members of the middle class, gentility, traditionally the exclusive hallmark of the upper classes, is a state of being that can be achieved regardless of birth through disposable income. By purchasing the objects associated with the upper classes, specifically the wardrobe of the upper classes, the dandy not only emulates but displays his genteel status. If clothes make the man, then genteel clothes make the dandy. For Jos, gentility, or, more accurately, the performance of gentility via his dandiness, allows him access to the English culture from which he has been isolated. He can display his wealth earned through colonial service, thus distinguishing himself from other middle-class men who earn their money at home, and, thereby, demonstrate his Englishness.

Therefore, while Jos's dandyism should be perceived as a means of conforming to British cultural standards—it is significant that he models himself after Brummell, a dandy, and not Hastings, a nabob—it does nothing to help him bridge the gap between himself and the English amongst whom he now lives. While Jos enjoys his opportunities to experience all that London has to offer a man with money to spend, he feels little

personal satisfaction, for, according to the narrator, "he was as lonely here as in his jungle at Boggley Wollah. He scarcely knew a single soul in the metropolis; and were it not for his doctor, and the society of his blue-pill and his liver complaint, he must have died of loneliness" (29). By using the qualifier "his," the narrator not only makes Boggley Wollah Jos's possession but his natural habitat. Although England is his native country, the colonial space he inhabits in Boggley Wollah becomes his in a way that England cannot be for him, the returned colonizer. Ironically, the complaint that forces him to leave his isolation in India brings him another form of isolation in England, an isolation which is probably even more devastating since it occurs at "home." Moreover, while the complaint was deemed threatening enough for him to return to England, this threat becomes life-sustaining; without it, he, surrounded by his family and thousands of Londoners, would have died of loneliness.

To help alleviate his loneliness and diminish his inevitable sense of personal insignificance, Jos actively embarks on a campaign of self-definition. As a dandy, he identifies himself as a genteel member of the British middle class. As a returned colonizer, he constructs a colonial identity that cannot be disputed because he is the only member of his immediate family circle with any colonial experience; his knowledge of India, rare as it is, is a precious commodity, and his possession of it, like any valuable commodity, bestows power on him. Jos, lonely as he is, relishes the opportunity to communicate his experience of balls and tiger hunts to Becky, who feigns an interest in India as the surest method of making Jos, who she sees as a rich Indian nabob, a potential husband. Jos, oblivious to Becky's ulterior motives, sees Becky as the ideal audience for

his Indian tales. Since Becky possesses no knowledge of India—with the exception of the belief that "all Indian nabobs are enormously rich"—Jos is free to paint the picture of India and, more importantly, of himself in India (23).

However, while the narrator allows Jos to construct India for Becky, he is quick to alert the reader to Jos's exaggerations. For instance, Jos leads Becky to believe that he frequently joins in tiger hunts. In the very next paragraph, the narrator immediately discounts his story: "He had never been but once at a tiger-hunt, when the accident in question occurred [that is, when his driver was pulled off an elephant by an enraged tiger], and when he was half killed—not by the tiger, but by the fright" (41). The narrator's interjection does two things: it undercuts Jos's credibility to the reader, and it exposes Jos's use of storytelling as a medium for self-construction. Jos wants to be seen as strong, adventurous, and relevant. He does not want anyone to know how tedious and lonely his occupation in India actually is. Instead, he exaggerates his experiences and in so doing constructs a colonial identity for himself based on extremely masculine characteristics. He uses the distance between England, the location of his audience, and India, the site of his supposed adventures, and the allure of the exotic to persuade his audience. Even while his own behavior seemingly contradicts and dismantles this constructed masculine identity—for instance, the narrator reveals that in his attention to his appearance "[h]e was as vain as a girl," and his own father believes he "lacks the courage of a man"—no one openly questions the authenticity of Jos's stories or, as a result, of the colonial identity he seeks to project for himself (29, 226). For Jos, his colonial experience provides him the opportunity to present himself as masculine just as

his colonial experience provides him the income to purchase the clothes of a dandy. In other words, Jos uses his colonial experience to construct a British middle-class identity.

Regardless of his attempts at defining himself as a member of the British middle class, the narrator consistently draws attention to his distance from the British culture in which he attempts to position himself. No matter what he does, Jos maintains a position on the periphery of English society. In his obsession with his personal appearance and his habit of storytelling, Jos keeps all focus on the external. He refuses to allow access to his internal feelings—only the audience, because of the narrator's interjections, knows how lonely and self-conscious Jos feels—and, as a result, exists only as the self-constructed projection of his desires. Ultimately, though, Jos's desires remain unfulfilled as evidenced by the fact that he feels out of place in both India and England

Although enamored with the idea that someone pays attention to him—Jos is too naïve about the world to understand that Becky's attention is merely her attempt to secure a position for herself as his wife—Jos's nerves, shyness, and tendency towards overconsumption, specifically, in this case, the overconsumption of rack punch at Vauxhall, cause him to flee both Becky and his parents' home and remain out of their lives and out of the novel until the primary characters leave England for the upcoming Battle of Waterloo. As it does for the other characters present and for Europe as a whole, Waterloo provides the setting for several life-changing events revealed through retrospective narration: "That period of Jos's life which now ensued was so full of incident, that it served him for conversation for many years after, and even the tiger-hunt story was put aside for more stirring narratives which he had to tell about the great

campaign of Waterloo" (310). It should be noted that this story carries the most weight when he is in India rather than Europe because in India he is one of a few men, specifically civilian men, who were present at Waterloo, just as he is the only one present in England who witnessed the tiger-hunting escapades. In Belgium, though, his role as his sister's escort and protector allows him to revise his identity and his appearance. Now in the presence of military men at a military campaign, he trades in his dandy costume for a military costume: "As soon as he had agreed to escort his sister abroad, it was remarked that he ceased shaving his upper lip" (310). Even the reader most ignorant of the facial hair habits of English soldiers of the early-nineteenth century can appreciate the implication: with a mustache, Jos hopes to align himself with military, inherently masculine, men.

However, despite his revision of physical appearance to align himself with the soldiers at Waterloo, he remains a consistent figure of empire, albeit in a slightly different role; at Waterloo, Jos becomes an imperial governor. After the soldiers leave the town to report for duty, "Jos Sedley was left in command of the little colony at Brussels, with Amelia invalided, Isidor, his Belgian servant, and the *bonne*, who was maid-of-all-work for the establishment, as a garrison under him" (345). Jos's role as commander is one of necessity; Amelia, who is pregnant, cannot take responsibility for the household, so the duty must fall to her brother. The fact that the narrator employs militaristic language in this passage—"command" and "garrison"—and throughout the Waterloo section of the novel adds to the comic effect. First of all, the fact that Jos, the same Jos who ran away from London in embarrassment after drinking too much at Vauxhall, is in charge of

anything is funny in and of itself. What is important in this passage, though, is not the opportunity for humor but the reference to the "little colony" of Britons in Brussels. This idea of British colonies is later repeated when Amelia takes her son to the continent years after the incidents at Waterloo. Of course, seemingly, Amelia and Georgey meet up with Britons wherever they go; it seems that no place is free of them, and each of these colonies is the same because of their presence: "Those who know the English colonies abroad know that we carry with us our pride, pills, prejudices, Harvey-sauces, cayenne-peppers, and other Lares, making a little Britain wherever we settle down" (754). This reference to little Britains and the strength of British cultural markers—both British commodities and British ways of thinking—seems perplexing when Jos is taken into consideration. If the British do make little Britains in their colonies, then it seems that Jos should not be so alien from the British in England. And if, on the other hand, they follow Jos's example, at the very least, these inhabitants of "little Britains" should be somehow marked as different from the British who remain in England when, or if, they return. But they never are. Instead, they apparently retain their Englishness intact.[19] The perception is not the same for returned colonizers from other, more exotic, colonies, like India, as evidenced by Jos when he eventually returns to England after Waterloo.

Contrary to the English outcome, Jos's Waterloo campaign is unsuccessful. He does not leave the battlefield victorious, but because he believes a rumor that the allied forces were failing, he flees Belgium before he can be taken captive by the French and

[19] Perhaps this ability to retain Englishness is connected, at least in part, to both the location and the population of the colony. The "little Britains" on the Continent are different because they are closer to Britain, thus alleviating the problem of both physical and cultural distance from the home culture, and because they are more heavily populated by the British, which further negates the feeling of social and physical isolation.

returns to the safe confines of India. Regardless of his motivation for returning to India—the narrator speculates that "[e]ither his furlough was up, or he dreaded to meet any witnesses of his Waterloo flight"—he entertains passengers on the India-bound ship with tales of his escapades in Belgium and his encounter with Napoleon at St. Helena (444). At this point, he is actively inserting himself into the narrative of the battle because he sees value in this association: "Perhaps he actually worked himself up to believe that he had been engaged with the army; certain it is that he made a prodigious sensation for some time at Calcutta, and was called Waterloo Sedley during the whole of his subsequent stay in Bengal" (444-445). Just as he did in England, he distorts the truth of his experience in an act self-construction.[20] He needs his fellow civilians to see him as a participant in this historic event because this battle represents both masculinity and success. With this brief comment about the creation of Waterloo Sedley, Jos virtually vanishes from the novel once again, existing only as the financial savior of his family after Mr. Sedley loses the family fortune in speculation on the Exchange. The empire, at least the official civilian position Jos fills in the empire, is stable and lucrative. The money he sends home prevents his parents, his widowed sister, and his orphaned nephew from falling into complete destitution; the (former) British merchant is saved by the colonial civilian.

[20] Interestingly, as Thackeray documents in his sketch *The Four Georges,* Jos is similar to another famous dandy of the period in this respect: "I believe that it is certain about George IV, that he had heard so much of the war, knighted so many people, and worn such a prodigious quantity of marshal's uniforms, cocked-hats, cock's feathers, scarlet and bullion in general, that he actually fancied he had been present in some campaigns, and, under the name of General Brock, led a tremendous charge of the German legion at Waterloo" (89).

Years and chapters pass before Jos enters the novel again. This time he, now retired and very rich, appears on board a ship to England: "A voyage to Europe was pronounced necessary for him—and having served his full time in India, and had fine appointments, which had enabled him to lay by a considerable sum of money, he was free to come home and stay with a good pension, or to return and resume that rank in the service to which his seniority and his vast talents entitled him" (671). The fact that this return home, though earned through completion of service, is deemed a necessity shows that "our stout friend" is still leading a life of over-consumption, the condition that necessitated his first trip home. Nothing has happened to change his habits, which speaks to his inherent desire for consumption and his complete lack of willpower. Moreover, while he has the choice to stay or return, he chooses to return perhaps because he still sees England as a place to enjoy himself. At the very least, England is a place where he will be free from work and will be able to devote himself entirely to pleasure. Since we never actually see Jos at work in India, the comment about his vast talents seems little more than sarcasm. In fact, based on the character that has been presented thus far, it seems that he has earned this seniority through his ability to stay alive; his vast talent is simply his strong survival instinct. As in his first introduction of Jos to the novel, the narrator spends great detail in describing his appearance. In regards to his dress, he seems to have made a permanent combination of the dandy and the military man:

> He was rather thinner that when we last saw him, but had gained in majesty and solemnity of demeanor. He had resumed the mustachios to which his services at Waterloo entitled him, and swaggered about on deck

> in a magnificent velvet cap with a gold band, and a profuse ornamentation of pins and jewellery about his person. He took breakfast in his cabin, and dressed as solemnly to appear on the quarter-deck, as if he were going to turn out for Bond Street, or the Course at Calcutta. (671)

The solemnity of his person may speak to his age—he is older and presumably wiser—while his reduced girth suggests that he has been victim to illness now. However, while it may seem that the colonial climate has taken a toll on his body—a fact which should elicit concern—the narrator's tone reveals that Jos remains an object of ridicule. Jos is still a selfish, effeminate dandy, a dandy intent on making a display of himself and his wealth, regardless of his location. For Jos, these locations—the deck of the ship, Bond Street, the Course at Calcutta—are the same. Each location is a place for him to be seen and, with any luck, admired. More significant than Jos's perception of these locations, though, is the narrator's implicit insistence that Bond Street in London and the Course at Calcutta in India are interchangeable. Regardless of the physical distance between these streets, they each or, rather, they both exist as English spaces in which English people travel and interact.

Of course, Jos is not the only man returning to England after years of service in India on board the Ramchunder East Indiaman. Major Dobbin, friend of George Osborne, Amelia's dead husband, is also on the ship. A member of the —th Regiment, the same regiment that Amelia and Jos accompanied to Waterloo, Dobbin, sick with fever, is headed to England with the vague notion of preventing Amelia, the widow of his best friend and the love of his life, from marrying another man. The fact that Dobbin and Jos

are on the same ship allows for a brief digression. Unlike Jos, who is consistently characterized as existing on the periphery of English society because of his service in India, Dobbin is never presented as anything other than an honest military man. As Sandy Morey Norton notes, "[t]he narrator portrays the British military, in contrast to the civilian colonial presence in the person of Jos, as powerful enough to preserve the integrity of English culture and civilization against the perceived temptations, luxury, and extravagance in colonial life" (132). While Morton's point is well-made and obvious when looking at the characters side by side, the question remains: what makes the military man different from the civilian?

Dobbin is introduced to the reader in the chapter following Jos's introduction into the narrative. While the narrator never gives us insight into Jos's childhood, Dobbin enters the novel via a flashback to his time at school. This flashback serves three purposes: it explains how the son of a grocer could be the friend of George Osborne, the son of a British merchant and self-made gentleman, since childhood; it establishes his character as a strong, compassionate, yet awkward and selfless, individual; and it allows the reader to become as sympathetic as the narrator is to "our Dobbin." "Our," the affectionate qualifier repeatedly attached to Dobbin's name, stands as a testament to the narrator's positive feelings toward him; for the narrator, Dobbin is "the true gentleman," an anomaly in the Vanity Fair that is British society (Ray, *Adversity* 412).

Following the story of his schooldays, Dobbin emerges into the present of the novel, specifically in the Sedley home before the eventful outing to Vauxhall where Jos over-consumes the rack punch: "This was no other than Captain William Dobbin, of His

Majesty's —th Regiment of Foot, returned from yellow fever in the West Indies" (56). Like Jos, Dobbin first enters the novel as a man recovering from an illness contracted in the empire.[21] Unlike Jos, though, Dobbin's colonial experience extends beyond India; he serves in the West Indies, Canada, and Europe, specifically at Waterloo, before being deployed to an Indian campaign. Although certainly marked by his military service, Dobbin is never marked as an outsider to English culture. In fact, his experience as a member of His Majesty's army firmly positions him as an Englishman, for like his friend George, who serves in the same Regiment until his death at Waterloo, Dobbin is a "British lion" (160). Unlike the civilian, the military man maintains his national identity despite spending most of his adult life abroad because, first and foremost, the military preserves the nation and, as such, military work is national work. Moreover, in conducting this work, regardless of the locale, the military man is consistently surrounded by his peers in the camp and in the barracks. With such a large group of Englishmen—and Irish women, like Peggy O'Dowd, the Colonel's wife—the military constructs a little Britain in India like all the little Britains scattered throughout Europe. Since Jos is virtually alone in his position as collector of Boggley Wollah, he does not possess this identity safety net. His distance from his English peers isolates him from both the home culture and his Englishness and, as such, causes him to overcompensate by presenting himself as an English dandy and English military man. Therefore, while Jos is not alone in his colonial experience of India, he is alone in his exile from Englishness and English culture.

[21] Of course, it should be noted that while Dobbin falls victim to a common disease that plagued the British in India, Jos's illness is self-inflicted.

The most significant difference in this re-emerged Jos on board the Ramchunder East Indiaman has nothing to do him but everything to do with how the narrator refers to him. When Jos makes this return, he is no longer referred to only as a civilian, his job function in India, but also as Indian or some form thereof; the narrator calls him "a portly Bengal gentleman," "an Indian," and a "Bengalee" (675, 692, 694). What is significant about this shift? By referring to him as an Anglo-Indian, the narrator suggests that Jos has experienced some fundamental change. Jos himself also seems to acknowledge this change. Whereas Jos lived with his parents during his first return, now, as a retired civilian rather than a civilian on leave, he opens his home to his widowed father, his sister, and his nephew and chooses to reside in an Anglo-Indian district of London:

> Jos's friends were from the three presidencies, and his new house was in the comfortable Anglo-Indian district of which Moira Place is the centre. Minto Square, Great Clive Street, Warren Street, Hastings Street, Ochterlony Place, Plassy Square, Assaye Terrace…—who does not know these respectable abodes of the retired Indian aristocracy, and the quarter which Mr. Wenham calls the Black Hole, in a word? (700)

Just as the English make little Britains all over the world, the Anglo-Indians have made a little Anglo-India in London. Why do they need to do this? If British colonies are inherently British, then the people within them should still feel tied to the British culture. The fact that they move back "home" shows that they are, but the decision to live in an isolated community within the larger culture shows that they feel more closely aligned to one another than to the nation as a whole. Their detachment and isolation continues—

they feel it, others feel it towards them. The exile continues and solidifies, which shows that the experience of colonial service is not without its consequences—there are losses and gains. While they seem to have lost an English identity—they are Anglo-Indians—they do have the disposable income that enables them to engage in expensive and pleasurable pursuits.

Interestingly, these Anglo-Indian men share Jos's affinity for elaborate dress, as evidenced by the narrator's use of the term dandy when referring to them: "The gallant young Indian dandies at home on furlough—immense dandies these—chained and mustached—driving in tearing cabs, the pillars of the theatres, living at West End hotels" (705). With the qualification "immense dandies these," the narrator creates a distinction between these dandies and the Brummell-esque dandies of an earlier era. What makes the Indian dandies different from the English dandies seems to be the level of the display. "Immense" connotes extremely ostentatious clothing and a more effeminate behavior. Though within the enclaves of a friendly and like-minded community, the comparatively more elaborate display offered by these Indian dandies implies an even stronger attempt to situate themselves within British middle-class culture. They, like the Brummells of an age gone by, emulate the upper class. The immensity of their dandyism signals both their success and their insecurity. In order to fit in, they overcompensate and push themselves even further away from the cultural center.

Interestingly, it is now that Jos has returned to London that attention is actually given to India. Brantlinger notes that "[p]aradoxically, … 'India' is almost more significant in London than it is in Boggley Wollah, Calcutta, or Madras, and especially

after Jos's final return, when he joins the Oriental Club and Amelia begins entertaining his 'brother Indians'" (Brantlinger 94). The thing to consider here is to whom is India more significant in London: Jos or the narrator? Very little time of the novel is spent in India; the time that is spent there is in the soldier camps, which, though technically in India, are firmly British. The narrator cannot write more about India or show more of an interest in India because knowledge of India is limited. On the other hand, Jos becomes more obviously connected to India because he is more than a civilian on leave, he is a retired civilian. As a retiree, he must establish a life for himself at home. He realizes that the only way he will feel comfortable or, to put it another way, less alienated from society, is to immerse himself in a society in which he feels comfortable. For him, this society must be that of the Anglo-Indian population in London. They have shared interests, backgrounds, experiences, psychologies. They are bound by their service and their detachment. To ameliorate their sense of isolation and alienation, they come together to form a community within the larger community. In this way, they are no different from other facets of society, like class and immigrant groups, that tend to live in separate communities.

Like the Anglo-Indian community he inhabits, Jos is both connected and disconnected to English culture because of his colonial service. Though he changes very little over the course of the novel and ends up, presumably, being murdered by Becky, the narrator's insistence on referring to him as an Anglo-Indian after he returns the second time shows that the perception of him has changed even if he himself has not. As such, Jos, as returned colonizer, demonstrates the extent to which colonial experience, the

reality of living outside of England for an extended period of time while performing colonial work, has some perceived impact on Englishness. Throughout the novel Jos feels as if he does not belong and is treated as if he does not belong in England. Therefore, as a representation of the returned colonizer, Jos illuminates the complexity and the frustration of the Anglo-Indian experience. Through no fault of his own, he is exiled from British culture, despite all indicators of his participation in it, because of his colonial work.

The Military Hero: A Gentleman from an Idealized Past

While the representation of Jos Sedley, the returned colonizer in *Vanity Fair*, is less than sympathetic, the same cannot be said of the representation of the returned colonizer, Colonel Newcome, in *The Newcomes*. Interestingly, Colonel Newcome has more in common with Dobbin than with Jos; as his title suggests, he is a military man, not a civilian. However, despite his military background, Colonel Newcome, unlike Dobbin, feels exiled from the England to which he returns after a lifetime of service in India but, significantly, unlike Jos, is treated more sympathetically by the narrator. The obvious question to ask is why: why is Colonel Newcome, though presented as an exile, presented as a sympathetic character? The very simple answer is that it is because he is a military man and, like Dobbin before him, "an epitome of the military virtues [Thackeray admired]" (Ray, *Buried* 108). But if this is the case, why is the Colonel represented, albeit sympathetically from the narrator's standpoint, as an exile while Dobbin was not? The answer to this second question, because of the inherent paradox, requires a more detailed explanation.

Like its predecessor, *The Newcomes* is about class, English society, and history, specifically how individuals are shaped through and by history. In this novel, though, Thackeray approaches the common subject from a different vantage point. *The Newcomes*, rather than an overt critique of British society, is a family history or, more specifically, a story of a "new family disguised as an old family"; despite attempts to create an elaborate and hearty family tree that extends back into the far reaches of English history, the fact remains that Thomas Newcome, the head of the family and the father of the Colonel and his twin half-brothers Hobson and Brian Newcome, began his career as a weaver in a northern county (14). Unsurprisingly, as the novel chronicles the rises and falls of this particular English family, conflicts arise, which is fitting given that R. D. McMaster describes it as a novel about conflict: "the English returned from India versus the English at home; eighteenth-century values versus Victorian; the grand versus the grandiose; the heroic versus the mundane and domestic" (118). Interestingly, much of the conflict McMaster identifies centers around the character of Colonel Newcome despite the fact that Pendennis, the narrator, names Clive, the Colonel's son, as "the hero of this tale," not the Colonel himself (36). Ultimately, then, it seems that to know Clive and to understand the thematic concerns of the novel, one must know his family and his father in particular.

Colonel Newcome, like Jos Sedley, is more than a figment of Thackeray's imagination, for, as several critics, evidently myself included, cannot help but mention, Colonel Newcome is based largely on Thackeray's stepfather Major Carmichael-Smyth because he had "always admired the old-fashioned simplicity of his mother's and

stepfather's way of life" (Peters 226). Peters's use of the phrase "old-fashioned simplicity" is integral to understanding Thackeray's representation of this returned colonizer for the simple fact that in the Colonel Thackeray combines the concepts of the ideal gentleman and the issue of imperial service with nostalgia for all that has been lost by contemporary society that permeates the novel. Despite all that has been gained financially, technologically, and imperially, there is an overwhelming sense that what has been irrevocably lost is more significant than any form of achievement that has been or will be made as the nineteenth century progresses.

On the one hand, then, Colonel Newcome represents a simpler, better time and, as such, embodies all that the nostalgic individual, Thackeray included, misses in contemporary Britain. Perhaps it his link to the idealized past that made the Colonel such a favorite with Victorian audiences: "for Thackeray's first readers, it was Clive's father, the Colonel, the simple solider, retaining in age the purity and grace of childhood, who formed the focus of the novel. Shown with all his faults and foolishness, his stubbornness and narrowness of vision, he nevertheless represented the Victorian ideal of manliness" (Monsarrat 326).[22] Childish, foolish, and simple though he may seem, above all, the Colonel is respectable and acts at all times according to a strict code of ethics and morals, the code of a gentleman.[23] Of course, as Robin Gilmour argues, the idea of the gentleman was important to the Victorians because for them the term gentleman was "a moral and not just a social category," and, therefore, it was an open category; anyone, not just men

[22] In fact, according to Ray, "of all Thackeray's characters [Colonel Newcome] was the supreme favorite with the Victorian public" (*Buried* 114).
[23] See Wheatley, Peters, Ray (*The Buried Life: A Study of the Relation Between Thackeray's Fiction and His Personal History*) for discussion of Colonel Newcome's simplicity as evidence of him as a Don Quixote-like character.

of the upper classes, with the right behavior could attain the distinction of the gentleman (3). For the Victorians, then, the idea(l) of the gentleman is connected with aspirations, particularly middle-class aspirations, of entering a higher social class through an elevation of moral conduct.

Interestingly, the code of conduct for which the Colonel was so admired by Victorian audiences has distinct eighteenth-century origins. Viewed from the vantage point of the mid-nineteenth century, the old-fashioned, eighteenth-century values exhibited by the Colonel are idealized; nostalgia makes them desirable or, at the very least, more desirable than contemporary nineteenth-century values. However, while the contemporary audience identified with these values out of a sense of nostalgia, the Colonel identifies with this earlier time simply because it is all that he knows. Absent from innovations and social developments in England for over a quarter of a century, the Colonel relies on the principles of an earlier age as the foundation of his tastes and behaviors to dictate his own actions. As such, the fact that the Colonel is a returned colonizer, though largely ignored in critical discussions of his gentlemanliness, should be considered a fundamental aspect of his character and an integral component of his identity as a gentleman.[24] For, if Catherine Peters's assertion is correct—that "one important preoccupation of the novel is the attempt to define, more searchingly than ever before the idea of the gentleman"—why is the ideal gentleman located in a returned

[24] Gilmour argues that the Colonel's "Anglo-Indian origin" is antithetical to his Englishness (41). However, given the fact that Colonel Newcome's origin is English—he was born and raised there—this claim refutes itself.

colonizer who, because of his colonial experience, exists as an exile on the periphery of English society (225)?[25] How is the returned Anglo-Indian an ideal English gentleman?

After completing the overture, an allegory about authors and critics featuring animals of various types, Pendennis opens the novel with an extended nostalgic lamentation that begins with a claim—"There was once a time when the sun used to shine brighter than it appears to do in this latter half of the nineteenth century"—and ends at the "Cave of Harmony," a favorite after-hours haunt for those in the mood for a late dinner and a song (7). Fittingly, this venue provides the setting of the Colonel's introduction to both the novel and to the narrator:

> There came into the 'Cave' a gentleman with a lean brown face and long black mustachios, dressed in very loose clothes, and evidently a stranger to the place. At least he had not visited it for a long time. He was pointing out changes to a lad who was in his company; and, calling for sherry-and-water, he listened to the music and twirled his mustachios with great enthusiasm. (8)

What is striking about his description of the Colonel is the attention given to his physical appearance. His complexion, his style of facial hair, and his clothing all mark him as a man from another place or, as Pendennis immediately qualifies his initial claim that the man is a stranger, as a man who has not been in this place, specifically London, for a

[25] Thackeray's interest in the idea of the gentleman also manifests itself in *The Four Georges*: "What is it to be a gentleman? Is it to have lofty aims, to lead a pure life, to keep your honor virgin; to have esteem of your fellow-citizens, and the love of your fireside; to bear good fortune meekly; to suffer evil with constancy; and through evil or good to maintain truth always? Show me the happy man whose life exhibits these qualities, and him we will salute as gentleman, whatever his rank may be" (108-109). He identifies Walter Scott, Robert Southey, Cuthbert Collingwood, and Reginald Heber, all writers, as gentlemen.

number of years. Of course, Pendennis is not alone in his identification of the Colonel as a man who has spent a number of years beyond England's borders. Later in the evening, Nadab the Improvisatore, the featured singer at the "Cave," offers his audience an improvised song featuring lyrics about the people present, including the Colonel: "'A military gent I see—and while his face I scan, / I think you'll all agree with me—He came from Hindostan'" (11). While the Colonel is ecstatic at the singer's inclusion of him into the song, the singer's choice of words demonstrates how the Colonel's physical appearance immediately marks him as different, as a man from another place. The fact that the singer can see that he has been in India by only glancing at him, coupled with the fact that the singer knows his audience will agree with his observation, shows how the experience of India separates the Colonel from the Englishmen in the room.

Of course, the cultural separation between the Colonel and the other men in the room is based on more than the physical. While immediately and significantly identifiable in his appearance, the Colonel's prolonged distance from both England and English culture also, just as significantly, manifests itself in his mannerisms and opinions. In speaking with Clive and his father, Pendennis learns that his (and everyone else's) initial supposition is correct: the Colonel has recently returned from India and, thus, is a stranger to England.[26] As a matter of fact, the Colonel has been absent for thirty-five years, a significant period of time by any standard but critical to understanding the Colonel: his frame of cultural reference is based on the England he left, not the England

[26] A further clue to the Colonel's Anglo-Indian identity in this scene is his use of the term "brandy-pawnee" instead of brandy and water (10). The Colonel's use of the Anglo-Indian vernacular for common items demonstrates the extent to which his customs have been shaped by his Anglo-Indian experience.

to which he as returned. Case in point, he has brought his son to this place to see what he refers to as "the wits" because, as Clive tells Pendennis, "'He says all the wits used to come here, —Mr. Sheridan, Captain Morris, Colonel Hanger, Professor Porson'" (9). For the Colonel, the 'Cave of Harmony' exists as the locus of English intellectualism, and, as an admirer of the English intellectualism of the England that he left, Colonel Newcome wants to surround both himself and his son with the best that English culture has to offer. However, as evidenced by the events that transpire, the "Cave of Harmony" is no longer what it once was. Instead of intellectuals, the "Cave of Harmony" features singers, who however talented they may be, do not bear the title of wit, as defined by the Colonel. In other words, no matter how tickled he is as at his inclusion in the Nadab's song, the Nadab is no Mr. Sheridan. Moreover, as evidenced by the note of warning to the owner of the establishment—"a boy was in the room, and a gentleman who was quite a greenhorn: hence that the songs had better be carefully selected"—the songs are neither intellectual, genteel, nor intended for a general audience (10). Rather, the songs are intended for a very specific audience: modern English men. In referring to the Colonel as a greenhorn, the writer of the note recognizes that his sensibilities are not adequately suited to modern forms of humor, implying that not only is he a stranger but that he is old-fashioned.

Despite the apprehension felt on his behalf, the Colonel, excited to be with his son again and "to see all that is to be seen" in London, initially enjoys the non-wit entertainment on display. He even contributes to the evening's festivities by singing "Wapping Old Stairs," an old ballad quite out of fashion yet ultimately accepted by the

audience because, according to Pendennis, "[t]here was something touching in the naïveté and kindness of the placid and simple gentleman" (12). Rather than the song itself, which the Colonel happens to sing with profound emotion, the audience responds to aspects of the Colonel's character exhibited in his performance. What makes these characteristics so praiseworthy, presumably, is their rarity. In drawing attention to the Colonel's naïveté, kindness, placidity, and simplicity as the factors that prompted an emotional response in the audience members, attributes that caused them to feel touched by the performance, Pendennis makes an implicit comparison between the Colonel and the average Englishman; the Colonel possesses qualities that seemingly no longer exist, and as such, ironically, the Colonel is momentarily celebrated, rather than disparaged, for his old-fashionedness and his difference.

Unfortunately for the Colonel, the evening at the "Cave" ends with a skirmish that simultaneously puts a damper on the evening and reveals the Colonel's standards for proper gentlemanly behavior. Following the Colonel's song, the intoxicated Captain Costigan offers his own rendition of the ballad before presenting his own song, "one of the most outrageous performances of his repertoire," to the delight of almost the entire audience, the single exception being, unsurprisingly, the Colonel (13). At the end of the second verse, the Colonel, "looking as ferocious as though he had been going to do battle with a Pindaree," brings the song to an abrupt halt with a declaration of his displeasure at both the song itself and the crowd's encouragement of Costigan:

> 'Does any gentleman say, 'Go on?' Does any man who has a wife and sisters, or children at home, say 'Go on' to such disgusting ribaldry as

> this? Do you dare sir, to call yourself a gentleman, and to say you hold the king's commission, and to sit down amongst Christians and men of honour, and defile the ears of young boys with this wicked balderdash?'…
>
> I thought I was coming to a society of gentlemen,…I never could have believed that Englishmen could meet together and allow a man, and an old man, so to disgrace himself. For shame, you old wretch! Go home to your bed, you hoary old sinner! (13)

Obviously, the Colonel's castigation of Costigan and his fans is based on his notions of proper gentlemanly behavior. According to the Colonel's code of conduct, a man with dependents at home and a man in the service to both King and country should behave in a respectable manner, which means that he should neither sing nor cheer "outrageous," "disgusting" songs. Although the lyrics of this particular song are never shared with the reader, the Colonel's comments indicate that they are in some way lewd or scandalous or unseemly, certainly not the form of entertainment suitable for a gentleman. The fact that the Colonel could not imagine this kind of behavior could take place in England amongst Englishman, coupled with the fact that the other men are not demonstrably offended by what they hear—based on their reactions, it seems rather standard fare for the 'Cave'—shows the extent of the evolution of culture in England since he has been away. By admitting that his presumption that he was spending the evening amongst gentleman has been contradicted, the Colonel essentially categorizes these men as something other than gentleman. At the very least, they are not gentlemen according to his standards. While the Colonel does leave the "Cave" disappointed in the society to which he has returned,

Pendennis uses this scene to establish the Colonel as an old-fashioned gentleman. Though out of place in the "Cave" and in much of the rest of London—as becomes abundantly clear as the novel progresses—Colonel Newcome stands out as the model of the true gentleman, a gentleman who demonstrates a strict adherence to an honor, morality, and propriety of a not too distant past, specifically of thirty-five years before.

By situating Colonel Newcome's character on the figurative border between England and India and, concurrently, between the present and the past, Thackeray can explore both the ways in which colonial experience shapes identity and the attributes that transform a man into a gentleman. The Colonel, now a stranger in England, relies on a cultural frame of reference that just so happens to be over three decades old as the foundation of his English identity. Feeling isolated from the culture in which he finds himself, he clings to his antiquated notions out of habit—it is all he knows, after all—and out of necessity. As such, in performing the role of an eighteenth-century English gentleman, the Colonel, much like Jos did as the English dandy, asserts his English identity, an identity compromised by his colonial service. To overcome the distance, both literal and metaphorical, that positions him in a perpetual state of exile, Colonel Newcome actively constructs his English identity. For him, being English means being a gentleman, and, being a gentleman means being an intellectual: "I admire genius. I salute it wherever I meet it…One of the great pleasures and delights which I had proposed to myself on coming home was to be allowed to have the honour of meeting with men of learning and genius, with wits, poets, and historians" (40). Intellectualism, not the outward displays of wealth, marks the gentleman. Although he professes not to possess

the attributes of the intellectual himself, he maintains his standing as a gentleman by the company he keeps; he is both a gentleman and an intellectual by association. Incidentally, it is his need to associate with intellectuals that precipitates his decision to take Clive to the "Cave of Harmony" in the first place—it is where the wits of the old days frequented—and then to leave when he realizes that the men in his company, specifically Captain Costigan and his fans, are not intellectuals, not gentlemen, at all. Their ungentlemanly behavior is both an offense to his sensibilities and a threat to his identity. He needs other gentlemen present to be a gentleman.

However, since actual gentlemen seem to be a rather endangered species in London, the Colonel surrounds himself with the products of gentlemen—books. Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, Colonel Newcome holds Samuel Johnson, or Dr. Johnson as he refers to him, in the highest esteem and selects his library for the quality of the gentlemen that appear in them: "'I read these, sir,…because I like to be in the company of gentlemen; and Sir Roger de Coverley, and Sir Charles Grandison, and Don Quixote are the finest gentlemen in the world" (41).[27] Through books and, more significantly, through fictional—and not always English—characters, he constructs his identity; through books he sees himself as a gentleman.[28] Through this belief in the intersection between gentlemanliness and intellectualism, Colonel Newcome introduces yet another conflict in

[27] Roger de Coverley is a character and fictional contributor to *The Spectator* (1711-1712), Sir Charles Grandison is the protagonist of Samuel Richardson's *The History of Sir Charles Grandison* (1754), and Don Quixote is the hero of *The Life and Exploits of the Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote de la Mancha* (1605-1615) by Cervantes. These three characters share three important traits: they are noblemen, they have integrity, and they are moral. Grandison and Don Quixote, like the Colonel, are likeable and simple.
[28] In *The Four Georges* Thackeray points to writers, "men of my own profession of letters," for examples of "some who merit the title of gentlemen," rather than to the monarchs who, from the title, appear to be the focus of the sketch (102).

the novel, specifically the conflict between intellectualism and commerce, which is itself a conflict between past and present. Interestingly, this conflict manifests itself as family discord between Colonel Newcome, the returned colonizer and old-fashioned gentleman, versus his half-brothers Hobson and Sir Brian Newcome, the finance-oriented modern gentlemen, whose status is ensured not through their behavior but by their money.

Of course, since this novel is a history of the Newcome family, it stands to reason that the novel's conflicts would be represented through familial relationships. After introducing the Colonel in the "Cave of Harmony" scene, Pendennis immediately offers a brief Newcome family history. Despite the efforts of certain family members to construct a lineage dating back to the days of King Edward the Confessor, the Newcome family history begins when the family's patriarch, Thomas Newcome, arrived in London from a northern manufacturing town during the reign of George III. He gained employment as a weaver at the Hobson Brothers clothing factory, and like "many other London apprentices, he began poor and ended by marrying his master's daughter, and becoming sheriff and alderman of the City of London" (15). Newcome's story, then, is a rags-to-riches tale, a tale of ingenuity, hard work, and an advantageous marriage. In fact, Thomas's second marriage—his first marriage to a poor woman from the north who died in giving birth to the second Thomas Newcome, the eventual Colonel—allows for his personal success and introduces wealth into the Newcome family. Young Thomas, though initially his stepmother's darling, soon becomes down-graded to the status of second-class citizen after his twin stepbrothers are born. Out of place in his stepmother's household and perceived as little more than a source of contamination of the youngest

Newcomes, young Thomas contents himself through reading. In fact, a book is both the source of his solace and his stepmother's solution to the problem of Thomas's presence: "The boy had a great fancy for India; and 'Orme's History,' containing the exploits of Clive and Lawrence was his favourite book of all in his father's library. Being offered a writership, he scouted the idea of a civil appointment, and would be contented with nothing but the uniform" (23). For the young Thomas, India or, to be more accurate, literary representations of India, exists as an escape from the reality of his unfulfilling home life. Engrossed within the world of a book, Thomas saves himself from his stepmother's scorn and simultaneously attains the foundations of his career, for Robert Orme's *History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan* published in 1763-1778 chronicles the militaristic and, in the young man's eyes, heroic exploits of the British in India. Based on his reading, he constructs an identity and a profession for himself—a military hero—in much the same fashion that he maintains his identity as a gentleman through his library as an adult.

However, while his childhood reading leads to his military training, it is unrequited love—the daughter of his French teacher refuses his proposal—rather than the ambition to be in the military that actually drives young Thomas to leave the scene of his heartbreak, England, for India. Although Orme has given him a certain amount of knowledge about India, his frame of reference is based entirely on military pursuits, on battles, victories, and defeats. He never understands the emotional and psychological effect of living and serving so far away from family and friends. Therefore, while Pendennis does allude to his military victories from time to time, more emphasis is

placed on his melancholy than on his triumphs as a means of allowing his readers another perspective, the private perspective, of the experience of India:

> What a strange pathos seems to accompany all our Indian story! Besides that official history which fills *Gazettes*, and embroiders banners with names of victory; which gives moralists and enemies cause to cry out at English rapine; and enables patriots to boast of invincible British valour—besides the spendour and conquest, the wealth and glory, the crowned ambition, the conquered danger, the vast prize, and the blood freely shed in winning it—should not one remember the tears too? (54)

In drawing attention to the pathos, Thackeray, via Pendennis, draws attention and empathy to the Colonel because for him the Colonel is more than a military figure, he is both a man and a father.[29] In sending the five-year old Clive home to live with his Aunt Honeyman, the Colonel, a widower, acted according to custom; children born in India, like Thackeray himself, were sent home to England to be educated. Despite the propriety of his action, though, Newcome mourns the separation from his son and spends all of his waking moments imagining their reunion. In casting the Colonel in this light, in drawing attention to the emotions felt and expressed by a father for his son, Thackeray humanizes the colonizer and the imperial experience. Through this private story of India embodied in the Colonel, he becomes more than a stranger. He is not simply a stranger; rather, he has been made a stranger by his detachment from the home country and from his family.

[29] In identifying a "strange pathos [that] seems to accompany all our Indian story," Pendennis establishes Colonel Newcome as a pathetic character and himself as an empathetic narrator. Through the narration, Pendennis exposes the Colonel's flaws but presents them as the result of his Indian experience rather than as inherent character traits.

As such, in chronicling the Colonel's experiences in England in the days and weeks following his return, Pendennis presents the Colonel as an outsider rather than a hero because that is how he is seen by everyone he encounters. The Colonel's outsider status is consistently reinforced through the manner in which he is described by both the narrator and the other characters. In these descriptions, two binaries are established. The first, already mentioned to a certain extent, is the binary between the Colonel, the old-fashioned gentleman, and all other men, the contemporary English gentleman. The second is the binary between the Colonel, the Anglo-Indian, and everyone else, the English. The question to ask is to what extent are these binaries related to or dependent on one another. As stated, the Colonel bases his notions of the gentleman on intellectual pursuits and exhibits his status as a gentleman through his literary tastes. However, while other characters, especially Pendennis, regard him as a gentleman as well, it is not because of his intellectualism but his old fashionedness, his simplicity, his calm and reserved character, his rigid belief in class distinctions. Furthermore, many characters admire the Colonel for his emotional expressiveness, his joy and love and concern for others and identify him as almost child-like in his knowledge of the world around him. No matter how positive the description of him is, though, the important thing to remember is that he is always distinguished as different. People are drawn to him and comment on his character because it is so different from everyone else's. Of course, what makes him different, what makes him simple and loving, could simply be his personality. However, the perpetual connection between the Colonel and the past demonstrates the extent to which his character has been affected by colonial service. He is simply stuck in

the England that he left behind; he lacks the cultural and social experiences to modernize. In fact, his half-brother, Brian, makes a pointed connection between his personality and his time out of England: "'He seems a very kind-hearted simple man," the Baronet said: 'eccentric, but he has been more than thirty years away from home" (65). The Baronet's use of the word "seems" here draws attention to the nature of perception and the role of appearances in forming opinions. From his perspective, the Colonel appears to be kind and simple; however, in using "seems" he fails to offer a concrete description of his brother. Moreover, the word that follows this description is "eccentric." For Brian, the shrewd businessman, the modern English gentleman, simplicity and kindness, rather than being admirable qualities of an old-fashioned gentleman, are the hallmarks of an eccentric personality.

As such, it is clear that the Colonel's Indian service provides the foundation of his difference from everyone else. Along with repeated references to his simplicity, which is linked to his being stuck in the past because of his time away from England, he, like Jos before him, is repeatedly called an Indian, or some derivation thereof, by both the narrator and the other characters. The Newcomes refer to him as "their Indian relative" and their "Indian brother" (51). Incidentally, he only reconciles himself to his half-brothers via the money he has sent home to their bank from India (51). Money solidifies the familial bonds, but the familial bond is qualified. The Colonel is not simply a relative or a brother; he is an Indian relative, an Indian brother. By extension, the manner in which the Colonel is treated by his brothers represents the ways in which the returned colonizer is treated by his fellow Britons: he is both a part of and isolated from the home

culture. The extent to which the Anglo-Indian is accepted is based largely on what he provides.

It should be noted, though, that the use of the term "Indian" is not always used in the same way. Specifically, those who appreciate the Colonel use the term in a descriptive way. Those who do not appreciate him use it in a derogatory manner. This difference in use can be explained by the following: "everybody who knew him, loved him; everybody that is, who loved modesty, and generosity, and honour" (58). Barnes Newcome, the Colonel's nephew, loves none of these qualities. He never fully welcomes his uncle home. He continually makes disparaging remarks about his uncle and repeatedly refers to him as an Indian or as his "Indian uncle" (631). For Barnes, the term Indian marks him as a lower class of person, a person "utterly ignorant both of society and business here" (631). Over time, Barnes comes to hate his uncle, but after he first arrives home, Barnes shows some interest in him and wants to learn more: "'You don't know anything against my uncle do you, Sir Thomas? Have I any Brahminical cousins? Need we be ashamed of him?" (67). Somewhat paradoxically, he has no interest in his military victories, the cause for adulation or pride, but in scandalous behavior.[30]

For Barnes, the most shameful and, thus, damning behavior his uncle could engage in, apparently, is fathering a child with a native woman. As Shuchi Kapila elucidates, many Europeans, including Britons, lived with one or more Indian wives or concubines in India during the late eighteenth century (1). Of course, what was deemed

[30] Sir Thomas fails to regard the insinuation and informs Barnes he would be better off if he were more like his uncle: "'He's an odd man: they call him Don Quixote in India…because he is one of the bravest officers that ever lived…because he gives himself no dashed airs, although he has reason to be proud if he chose'" (67).

appropriate amongst these men was not necessarily shared by their peers at home, as evidenced by Barnes's questions. For Barnes, mixing of the races results in a pollution of the bloodline. He classifies the hypothetical cousins—whose existence he apprehensively speculates—as Brahminical, which suggests that he sees them as entirely other; they have no connection to Britain but are entirely native. The fact that he refers to these native cousins as Brahminical, rather than Indian, corresponds with British attitudes toward the native Indian peoples; according to Mrinalini Sinha, "the British emphasized what they considered to be irreconcilable differences of caste, religion, and community among the inhabitants of India. Consequently, they were loath to consider any one of the native groups as representative 'Indians.' Indeed, the term 'Indian,' as in Indian civilian or Indian army officer, was commonly used to refer to Anglo-Indians serving in India" (23-24). Given the diversity of the Indian populace, the British, apparently convinced of the notion that national identity is based on homogeneity rather than heterogeneity, employ an elaborate system of classification when referring to native peoples. Ironically, then, it is not the indigenous population of India, the colonized, but the English serving in India, the colonizer, who reserve the right to be called Indian.

This practice of referring to Anglo-Indians in England as Indian is common amongst the characters of the novel; the Colonel, his friend, James Binnie, and other former civil servants and military men are all referred to as Indians, as well. More often than not, it is merely a descriptor, but it can also be used as a slur, as in the case of Barnes. However, there is one more Indian mentioned in the text, an Indian who fails to fit with the borders of classification Sinha describes, namely Rummun Loll, "the

celebrated Indian merchant, otherwise his Excellency Rummun Loll, otherwise His Highness Rummun Loll, the chief proprietor of the diamond mines in Golconda, with a claim of three millions and a half upon the East India Company" (77). Here, the Indian in question is a native Indian, not a member of the East India Company as is the case with all the other Indians in the novel. Treated as a distinguished guest at Mrs. Hobson Newcome's party—the Englishmen make themselves sick in attempting to smoke the hookah as he does, and the Englishwomen hang on his every word—Colonel Newcome, who knew Loll in India, is outraged to learn that this man, "'who wouldn't sit down in an officer's presence'," is masquerading as and being treated like a prince (78). While Loll eventually plays an important role in the novel, which will be discussed in detail in the next few pages, the point of interest here is the fact that he is referred to as an Indian. While this point may seem insignificant, it does lead to a series of questions, some more relevant than others. Does the term Indian have more than one meaning? In this text, it seems to be the case. In using it to refer to both returned colonizers and Loll, Indian indicates both colonial service and country of origin. Regardless of the specific usage, though, the fact remains that the label connects all of these men, native Britons and native Indians, to India. If these men are all marked by their connection to India, why is James Binnie, who like the Colonel has served in India for over two decades—twenty-two years to be exact—referred to as both an Indian and a "Scotch-gentleman," but the Colonel is never referred to as an English gentleman? Why does Binnie retain his national identity while the Colonel does not? Perhaps it is simply because the narrator is attempting to maintain the sense of difference between these men and the other men in England. As a

"Scotch-gentleman," Binnie remains an outsider in London, even when not referred to as an Indian. The status of the "foreigner" never ceases to be a point of consideration, especially for those who are foreign, like Colonel Newcome.

Regardless of the time spent in England, the Colonel never feels that he belongs in his home country. Soon after he arrives, though, he does make some effort to modify his habits so as to better fit in. For instance, after meeting his niece Esther, the young woman whom he hopes will be Clive's future wife, the Colonel decides that he must wear more fashionable clothes, for as he instructs his servant, "'see that I don't do anything or wear anything unusual. I have been so long out of Europe, that I don't know the customs here, and am not above learning" (159). With this simple instruction, the Colonel admits that his time in India has left him in the position of a cultural outsider, a man who can easily draw attention to himself simply with his appearance. The evening at the "Cave of Harmony" corroborates this assertion. Eager to fit in, eager to learn and acclimate himself to English culture, the Colonel does try to accommodate his tastes to more modern fare. Over time, though, despite professing contentedness with being in England, it becomes clear that the more time he spends there, the more, not less, out of place he feels: "in spite of his happiness, his honest face grew melancholy; his loose clothes hung only the looser on his lean limbs; he ate his meals without appetite; his nights were restless" (197-8). Nothing he does gives him joy, and, as a result, he becomes a shell of the man he had once been; there is nothing in England to sustain him outside of his son, who as a young adult becomes more of a stranger to his father with each passing day. He attempts to appreciate all that Clive and his friends appreciate, especially when it comes to literature,

but to no avail: “Doctor Johnson not write English! Lord Byron not one of the greatest poets of the world! Sir Walter a poet of the second order! Mr. Pope attacked for inferiority and want of imagination; Mr. Keats and this young Mr. Tennyson of Cambridge, the chief of modern poetic literature!...Such opinions were not of the Colonel’s time” (200). Given the position literature holds for the Colonel, it comes to no surprise that these modern pronouncements fall on disbelieving ears. He cannot fathom how his favorite artists, the gentlemen with whom he fraternizes, can be so easily dismissed; in disparaging these writers, Clive and his friends implicitly disparage the Colonel. He is out of fashion and out of place. It should come as little surprise then that after a few years of furlough, he contemplates the necessity of returning to India with mixed feelings. He wants to be with his son and, therefore, wants to stay, but at the same time, his lack of resources—he has spent all of his money on Clive and in paying his brother-in-law’s debts—coupled with the alienation he feels make him eager to go back. In fact, as he tells Pendennis, “‘I will go back, sir, where I have some friends, and where I am somebody still” (255). With this statement, the Colonel implicitly identifies what he lacks at home: friends and respect. The number of relations he has in England cannot surpass the feeling of belonging he has in India. After all, in India, he is a military hero. In England, he is just another eccentric Anglo-Indian.

As a result of this decision, the Colonel exists only on the periphery of the novel for the next several years and several hundred pages and is only mentioned through his correspondence with Clive and certain other acquaintances; since Pendennis does not accompany the Colonel to India, he cannot chronicle his exploits in India directly. Based

on the lack of attention given to the Colonel in this section of the novel, it can be surmised that what we do hear of him is of great importance. Arguably, the most significant event that befalls Colonel Newcome during his second term of Indian service is his relationship with Rummun Loll, the novel's other Indian. In a letter to Clive, Colonel reveals the details of his unexpected partnership with the man he believed to be a fraud at Mrs. Newcome's party in London years before: Loll saves the Colonel from a financial loss and then encourages the Colonel to become a shareholder in the Bundelcund Bank. Once he is a shareholder himself, he encourages family members and friends to become shareholders as well, and because they trust him, they follow his advice.

Through his association with Rummun Loll and as a shareholder in the Bundelcund Bank, Colonel Newcome enters the world of commercial banking inhabited by his half-brothers and his nephew and participates in the contemporary economy through investment or, depending on your perspective, speculation. At the time, while these terms were used to describe very similar if not identical practices, the attitude toward the practice was antithetical: "the distinction between gambling or speculation and sound investment is fuzzy; it seems often to depend merely on whether a business venture succeeds or fails" (Brantlinger 97). Through his association with the successful and prosperous bank, which is perceived as a sound investment, the Colonel is granted an unprecedented level of respect from his Newcome relations when he eventually, and finally, returns home to England. Although he appreciates the kind feelings, he has no misapprehension as to its source, for when commenting on Barnes's apparent change in

attitude towards him, the Colonel reveals, "'Tom Newcome, of the Bundelcund Bank, is a personage to be conciliated, whereas Tom Newcome, of the Bengal Cavalry, was not worth Master Barnes's attention'" (517). It is only through business that the Colonel has any real clout in his family or power in England. It remains puzzling, though, why the Colonel trusts Loll to begin with and why his family and friends trusted his advice. On more than one occasion, the narrator and Clive comment on the Colonel's lack of business acumen, especially after he returns from India. Perhaps the desire to profit on the empire blinds the Colonel's friends to the potential dangers in the enterprise; because they see him as simple and kind-hearted and generous, they refuse to acknowledge that his naïveté will pose a threat to them. Interestingly, now that he is a shareholder and advocate for the bank, he is referred to as a "capitalist" rather than an Indian gentleman by none other than his nephew, Barnes (520). Through the Bank, he becomes like other English men or, at the very least, like his half-brothers and nephew, all of whom work in the family business, Hobson Brothers and Newcome.

As capitalist, the Colonel brings together English and Anglo-Indian society in London; he engages in the commercial interests like an Englishman and associates with Anglo-Indians. In London, he sets up his house in a lavish way that is described as "his lavish Indian way" (626). Although his half-brothers make the most of their opportunities to display their wealth, the Colonel's manner of doing so is qualified as Indian, which suggests that his cultural predilections result in a more ostentatious display than would be expected of an Englishman. Like Jos, then, he is attempting to use his wealth and his ability to display to wealth to create a place for himself in England. However, also like

Jos, his wealth does nothing to make him feel more comfortable in English society. Instead, the Colonel chooses to spend most of his time with men he finds a connection to, the connection, of course, being India: "the old boys, the old generals, the old colonels, the old qui-his from the club" (626). The repetition of the word old draws attention to both the generational and the cultural gap. Whereas the Colonel is celebrated, in part, for his new capitalistic ways, his nephew, who earlier acknowledges that he must treat his uncle differently in manners of business, still looks down on his uncle because he believes him to be "utterly ignorant both of society and business here" (631). Unsurprisingly, a minor war erupts between uncle and nephew when they both run for Parliament. While the Colonel aspires to a position as director of the East India Company, he is encouraged to run for Parliament as a Liberal candidate against Barnes despite the fact his own sentimental beliefs in class divisions align him more closely with the Tories. For the Liberals, the Colonel's actual political beliefs matter little. They simply need a candidate that provides a distinct contrast to Barnes. As such, Colonel Newcome functions as a symbol of strong moral character and integrity against Barnes, who is projected as a neglectful husband and father and, thereby, a neglectful representative for the district.

Aside from the internal warfare between the Newcomes, ultimately, like many other Indian banks, the Bundelcund collapses.[31] Contrary to its solid façade, the Bundelcund is a "complicated, enormous, outrageous swindle," and all of the

[31] Thackeray lost his own money in a similar fashion. According to McMaster, "the failure of the Bundelcund Bank is not exotically remote from the experience or knowledge of Thackeray's English readers, who had witnessed similar evolutions in banking at home. He does cater to their xenophobia and racism however by making Rummun Loll and his company the cause of the Bundelcund Bank's failure" (117-118).

shareholders lose their money (691). Since he was the one who encouraged their investment or, as it is finally perceived, their speculation, everyone who loses money blames the Colonel. As was customary in joint-stock companies of the time, despite the personal risk inherent in this type of speculation, none of the shareholders accepts personal responsibility for the losses because "[i]n evaluating the viability of companies, then, the primary criterion used by potential investors was the reputation of individual partners" (Miller, "Subjectivity Ltd." 141). The shareholders recruited by the Colonel place all of their trust in and thus all of the responsibility on the Colonel. As a result, the Colonel, once a financial savior, is now a villain, especially to Clive's mother-in-law who finds every opportunity she can to demean the Colonel as retribution for her daughter Rosey's losses. Ultimately, the Colonel is forced into bankruptcy and ends his life as a pensioner at his old school.

The bank fraud and the speculation in the bank ruin Colonel Newcome. Brantlinger argues that this bank fraud is a representation of the extent to which the Colonel and, by extension, England have been corrupted by India: "What is at the periphery of the novel's concentric social circles—India—is treated least sympathetically of all, as the ultimate source of the fortunes and misfortunes of the novel's most central, most sympathetic characters, Clive and the Colonel" (Brantlinger 99). While India certainly contributes to their financial ruin—it is the setting of the bank and the basis of the speculation—this reading seems to exempt both Clive and his father from blame or, at the very least, from responsibility. What Brantlinger seemingly refuses to acknowledge is that neither of these characters—a simple, old-fashioned gentleman and an artist—is in a

position to engage in the complex world of finances and commerce; they are foolhardy to do so. For Brantlinger, this foolhardiness is not a personal flaw but a sign of contamination: "Art and war, Clive and the Colonel, are separate, pure, higher than the money-grubbing world of commerce; yet as the plot records, the diseases of the lower world infect the higher, the periphery invades the center, India corrupts England" (100). Certainly, Rummun Loll, the figure of the corrupt and corrupting India, is embraced by the English at Mrs. Newcome's party; he says he is a prince, and in their desire to associate with royalty, they believe him. While the Colonel initially sees through this sham, he later gives Loll the benefit of the doubt and begins to trust him. It remains unclear why this change occurs, or why he fails to follow his initial instincts regarding the man. Perhaps it is because he is blinded by his desire to provide for Clive; his dreams of financial security for his son prevent him from recognizing the potential danger of the situation. If this is the case, his cultural bias towards English gentility and his desire to see his son established as an English gentleman make him open to the suggestion of amassing a fortune through speculation. In other words, despite Brantlinger's claim that "the entire scheme of the Bundelcund Bank rests ultimately on the quicksand of that 'Asiatic mendacity' which Macaulay, Charles Grant, James Mill, and Thackeray all identify particularly with the Bengali race," India does not corrupt (102). Rather, it is the opportunity for wealth that India represents in the English imagination that encourages the Colonel and his fellow English shareholders to invest in the bank. Certainly, Loll is presented as duplicitous and corrupt but then again so is Barnes. Specifically, Barnes Newcome recognizes what is happening with the bank and does nothing to save his uncle

or the other investors out of spite. Although Brantlinger does refer to both Barnes and Loll as traitors, he vilifies Loll more despite the fact that Barnes is presented as a despicable man who defiles and degrades women and who abandons his uncle when he needs him most. If, as Brantlinger claims, "immorality, crime, and disease emanate in part from India, the farthest periphery," we need to investigate where else it emanates from; in this case, it seems that it is from England itself (102). Barnes represents the English greed that benefits from assertions of Indian degeneracy. This Othering of the Bengali race that Brantlinger sees in Macaulay, Charles Grant, James Mill, and Thackeray seems little more than a cover-up of English immorality, which ultimately corrupts Colonel Newcome.

Although held in contempt by many because of his innocent and simple nature, the Colonel remains a pathetic character until the end of his life. Penniless and broken, Colonel Newcome spends his last remaining days as a pensioner. Fittingly, his death scene, which is both sentimental and tragic, serves as a final reminder of the disconnect between Anglo-Indian and English society and how the Anglo-Indian is treated by the English. The Anglo-Indian is only accepted and acknowledged through financial prosperity, which demonstrates the inherent hypocrisy of the national interest in colonies. When he ceases to be useful, he is left to fend for himself, and although he is surrounded by those who truly love him, he leaves this world with no recognition for his contributions to England's prosperity through military pursuits or through his generosity to his family. If Jos serves as a warning—what will happen to us if this is the type of person serving in India?—then the Colonel is a reminder of the individual sacrifice and

personal responsibility involved in the imperial process. His faults, though many, stem from his belief in the England he left as a young man. As a result, his demise marks the end of a way of thinking and being that cannot be reclaimed.

The "Foreigner": Revealing the Bond between Colony and Nation

Despite his unsolicited and supposed status as predecessor-apparent to Rudyard Kipling as the voice of Anglo-India, Thackeray, of course, is not the only author to write about India or, more precisely, to include returned Anglo-Indian characters in novels of English society. For instance, Elizabeth Gaskell's *Cranford*, published chronologically between *Vanity Fair* and *The Newcomes*, also features returned Anglo-Indians, at least three to be exact, but none more significant than Peter Jenkyns. Unlike his fictional Anglo-Indian counterparts, Jos Sedley and Colonel Newcome, though, Peter Jenkyns spends almost the entirety of the novel in India. In fact, until his eventual return to his only surviving family member, his sister Matilda, and the land of his birth as an old man in the penultimate chapter, he only enters the narrative as a figure from the past after a stack of old letters elicits an untold family history and again after a stranger arrives in town with a story of her own experience in India. However, despite his prolonged existence outside of *Cranford*, the narrative's conclusion depends on his marginal status both as a secondary character and as a returned Anglo-Indian: because of the money he has earned over a lifetime in India, Peter saves his sister Matty from relying on the charity of others and, significantly, brings the community of Cranford together. Peter's ultimate impact on the community is all the more significant because Cranford is a community that is almost without exception comprised solely of women. As such, since

he is treated as a stranger, Peter, the returned colonizer, offers insight into the dependent relationship between England and India, for although it presents itself as entirely shut off from or, at the very least, only tangentially connected to the rest of the world, Cranford and its society—like England and its society—relies heavily on its colonial holdings in India and the endeavors of the Englishmen serving there for financial security and stability.

However significant this connection between colony and metropole may be, it remains hidden under the surface of both English society and the novel. *Cranford*, after all, presents itself as an episodic novel about life in a quiet and seemingly isolated English village inhabited almost entirely of women. Accordingly, *Cranford* is often read as novel about a feminine utopia. It seems that the lack of men within the society in question can be equated to an ideological position: the lack of men is not simply a feature of the society but an ideal feature of the society. From this critical perspective, Gaskell is seen as using the novel to present a vision of a world where women live free from men and, thus, according to their own dictates. For example, Rae Rosenthal, who bases her reading of the novel on Elaine Showalter's concept of women's culture as a "wild zone" that exists outside of masculine culture, argues that "[the novel] creates the possibility that the muted culture might accept its marginal space, reject the dominant culture, and establish itself as an alternative community—a feminist utopia—a separate and better world in which women live pacifically" (73). The key to this vision of Cranford as feminine (or feminist) utopia, obviously, is that this community exists not just on the margins but completely separate from the dominant (masculine) culture. Since this

complete separation between masculine and feminine communities apparently exists as a determining factor—to be utopian, the community must be separate—the events in the novel contradict the possibility that the novel does what Rosenthal claims it does.[32] Cranford, despite apparent evidence to the contrary, is not and cannot be utopian for the simple reason that men and thereby the dominant culture are never fully absent; Cranford is not completely isolated from men, the rest of England, or from the world.[33] Rather, as the repeated male intrusions into Cranford society demonstrate, Cranford is fully connected to the world beyond its borders and thus exists as a part of a larger community, the nation, rather than as an isolated, self-contained entity.

To fully appreciate the significance of the male intrusions that ultimately function as a bridge between Cranford and the outside world requires an understanding of the town of Cranford itself, both what it is and what it represents. In the opening chapter, titled "Our Society," the narrator, Mary Smith, introduces the reader to Cranford.[34] As evidenced by her first sentence, this society defines itself by the gender and the class of its inhabitants:

> In the first place, Cranford is in possession of the Amazons; all the holders of houses above a certain rent are women. If a married couple come to settle in the town, somehow the gentleman disappears; he is either fairly

[32] Of course, Rosenthal is not alone in her reading of Cranford as a female utopia. See also, for example, Nina Auerbach, Rowena Fowler, Carol Lansbury, and Barbara Weiss.

[33] In making this argument, I align myself with critics such as Malcolm Pittock, Margaret Reeves, and Jenny Uglow who call attention to the repeated introduction of male characters as evidence that Cranford is not an isolated society but a society that relies on both masculine and feminine qualities to survive (Uglow 288).

[34] Although Mary identifies herself as a part of this society—evidenced by her use of "Our" in the chapter title—she is only a frequent visitor, not an actual resident of Cranford. Her dual perspective as both Cranford insider and outsider is critical to her narrative voice; she is close enough to speak with knowledge, but distant enough to be (relatively) objective.

> frightened to death by being the only man in the Cranford evening parties, or he is accounted for by being with his regiment, his ship, or closely engaged in business all the week in the great neighbouring commercial town of Drumble, distant only twenty miles on the railroad. (1)

The "Amazons" of Cranford are single, middle-class women—some widowed, some never married—of independent means. In the absence of men, these women support themselves.[35] For widows and spinsters survival requires self-reliance; no other option exists (Uglow 24). Furthermore, by calling these women "Amazons," Mary effectively aligns them to the mythic women warriors who challenged patriarchal authority in Ancient Greece and, thereby, stresses their inherent strength and their position on the borders of the dominant culture. Of course, she immediately undercuts the potential severity of these women—they are not warriors—and their marginal status by acknowledging the fact that men do enter and reside in Cranford. Their absence is not a matter of forced separation but a matter of necessity. Work calls them away from Cranford, and, fortunately for them, the railroad provides easy access between the village and Drumble, the representative setting of commerce and, thereby the dominant culture.

Regardless of their actual proximity to the outside world or to men, the society of women Mary writes about attempts to ignore everything that occurs outside of Cranford and concentrates its collective focus on domestic spaces, domestic issues, and domestic maintenance. In fact, maintenance—of gardens, appearances, households, order, sensibility, and respectability—provides the foundation for the society upon which the

[35] Presumably, since none of these women has an occupation, their primary means of financial support is inherited money.

Cranford ladies have built their lives (1). As such, given the inherent domestic and self-sustaining nature of their social structure, Cranford is more than a village. Cranford is a domestic space, and, because of this, the absence of men in Cranford is not a problem but a relief: "'A man,' as one of them observed to me once, 'is *so* in the way in the house!'" (1). With the emphasis on the "so," the anonymous woman Mary cites gives the impression that since men are little more than a nuisance within the domestic realm, the ladies have actively protected their unmarried status and have chosen to live their lives without men. In other words, their single-status reflects an active choice.

While remaining single may present certain advantages, the economic reality of living independently from men or, to put it another way, of living on a fixed income places these women in a tenuous position. The fragility of their economic self-sufficiency can be defined in a single term: "elegant economy" (4). Mary uses this term, a Cranfordism, to describe the means by which the ladies manage their money in such a way so as to maintain their class position; it "describes everything from managing household expenditures to regulating one's life" (Mulvihill 343). To maintain their status as ladies, they must be frugal, a necessity usually associated with the lower, not the upper, classes. Although frugality is difficult, as Mary acknowledges, it is fundamental to survival, specifically class survival, and is therefore tolerated: "I imagine that a few of the gentlefolks of Cranford were poor, and had some difficulty in making both ends meet; but they were like the Spartans, and concealed their smart with a smiling face. We none of us spoke of money, because that subject savoured of commerce and trade, and though some might be poor, we were all aristocratic" (3). To speak of money or to explicitly

admit to financial difficulties would require the ladies to engage in the discourse of commerce and trade, the discourse of the dominant culture. Moreover, to acknowledge a lack of money would sully the façade of gentility the women have constructed; they are ladies, after all. As such, by qualifying the term economy, a word from the dominant culture, with the word elegant, the ladies maintain the illusion that their status can be maintained without money, without connections to the vulgar realities of life that exist beyond the society's borders.

Despite this Cranfordian misapprehension, the repeated male intrusions into the domestic space indicate that Cranford is actually and firmly connected to the outside world. As a matter of fact, the most significant male intruders—Captain Brown, Major Gordon, Major Jenkyns, Signor Brunoni, and Peter Jenkyns—all come into Cranford from "the East." [36] Of course, as Brantlinger notes, this repeated intrusion of the East into Cranford is not unique to this text but a common feature of nineteenth-century novels: "the Empire may intrude as a shadowy realm of escape, renewal, banishment, or return for the characters who for one reason or another need to enter or exit the scenes of the domestic conflict" (12). However, while the East may simply serve as a narrative tool in this novel in that it is the place to and from which men go, it matters that this particular place, rather than another place like London, for example, remains in the background of the narrative. As a matter of fact, this repetition of the East is thematically significant, for as Jeffrey Cass argues: "through their stories or their occupations, [several of the men

[36] The use of the generic term east rather than a specific place name is significant; as an idea, the East exists as "a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences" (Said, *Orientalism* 1).

who appear in Cranford] represent the simultaneous fear and appeal of the Oriental Other as well as the impending social, cultural, and economic reconfiguration of the town that results from its infiltration into mainstream life" (425). In making this argument, Cass refers to these men, these Englishmen, as the "Oriental Other." While this label may not be entirely accurate—after all, they are English, not "Oriental" and some, like Captain Brown and Major Gordon, display no "Oriental" characteristics at all but simply have professional associations with the East—his use of it adequately describes the Cranfordians' perception that these men have experienced a fundamental change in character as a result of their experience in and contact with the East: to the ladies, these men have been Orientalized and, thus, are something other than English. Accordingly, the ladies' perception of each of these male intruders from the East must be taken into account, for while these men are all associated with the same place, the level of personal influence each has on Cranford varies. Furthermore, examining the interaction between the Cranford ladies and each of these intruding men will illuminate the significance of both the reception and the perception of Peter, the returned colonizer who not only stays but becomes an integral member of the Cranford society.

Captain Brown bears the distinction of being the first man to cross the seemingly impenetrable borders of Cranford and to insert himself in the society of ladies. Although he does have some association with the East—apparently he has served somewhere east

of the Cape of Good Hope—his more relevant association, at least for the ladies, is with the railroad.[37] Mary conveys the extent of the distress elicited by his presence:

> The ladies of Cranford were already rather moaning over the invasion of their territories by a man and a gentleman. He was a half-pay captain, and had obtained some situation on a neighbouring railroad, which had been vehemently petitioned against by the little town; and if, in addition to his masculine gender, and his connection with the obnoxious railroad, he was so brazen as to talk of being poor. (4)

In using the terms "invasion" and "territories," Mary extends the Amazon metaphor she employs in her initial description of the society to describe the ladies' militaristic isolationist stance. Cast in the role of invader, Captain Brown presents a triple threat to the Cranford way of life—he is a man; he works for the railroad; and he acknowledges his poverty—because he embodies their unacknowledged connection to the rest of the world and, thereby, contradicts the idea that Cranford is isolated and secure. However, despite the initial antagonism the ladies have for him, Captain Brown eventually becomes an important member of the society, not through warfare, but through diplomacy: "his excellent masculine common sense, and his facility in devising expedients to overcome domestic dilemmas, had gained him an extraordinary place as authority among the Cranford ladies" (5). Ironically, perhaps, he relies on the presumed attributes of his masculine gender—his common sense and his problem solving skills—to secure a

[37] Mary never divulges from where in the East Captain Brown has been. However, something of his past is revealed when Mrs. Jameson's husband's friend, Lord Mauleverer, comes to Cranford: "It was to see Captain Brown, with whom, it appears, his lordship was acquainted in the 'plumed wars,' and who had the privilege of averting destruction from his lordship's head when some great peril was impending over it, off the misnomered Cape of Good Hope" (14).

position for himself in Cranford. Although he does assume a position of authority, it is one given to him rather than one taken by him. As a result, his relation to the society is transformed: he is no longer an intruder but a guide.

Significantly, only Deborah Jenkyns, the presumed leader of the society, refuses to warm to his presence and maintains an attitude of cold formality towards him for the rest of his life, which, unfortunately for the Captain is not long: he is run over by a train while attempting to save a child who had wandered onto the tracks.[38] While the women of Cranford, even Deborah, view the incident as a tragedy, Nina Auerbach reads his death and subsequent dismissal from Cranford as a triumph of women over men: "[t]he episode of Captain Brown illustrates not only Cranford's unsettling power to obliterate men, but its corresponding gift of producing them at need" (81). Implicit in this claim is the notion that Cranford, whether the town itself or the society of women who inhabit it, has the power to attract and repel men at will. However, given the fact that Captain Brown is drawn to the town by a new occupation and is killed by a train while attempting to save a child's life, it seems inadequate to posit, as Auerbach does, that the town possesses some "sudden, quasi-magical power" that draws and repels men to suit the needs of the women (82). Certainly, the women do eventually come to rely on Captain Brown for guidance

[38] Much of Deborah's animosity towards Captain Brown stems from a literary argument they have: she likes Doctor Johnson, while he likes Charles Dickens. Significantly, Deborah's adamant refusal to accept the literary merits of any author after Johnson is connected, in large part, to the fact that Johnson is her father's favorite author. Her literary tastes and literary opinions are completely dictated by her father. She has no way of commenting on Dickens without comparing him to Johnson because Johnson is all she knows. Her preservation of the past and old-fashioned ideas demonstrates the extent to which she lives within the confines of her father's identity or, to put it another way, the extent to which her identity is shaped by her father. Moreover, Margaret Ganz argues Gaskell reveals the ideologies of the adversarial characters by positioning Johnson against Dickens: "Gaskell suggests in comic terms the larger clash between those principles of reason, order, moderation, and self-restraint which justify formality and decorum and those inclinations to cultivate the instincts and the imagination which negate their relevance" (143).

and advice over time; which suggests that they do need him. However, more realistically, what the episode with Captain Brown reveals, quite simply, is the extent to which Cranford, isolated as it may seem for the rest of England, is connected and, therefore, subject to the presence of men, who arrive and leave sometimes completely irrespective of what the ladies want or need.[39]

Captain Brown, the first male intruder, is, of course, followed by a series of men, each of whom exhibits increasingly obvious connections to the East and through whom the significance of the East to the text becomes more apparent. The first such example, which is described in a brief interlude that takes up little more than a page of the narrative, is Major Gordon, who proposed to and was refused by Jessie Brown, the Captain's daughter, before they arrived in Cranford, and traveled to the East as a means of physically removing himself from the setting of his bitter disappointment. He eventually returns from (somewhere in) the East, reads about Captain Brown's death in a newspaper in Rome, travels to Cranford, marries Jessie, and takes her away to his estate in Scotland, thus saving Jessie from the fate of the ladies of Cranford. Important as his presence is to Jessie, Major Gordon has no real impact on the ladies at Cranford, other than the fact that he represents, via his marriage, the power men have to change a woman's status from single to married. The same cannot be said, of course, of the arrival of Major Jenkyns who visits Cranford with his wife after twenty or thirty years in India (29). His visit significantly affects Matty as it is the first time that she, after her sister Deborah's death, acts as primary hostess to a gentleman visitor and, thereby, assumes her

[39] To substantiate this claim, it should be taken into account that when Gaskell originally wrote the episode, she constructed it as a self-contained work, not the opening chapter of a novel.

post as the unspoken head of the Cranford society. The visit itself is short—the Major and his wife stay only one night before heading off to Scotland, which takes up less than two pages in the narrative—but it affords Mary the opportunity to dwell on the appearance of these strangers and offers insight into the Cranford ladies' knowledge of the East:

> The Major and his wife were quiet, unpretending people enough when they did come; languid, as all East Indians are, I suppose. We were rather dismayed at their bringing two servants with them, a Hindoo body-servant for the Major, and a steady elderly maid for his wife…Martha, to be sure, had never ended her staring at the East Indian's white turban and brown complexion, and I saw that Miss Matilda shrunk away from him a little as he waited at dinner. Indeed, she asked me, when they were gone, if he did not remind me of Blue Beard? (30)

Apparently, the Major and his wife deserve little attention. Mary describes them in a single sentence using only three adjectives: quiet, unpretending, and languid. Implicitly, Mary suggests that their overwhelming quiet and unpretending demeanor fails to meet her expectations of how a returned colonizer should act. Rather than overwhelm Mary, Matty, and Martha, the servant, with their behavior, which would presumably result in a more vivid description of their actions and their speech, they blend into the Cranford setting as if they belong there. Mary quickly assures the reader that despite appearances, they certainly are not like the Cranfordians because their quiet and unpretending is East Indian, not English, in its origin. Mary's use of the word languid, which means, of course, lacking in vigor, to rationalize her unfulfilled expectations and to

explain their behavior demonstrates the extent to which she believes the Major and his wife have been affected by their time in India. In Mary's use of the word, languid is a quality unique to the East Indian, the term she uses to define the Major and Mrs. Jenkyns and, significantly, to refer to the Hindoo servant who has accompanied the couple to England. While the label "East Indian" could be read as merely a way to distinguish them from West Indians, the common term given to returned colonizers from the Caribbean, the fact that Mary uses the term to refer to both native Britons and a "Hindoo" servant substantiates her belief that India makes people different from the people in England.

However, instead of elaborating on her impression of the Jenkyns, she devotes the rest of her description of the episode to the servants. The male servant, with his brown skin and white turban, exhibits his exoticism in his very person. He clearly provides an object of interest and of fear to the women present. While Martha cannot stop staring at him, Matty cannot refrain from admitting her fear both in his presence and after he leaves. For her, his turban creates a distinct point of comparison to Bluebeard, a Turkish character of oriental tales who murders his wives.[40] Seeing the turban on the servant, Matty, exhibits the source of her knowledge—oriental tales—and exposes her ignorance of the East. The fact that Bluebeard is Turkish, not Indian, bears no meaning for her; the turban transcends all geographic and cultural realities, and from her limited perspective, a turban signals murderous intentions and identifies the servant as a murderer. Fortunately

[40] Bluebeard is originally a French character of a French fairy tale published by Charles Perrault in 1697. Casie Hermannson traces the Oriental origins of the Bluebeard character to three sources: the *Thousand and One Nights*, first translated into English in 1705, the frame of which is a Bluebeard story; the G.M. Gent translation (1799) of "*coutelas*" to "scimitar" rather than "cutlass," as in the earlier Robert Samber translation (1729); and, perhaps most significant, the George Colman and Michael Kelly libretto *Blue Beard, or Female Curiosity!* (1798) set in Turkey, thus making Bluebeard Turkish.

for Matty, her perception proves to be false; she survives to tell the tale of the time the East Indians came to dinner to her friends in Cranford. In fact, over time, she becomes obsessed with the idea of wearing a turban herself.

The shift in Matty's opinion of turbans—from symbol of oriental criminality to emblem of English fashion—coincides with her realization that Queen Adelaide, who is neither a murderer, nor an East Indian, wears turbans and the arrival of Signor Brunoni, a foreign magician, in Cranford. Eager to appear fashionable at the magician's performance, Matty asks Mary to bring a sea-green turban for her when she comes to Cranford for the show, but Mary refuses to oblige: "I was very glad to accept the invitation from my dear Miss Matty, independently of the conjurer, and most particularly anxious to prevent her from disfiguring her small, gentle, mousey face with a great Saracen's head turban; and accordingly, I bought her a pretty, neat, middle-aged cap" (90). Regardless of the Queen's apparent opinion on the subject, Mary fails to see a turban as an appropriate accessory for a woman, especially a woman like Matty, for the simple reason that she associates it with both the masculine and the Oriental. She replaces the object of Matty's desire with a traditional feminine cap, a more conventional choice, and in doing so Mary casts herself in the role of Matty's guardian and savior. With her more extensive knowledge of the world—after all, she is from Drumble—Mary protects Matty from contaminating herself with a foreign object.

Although Matty begrudgingly acquiesces to wearing the lace cap Mary chooses for her, the discussion of the turban resumes the exploration of the Cranford ladies' opinions of the foreign that began during Major Jenkyns's visit. Once again, this

consideration of the foreign surrounds a male character. Signor Brunoni, as both his name and appearance suggests, is a foreigner: "[the curtain] flew up revealing to our sight a magnificent gentleman in the Turkish costume, seated before a little table, gazing at us….with calm and condescending dignity, 'like a being of another sphere,' as I heard a sentimental voice ejaculate behind me" (95). Using his clothing and his broken English as their evidence, the women identity Brunoni as a Turk, or as Miss Pole refers to him, The Grand Turk. The fact that none of the women has ever met a person from Turkey is entirely beside the point. In his costume, in his broken English, in his facial hair, they see "a Mussulman" (96). He fits the description of what they imagine a Turk, a non-Christian, to be, and, as such, they feel entirely comfortable in their identification: he is foreign.

Coincidentally, in the weeks that follow Signor Brunoni's performance, a wave of robberies sweeps Cranford, which precipitates a corresponding wave of fear. In their attempt to protect themselves from being victimized and reinforce their belief in the community, the ladies rely upon their powers of deductive reasoning to identify the guilty party:

> We comforted ourselves with the assurance that the robberies could never have been committed by any Cranford person;…therefore, we must believe that the robbers were strangers—if strangers, why not foreigners? If foreigners, who so likely as the French? Signor Brunoni spoke broken English like a Frenchman; and, though he wore a turban like a Turk, Mrs. Forrester had seen a print of Madame de Staël with a turban on, and

> another of Mr. Denon in just such a dress as that in which the conjurer had made his appearance, showing clearly that the French, as well as the Turks, wore turbans. There could be no doubt Signor Brunoni was a Frenchman—a French spy come to discover the weak and undefended places of England, and doubtless he had his accomplices. (99-100)

Amusing as this series of deductions is—it is, of course, the French who stand at the root of the trouble—it reveals the inherent xenophobia of Cranford. Convinced of their own superiority and sense of decorum, these ladies refuse to suspect someone of their own class and of their own community. In determining what type of foreigner is responsible, the women display not only their prejudice but the source of their knowledge: print culture. Unsurprisingly, given how ludicrous the chain of logic which points to Signor Brunoni, no longer The Grand Turk but a French master of disguise, as the robber is, the ladies eventually learn the truth about Signor Brunoni. He is neither a Turk, nor a Frenchman, nor a robber. He is an Englishman named Samuel Brown who served as an army sergeant in India and is, thus, a returned Anglo-Indian, a returned colonizer. While important in exposing Cranford's fear of the foreign, the revelation of Signor Brunoni's real identity has a much larger impact on the outcome of the novel: in speaking with Mrs. Brown, Brunoni's wife, Mary learns about the difficulties English women experience in India and, most importantly, receives a clue about Matty's brother, Peter, who has been in India for several decades.

Despite his prolonged absence from England, Peter appears in the pages of Mary's narrative long before she ever speaks to Mrs. Brunoni. One evening a few years

earlier, Mary helps Matty burn a stack of old letters. Before Matty drops each letter in the fire, though, she shares the contents with Mary, and thus Mary first learns about Peter's existence despite her long relationship with the family. Through these letters, Mary learns that Peter, the youngest Jenkyns, though a nice child, had difficulty staying out of trouble as evidenced by the repeated apologies and promises to be better in his letters to his mother: "'Poor Peter!,' [Matty] said. 'He was always in scrapes; he was too easy. They led him wrong, and then left him in the lurch. But he was too fond of mischief. He could never resist a joke. Poor Peter!'" (54). In her explanation of her brother's character, Matty reveals that Peter possessed two flaws: he was easily persuaded, which suggests an eagerness to please others, and he was too fond of jokes, which reveals an easy-going nature and a need for attention. Ultimately, it is Peter's love of jokes, along with his apparent need to contradict the rigid propriety of his home and of Cranford, which leads Peter into trouble and drives him out of the town. Although Peter made a brief career out of playing jokes on the people of Cranford, Matty only offers details of two of them: in the first, Peter, dressed as a woman, visited his father, the rector, and told him how much he admired his Assize Sermon; and in the second, Peter disguised himself as Deborah, who was away at the time, and stood out in the yard, holding and talking to a pillow as if it were her baby. Significantly, in each case, Peter chooses to adopt a feminine persona so as to more effectively poke fun at the butt of his joke; in disguise, Peter can more effectively expose his father's vanity and seek playful revenge on a sister who repeatedly admonished him for his "ungenteel" behavior (57).[41] While Reverend Jenkyns never

[41] In practical terms, a feminine persona provides the most effective disguise for a boy.

learned that Peter was his lady admirer, he did witness the second prank and responded by flogging Peter out in the open. Following his public beating, Peter leaves the family and changes it forever. As Alyson Kiesel reads it, "the story of Peter is really one of origin—it's the violent rupture of his parting that seals Cranford off from the rest of the world and locks it in a timeless, changeless, Eden of 'Amazons'" (1002-3). Kiesel supports this reading by pointing out that when Peter leaves, his mother dies of a broken heart and Deborah vows not to marry so as not to abandon their father. Matty, always susceptible to Deborah's rule, remains single as well even though she would have preferred being Mr. Holbrook's wife rather than a spinster. She also would have preferred to maintain contact with her brother, but after he left Cranford, Peter went to Liverpool, joined the military, and was shipped off to India. While he did return home once after their mother's death, Peter was sent back to India and was never heard from again.

Presumed to have been killed in action, he only exists in Matty's memories and retreats into the background of the narrative until Mary speaks with Mrs. Brunoni about India. Mrs. Brunoni tells Mary of her plight to save her last surviving child—six had already died—from "that cruel India" (119). She walked from her husband's station to Calcutta with her infant child in her arms determined that she would raise it in England and, thereby, give it a chance for survival. Along the way, the child fell ill, but, as she informs Mary, "'[God] led me to a place where I found a kind Englishman lived, right in the midst of the natives,'" and she was saved (120). Mrs. Brunoni attributes her child's existence to the kindness of this Englishman, Aga Jenkyns of Chunderabaddad, who lives a seemingly isolated existence in that he, as suggested by the phrase "right in the midst of

the natives," lives outside the Anglo-Indian community, much like Jos Sedley did in Boggley Wollah. What is important to Mary, though, is this man's name, not his living conditions. Upon hearing the name Jenkyns, Mary believes she might possess information that will allow her to reunite Matty with her long lost brother.

After an unproductive fact-finding mission amongst the Cranford ladies for additional news that may link Peter to Aga Jenkyns, Mary finally reaches out to the stranger, not out of curiosity but out of desperation: the failure of the Town and County Bank has left Matty with an income of only thirteen pounds a year. Upon learning the news of Matty's financial ruin, Mary writes a letter to Aga Jenkyns in the hopes that Mrs. Brunoni's savior will be Matty's savior as well. Interestingly, this letter, as Mary imagines it, will be transformed by its journey to India: "It would get tossed about on the sea, and stained with sea-waves perhaps, and be carried among palm-trees, and scented with all tropical fragrance; the little piece of paper, but an hour ago so familiar and commonplace, had set out on its race to the strange wild countries beyond the Ganges!" (142). On its journey from Cranford through India, the composition of the paper will be impacted by the change in setting; it will be touched by the foreign—the sea, the land, the air of India—and, in the process, become unfamiliar and uncommon. Not to be dismissed as an idle moment of fantastical thinking, the life Mary imagines for the letter mirrors the life she imagines for the unknown Peter. From his sheer proximity to foreign objects and his experience of this foreign place, Peter, like the letter, will be made foreign, at least by Cranfordian standards. In a way, then, the letter foreshadows the arrival of Peter in England. Once familiar and commonplace in Cranford, he will now be foreign.

Over the months that pass, Cranfordian charity ensures that Matty is protected: the Cranford ladies donate an annual sum to help maintain her, Mary helps her set up a tea shop to provide a source of income, and Martha and her husband take over the mortgage to allow Matty to remain in her home. This crisis seemingly ends as all crises in Cranford end—with the ladies taking care of one another. However, Peter's return alters the customary Cranfordian ending; in this episode it is a man, not a woman, who saves the day. Mary, the woman who orchestrated the reunion and the salvation, comments on the result of her action: "I don't believe Mr. Peter came home from India as rich as a nabob; he even considered himself poor, but neither he nor Miss Matty cared much about that. At any rate, he had enough to live upon 'very genteelly' at Cranford; he and Miss Matty together. And a day or two after his arrival, the shop was closed" (167). While Peter may disappoint Mary's notions of what a returned Anglo-Indian is—not all of them end up being "as rich as a nabob"—what matters most to the Jenkyns siblings is not the quantity of money but the quality of life the money affords; Peter's fortune, small as it may seem to Mary, allows them to maintain a genteel lifestyle together. In granting Peter the ultimate power in this situation, Margaret Reeves contends that "Gaskell undermines [the] triumph of female independence and solidarity over financial ruin by bringing in a man to put an end both to her vocation and to that independence" (403). While Reeves rightly points out the significant impact Peter's return has on the novel's theme about women's self-sufficiency and independence, suggesting that Peter ends Matty's independence overstates the case as evidenced by two simple facts. First, Matty's financial independence was effectively ended the moment the bank failed; and second,

Matty's tea shop did not provide any financial independence as she continued to live as a lodger in her own home during its entire period of operation. What Peter's return does change, then, is not her independence but the nature of her dependence; she is now dependent on her brother rather than on the community. Significantly, this shift in dependence reveals the connection this isolated feminine community has on the dominant masculine community, which includes, via Peter's colonial experience, Britain's colonies.

Of course, Matty is not the only person whose life is altered by Peter's decision to reside in Cranford, for as the title of the novel's last chapter indicates, Peter's presence brings "Peace to Cranford, " a peace made necessary by the social division caused by Lady Glenmire's marriage to Mr. Hoggins, the town doctor. In marrying the doctor, Lady Glenmire not only binds herself to a man but binds herself to a lower class. From the perspective of the Cranford ladies, particularly of Mrs. Jamieson, who had always borne a negative feeling for the doctor, this is an unconscionable act that cannot be forgiven until, of course, Peter arrives. Significantly, the manner by which Peter accomplishes this feat does not involve his money but his foreignness: "The ladies vied with each other who should admire him most; and no wonder, for their quiet lives were astonishingly stirred up by the arrival from India—especially as the person arrived told more wonderful stories than Sinbad the Sailor; and, as Miss Pole said, was quite as good as an Arabian Night any evening" (169). His Indian experience transforms Peter from a man, a figure traditionally viewed with skepticism and reserve in Cranford society, to a portal to another world: "what [Peter] brings to Cranford is above all stories, tall tales, news of an exotic world of

color, and adventure which obviously contrasts with the unexciting routines of the elderly women who are the novel's main characters" (Brantlinger 12). In Cranford, Peter, the retired soldier and indigo planter, becomes an "Oriental" storyteller. Stories of his experiences in India, some more elaborate and obviously exaggerated than others—for instance, in telling Mrs. Jamieson about the Himalayas, he admits that he once shot a cherubim there—become Peter's greatest gift to Cranford, but like many gifts, they are interpreted as mixed blessings (175). For instance, Mary, although intrigued by his stories and inclined to believe them as true, becomes increasingly suspicious of their validity and their effect on the ladies: "I began to have my doubts; especially as I noticed that when his sister was present the accounts of Indian life were comparatively tame; not that she knew more than we did, perhaps less. I noticed also that when the rector came to call, Mr. Peter talked in a different way about the countries he had been in" (169). Having witnessed Peter interact with various members of the Cranford community, Mary becomes afraid that Peter's stories are a series of intentional and manipulative lies rather than a form of entertainment or education. Malcolm Pittock, in his interpretation of Peter, echoes her concern: "when he returns to Cranford he satirises the ignorance and credulity of the Cranford ladies by deliberately adopting the role of Baron Münchhausen and telling them tall stories about his adventures in India" (118). For Pittock, Peter's use of satire tarnishes the potential good that his stories have because he believes Peter, as a traveler, should inform, not entertain. However, in making this claim, Pittock neglects the fact that Peter stretches the truth not to humiliate the ladies or to expose their gullibility but to meet their expectations of him as an Anglo-Indian, as a foreigner. While this

performance of foreignness may ultimately reveal the culture's ignorance, in much the same way his performance as a woman exposed his father's vanity and ridiculed his sister's notions of gentility years before, it is not his intention. Peter, older and wiser than the boy who twice donned women's clothing to make a point, accepts the role in order to be accepted. Even Mary, with all of her doubts, makes this realization: "I don't think the ladies in Cranford would have considered him such a wonderful traveler if they had only heard him talk in the quiet way he did to [the rector]. They like him better, indeed, for being what they called 'so very Oriental'" (169). In other words, the women like Peter not for who he is, but for his ability to meet their expectations of what they think he should be. Recognizing this prerequisite for membership in the society—being a Cranford native is not enough—Peter, as Audrey Jaffe phrases it, organizes his identity around the fiction that is the "Orient" (52). He becomes what they need him to be, which allows them to feel that they, in holding him to the standards of their "Oriental" fiction, control his access to their society.

This notion of perceived control is important. Aware of the power of his stories and his position as an "Oriental," Peter, the returned Anglo-Indian, uses his influence to heal the wounds of the community by bringing everyone together to watch Signor Brunoni's second performance. When Mary expresses displeasure at the content of the stories he tells Mrs. Jamieson, Peter reveals his plan:

> 'I am bent on propitiating her…I bribed her here by asking her to leave me her name as patroness for my poor conjurer this evening; and I don't want to give her time enough to get up her rancor against the Hogginses, who

> are just coming in. I want everybody to be friends, for it harasses Matty so much to hear these quarrels…I intend to enter the Assembly Room tonight with Mrs. Jamieson on one side, and my lady, Mrs. Hoggins, on the other. You see if I don't.'(175)

And, ultimately, Peter does succeed. He reunites the warring factions of Cranford and restores the peace of the society. Significantly, this peace could only be achieved by someone from the outside: "*only* a foreign element, like Peter himself, could unite Cranford" (Garcha 215). Peter relies on his status as a peripheral cultural figure—in the eyes of Cranford, he is an Oriental storyteller—to recreate a strong community, thus showing how the returned colonizer serves as a means by which the metropole uses the periphery and its perceptions of the periphery to create an identity for itself. Although an integral member of the culture, Peter, as a man and as returned colonizer, will always remain on the edges of the culture for the simple fact that his colonial experience has changed the ways in which he is allowed to interact within English culture. In order to be a part of Cranford, he must be an Anglo-Indian; he must be foreign.

Ultimately, while the details of their experiences of life as a returned colonizer vary—Jos Sedley finds sanctuary amongst other returned colonizers in London, Colonel Newcome sacrifices himself for the sake of his son and remains alone, and Peter Jenkyns plays the part of a foreigner to establish a place for himself at home—each confronts a shared reality: the experience of colonial service has changed the ways in which they are perceived by the English in England. Specifically, as colonizers they have all become something other than English. They have become Anglo-Indian. Through this Othering,

these characters draw attention to the ways in which English identity is both dynamic and, at least in the first half of the nineteenth century, connected to place, for, as is the case for these returned colonizers, the consequences of a prolonged absence from England is, quite simply, perpetual exile.

Chapter 2: In the Wake of the Rebellion: The Colonizer, the Empire, and the Nation

In the decades preceding the Indian Rebellion of 1857, British reading audiences perceived the colonizer, a character consistently identified as Anglo-Indian, as an exile out of touch with contemporary English life at best and a dissipated decadent ensconced in Indian ways at worst.[42] However, the period immediately following the Rebellion offers a distinct contrast in representing the colonizer. Here, we see, a shift away from emphasis of the negative characteristics of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian to a celebration of the positive characteristics of colonizer as English. In large part, the reason for this shift can be explained by a single event—the Rebellion—and the political consequences of this event—the abolition of the East India Company and the inception of direct British rule on November 1, 1858. Simultaneously perceived as both a direct attack on and therefore an indictment against English imperial ideology and a legitimization for and thus a consolidation of English imperial power, the Rebellion marks a shift in both imperial politics and in literary representation; after the Rebellion, the imperial experience comes to mean something different and, as such, the colonizer, as represented in literature—specifically, as represented in George Otto Trevelyan's *The Competition Wallah* (1864), Alfred, Lord Tennyson's "The Defence of Lucknow" (1880) and Rudyard Kipling's "The Little House at Arrah" (1888)—is perceived differently.

[42] I use the term Indian Rebellion to reflect the fact that the uprising was not limited to the military, as the terms Sepoy Rebellion and Sepoy Mutiny both suggest.

Before exploring how post-Rebellion representations of the colonizer reflect the ways in which the Rebellion impacted the English consciousness, though, it seems appropriate to offer some historical context for the conversation at hand. The Rebellion began in Meerut during the evening of May 10, 1857, when sepoys from three native regiments—the 3rd Light Cavalry and the 11th and 20th Native Infantries—took arms against their English commanders, presumably in protest against the guilty verdict and the sentence of 10 years imprisonment with hard labor imposed on eighty five sepoys who refused to use the new Enfield rifle cartridges during a parade ordered by Colonel George Carmichael-Smyth, the commander of the 3rd Light Cavalry, on April 24.[43] The sepoys left Meerut, marched to Delhi, and took the city within a matter of days. News of the fall of Delhi spread across the country and was followed by uprisings and sieges throughout the Bengal Presidency over the next several months until peace was finally restored via official declaration on July 8, 1859.[44] Obviously, a proper narrative of the Rebellion—its causes, its battles, its heroes, and its victims—requires more space than I have allowed it here.

As even the most elementary scholar of the Rebellion can attest, the subject of the Rebellion is more complicated than a simple list of dates, places, and participants. It is replete with interpretations of cause and effect that not only shape the historical narrative and, as such, the understanding of the event but that manifest themselves in the term used to identify the event. Specifically, should it be called a mutiny or a rebellion? While the

[43] See Saul David for a more detailed history of the controversy of the Enfield rifle cartridges (52-66).
[44] The Rebellion was contained to the Bengal Presidency where 54 of the 74 native regiments in the Bengal Army either wholly or partially mutinied (David 19).

issue of naming may seem trivial, the term used speaks to the issue of cause and effect and substantiates Herbert's claim that the conflict between historical truth, interpretation, and understanding is one that has plagued scholars since even before the Rebellion ended: "It turns out that the Mutiny, far from resolving the historiographic lens into a totalitarian orthodoxy, was open in mid-Victorian decades to such a spectrum of diverging interpretation as to raise philosophical doubt as to the attainability of historical truth itself" (Herbert 138). Regarding the issue of terminology, for example, for the British who felt betrayed by the Indians and/or wanted to believe that it was an entirely military event, Mutiny became the accepted term; however, even before the "Mutiny" ended, Benjamin Disraeli, who claimed, "the decline and fall of empires are not affairs of greased cartridges. Such results are occasioned by adequate causes, and by an accumulation of adequate causes," and, therefore, saw it as a national revolt and not a military mutiny, argued that an effective response required an accurate definition (qtd. in Embree 5). In his mind, mutiny was an inappropriate term and so use of it, rather than of a more appropriate term, specifically revolt, impeded the processes of resolution and reconciliation. Later in the twentieth century, Indian nationalists offered a new interpretation and a new term: the First War of Independence (Embree vii).

As the longstanding debate over the proper nomenclature demonstrates, interpretation, not documentation, provides the foundation of most nineteenth-century writings on the Rebellion, and, as a result, the question of why—why did the Rebellion happen?—rather than of what—what happened during the Rebellion?—informs the historical narrative of the event. For instance, while the cartridges have been repeatedly

identified as the cause of the Rebellion, numerous sources point to other contributing factors, including the deteriorating relations between native troops and British officers, the ratio between native and British troops in regiments, the presence of Christian missionaries, and the annexation of Oudh. Given the preponderance of contributing factors, it is probably safe to assume that there was no single cause and that those involved wanted to bring an end to British occupation. My purpose here, however, is not to offer my own detailed interpretive account of the Rebellion because what intrigues me is not the actual Rebellion itself, but the way in which the Rebellion dominated the Victorian imagination and, as a result, shaped mid- to late-Victorian opinions about nation and empire. In other words, the matter that concerns me here is not the facts of the Rebellion but the English perception of the Rebellion.

In focusing my work in this way, I align myself with numerous scholars, including Gautam Chakravarty, Christopher Herbert, and Patrick Brantlinger, who see the Rebellion as an event that had profound impact on the way the English conceived of themselves as imperial agents and of England as an imperial power. To claim that the Rebellion had a profound impact is, of course, not a particularly insightful argument; the Rebellion completely altered English perceptions of the nation's relationship with its empire. As Chakravarty makes clear, it was not the method by which the British took India as a Crown colony that played a part in this alteration in perception because nineteenth-century British culture was, above all, a war culture: "it would be impossible for a nation to engage in warfare for a century without a public culture that sanctioned war as the legitimate arm of state and commercial policy, and that viewed expansion as

the expression of an inevitable national and racial urge with very real material dividends" (1). War—victory in war—was the means by which the British exerted its authority and amassed its dominion. And while the violence of the counter-insurgency tactics, which included blowing captured sepoys from cannons, caused some to question the notion of civilization—could a civilized people, as the English believed themselves to be, sanction such acts of brutality against their opponents?—the majority ultimately deemed these acts to be extreme yet justified.[45]

What prompted such intense interest and, thereby, the change in perception was the fact that it was not the British, but Indians who precipitated the event, Indians who chose a militaristic intervention to ameliorate their dissatisfaction with the British. The ferocity of this intervention illuminated the truth of the colonial situation, and it is this aspect of the Rebellion that proved to be so significant, in Herbert's estimation, to the British: "The shock of finding they were despised by their supposedly grateful imperial subjects in India was part of the shock of finding that their national idealism and national self-esteem were self-deluding and morally corrupting" (17). Up to this point, it had been popular—at least amongst those who took the time to think about Britain's place in India—to believe that the British held India for the benefit of its people and that the justification for holding India was not the wealth it brought the British but the civilization it bestowed upon the Indians. The Rebellion shattered this illusion, as evidenced by the

[45] The violence of the British counter-insurgency and the use of vengeance as a justification for brutality have sparked intense debate. Regarding the practice of shooting rebels from guns, an act that many have come to vilify, Saul David believes that the tactic has been wrongly interpreted and offers the following context to correct the matter: "it was a punishment first used in India not by the British but by the Moguls; it was regarded by Indian troops as an instantaneous and honourable 'soldier's death' and infinitely preferable to the degradation of death by hanging; and…it was used not as an act of vengeance but of deterrence" (146).

following claim published in a review of recently published books and speeches on the subject of the Rebellion in 1858:

> During the last hundred years the British nation has been habituated to the spectacle of an immense empire growing up, in addition to their widespread colonial dominions, without their being called upon to contribute towards the cost of the conquest, or even to share the responsibilities which such an acquisition must necessarily entail…It has hitherto been sufficient to know that our power was yearly extending in the East, and our trade and wealth increasing, and we were content to leave others the credit or the blame of acts by which we benefitted. ("Our Indian Empire" 253-254).

The shock to which Herbert refers, therefore, reveals the extent of ignorance and ambivalence toward the imperial project within the English public that this reviewer identifies and, in doing so, denigrates. In this reviewer's estimation, this collective ignorance is inexcusable and, in light of recent events, no longer possible. However, while the English to whom the reviewer refers paid little, if any, attention to India and, as a result, could see the Rebellion as a complete and utter surprise, others, especially Anglo-Indians in positions of power, were conscious of the disaffection in the months leading up to the events in Meerut.[46] What the Rebellion did, then, was awaken the English public to the implications of the situation in India.

---

[46] For instance, Governor-General Charles Canning confirmed in a letter written February that the grievance over the greased cartridges as an issue of legitimate concern (David 54). Furthermore, in a letter dated May 5, 1857, to Captain Septimus Becher, assistant adjutant-general with Army Headquarters at Simla, Lieutenant Edward Martineau, commander of the Ambala musketry depot, wrote: "Feeling…is as

Significantly, this awakening lasted more than a moment and consisted of something more than a passive consumption of the official record of the Rebellion. It became, in the words of Alex Tickell, "the defining episode in British colonialism's historical narrative of itself" (3). Tickell's word choice is significant here because it is the narrative quality of the Rebellion—the way in which the story is told and retold over time—that offers the best insight into how the Rebellion impacted the way in which England imagined itself. Hilda Gregg offers what is if not the first than the most frequently cited articulation of the way in which English writers and audiences gravitated to the subject of the Rebellion. In a literary review of mutiny fiction published in *Blackwood's* in 1897 Gregg writes, "Of all the great events of this century, as they are reflected in fiction, the Indian Mutiny has taken the firmest hold on the popular imagination" (218). The question, of course, is why—why did this particular event have such a profound effect on the English imagination? For Gregg, the answer lies in both the English response to and the inherent literariness of the Rebellion. In making her claim, Gregg argues that while the Crimean War, the other significant military event of the mid-nineteenth-century, did affect the English public, as evidenced by its almost constant presence in newspapers and periodicals of the day, it did not enter into the realm of literature to the extent that the Rebellion did for a very simple reason: "Men alone took part in the earlier struggle, but in the Mutiny it was the sufferings of women and children which roused England to madness" (218). The suffering of men, though heartbreaking, is

---

bad as can be and matters have gone so far that I can hardly devise a suitable remedy…I know that at present an unusual agitation is pervading the ranks of an entire native army, but what it will result in, I am afraid to say" (qtd. in David 77).

something expected in a military campaign. The suffering of women and children is another matter altogether.[47] The idea that women and children, not merely men, suffered at the hands of the rebels evoked unprecedented levels of sympathy and connectedness to an imperial campaign and, as Gregg articulates, moves the Rebellion from the annals of history to the realm of romance: "Valour and heroism, cruelty and treachery, sharp agony and endurance, satiated vengeance and bloodthirsty hatred, while the men of that day…had something titanic in them, something that recalled older and stronger ages than our own" (219). Given the number of newspaper and periodical articles that appeared during the Rebellion and the scores of personal narratives available to the reading public in the years thereafter, the English public was well aware of the romantic elements of the event—the suffering, the hardship, and the heroism. Perhaps more significant for the late-nineteenth-century audience, of which Gregg is a member, then, is not so much reading yet another version of the well-known story of the Rebellion in novel form but the ability to return to a period when men were strong and resolute. Nostalgia provides part of the genre's appeal in that it links those in the present to the glorious, the more vigorous, and the more laudable ancestors of the not too distant past.

Regardless of this nostalgic impulse—or maybe because of it—over time the Rebellion became the vehicle by which the English articulate anxiety, strength, and, perhaps most significantly, a new identity that bridges that apparent gulf between the

[47] In fact, as Jenny Sharpe has more recently argued, British womanhood was used to legitimize the both the counter-insurgency that brought down the rebels and, thus, the imperial project: "When articulated through images of violence against women, a resistance to British rule does not look like the struggle for emancipation but rather an uncivilized eruption that must be contained. In turn, the brutalized bodies of defenseless English women serve as a metonym for government that sees itself as the violated object of rebellion" (7).

nation and the empire. For amongst the social, cultural, and political transformations it inspired, the Rebellion also changed the way in which the colonizer was represented: rather than a strange, exiled Anglo-Indian, the colonizer is an Englishman. While others tend to focus on the mutiny novel to show how the Rebellion affected English imperial consciousness, I will focus my attention on texts outside the genre—the novel *The Competition Wallah* by George Otto Trevelyan and the poem "The Defence of Lucknow" by Alfred, Lord Tennyson—to illustrate the extent to which the Rebellion narrative invaded both popular culture and shaped national identity.[48]

In terms of form, *The Competition Wallah* is an epistolary novel documenting a one-sided correspondence between Henry Broughton, a member of the Indian Civil Service—the competition wallah named in the title—to his friend Charles Simkins in England. Incidentally, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term "competition wallah," the Anglo-Indian colloquial term for competitioner, "applied to members of the Indian Civil Service admitted on the competitive system, when first introduced in 1856" ("Competition Wallah"). In these letters, which Simkins subsequently submits for publication to a British periodical and, thus, a wider audience, Broughton offers a detailed account of his experience in India, an account punctuated by claims about the differences between the Anglo-Indian and the English. As Broughton represents him, the Anglo-Indian is corrupt and selfish and, as a result, at least implicitly to blame for the Rebellion; if the Anglo-Indian colonizer had better attended his duty to serve the Indian population, the Rebellion would not have occurred. As such, to ensure success in India,

[48] According to Chakravarty, over 70 mutiny novels have been written since 1859 to the present (3).

the colonizers must act in accordance with the attributes and characteristics of the English race: duty, ingenuity, ability, and character.[49] The shift in representation from Anglo-Indian to English also corresponds with the shift in imperial control. Now under direct governmental rule, imperial work in India has been transformed; imperial work is now national work, and the colonizer is not only an imperial but a national servant. Representations of the colonizer as English serve to cement this bond between nation and empire in the collective English consciousness both at home and abroad. It is for this reason that Alfred, Lord Tennyson presents the defense of Lucknow as a defense of England.[50] Ultimately, then, this shift in representation from the Anglo-Indian to the English marks a shift in national consciousness that transpired in the wake of the Rebellion. No longer a marginal territory, India has been transformed: it is the jewel in the imperial crown. Accordingly, the colonizer is no longer a marginal character but a reminder of English imperial power.

Bridging the Gap between Nation and Empire

George Otto Trevelyan, son of Sir Charles Edward Trevelyan, Financial Member of the Governor-General's Council, and nephew of Thomas Babington Macaulay, was born July 20, 1838, in Leicestershire. Although he only spent one year in India as private secretary to his father, he wrote three books about India: *The Dawk Bungalow; or Is His*

[49] Herbert provides an analysis of *Cawnpore* that seems to apply to *The Competition Wallah* as well: "the patriotic current in Trevelyan's book needs to be construed as a defensive, compensatory formation, a symptom not of the proud national self-assurance it proclaims but something like its opposite, a bad conscience as pressing as the cultural narcissism of the text is exorbitant" (187).

[50] Along with literary representations of the colonizer discussed here, it should be noted that images of the Rebellion and of the British Raj become a part of advertising campaigns for pharmaceuticals—"Be on the Look Out and Resist First Attacks by Taking Beecham Pills" reads the caption with an image of an Indian soldier—and for foods—the Camp Coffee label features a seated Highland soldier being served coffee by an Indian soldier standing at his side.

Appointment Pucka? (1863), *The Competition Wallah* (1864), which was first published as individual letters in *Macmillan's Magazine* January 24-July 20, 1863, and *Cawnpore* (1865). Although *The Competition Wallah* was well-received and at least well known enough in 1888 for Kipling to cite it in "The Little House at Arrah," it has been virtually ignored for decades.[51] Yet given its explicit engagement with post-Rebellion India and the relations between England and India, it seems worthy of more than a little consideration.

Trevelyan explicitly articulates his intention in the "Preface" and, in doing so, clearly admits that his purpose is not to entertain but to persuade. He states, "my most earnest desire and most cherished ambition is to induce Englishmen at home to take a lively and effective interest in the native population of their Eastern dominions" (v). In making this statement, Trevelyan identifies two key features of his book: his audience and his purpose. He is an Englishman writing to Englishmen in England, who wants the English to be interested in the native population of India. But, significantly, he does not simply name India but refers to it as "their East dominions." He uses the plural possessive pronoun "their" to create a concrete link between his audience and the subject of his concern; these people should be of interest because they inhabit a space that belongs to them and to England. With one pronoun, he shows that he views empire as a national concern and, as such that he believes, not only the empire, but more specifically, the inhabitants of this empire, can no longer be ignored. Rather than ignorance, Trevelyan

[51] The same cannot be said, of course, of *Cawnpore*, which has been hailed as "probably the most popular and influential of the Victorian histories" and "probably the most widely read of all Mutiny texts" of the Rebellion (Brantlinger 202; Herbert 15).

believes the native peoples of India should, as imperial subjects, receive something from the English in exchange for their loyalty. As such, he claims, "These letters will not have been written in vain if, by their means, the natives of India obtain some portion of English sympathy and English justice" (vi). While it is not clear how much "some portion" amounts to, what is clear is the implication: up to this point the natives of India have not received enough, if any, of either. Accordingly, John Clive reads his intention as the product of his desire "to make Englishmen at home aware of the harshness and contempt with which so many European settlers in India, most of them English, treated the native populations" (318). In exposing this behavior, behavior which he finds antithetical to true Englishness and, thus, to the English mission in India, Trevelyan—using Broughton, as his conduit—presents the colonizer as resolutely English. Furthermore, in identifying this English colonizer as a competition wallah, a member of "the higher ranks of the Indian Civil Service," Trevelyan also implicitly contends that the ideal colonizer is both a man "who [has] conformed to the ideal of the gentleman" and a civilian rather than a settler (Clive 313). By relying on their Englishness more faithfully, these gentlemen-colonizers would ultimately succeed in healing the festering wound inflicted during the Rebellion.

Broughton's friend Simkins provides the introduction, which is presented as a letter to the editor of *Macmillan's Magazine* asking him to consider the letters for publication for an English audience. When comparing himself with Broughton, Simkins reveals the characteristics possessed by the civilians: "I was the more thoughtful and the intellectualler of the two, he the more practical and the quick-sighteder" (1). While this

could be a matter of bragging—one could consider being thoughtful and intellectual as more desirable or laudatory attributes—it is more likely that Simkins is actually making an excuse for his failure to pass the examination himself. From his perspective, although he betrays the root of his failure with his poor grammar—"intellectualler" and "quick-sighteder"—the examination is designed for the practical, not the intellectual.[52] In making this claim, regardless of its intention or effect in regards to his own character, Simkins defines the type of person best suited for this type of work. Above all else, a civilian must be practical, logical, and commonsensical, characteristics he ascribes as inherent in Englishmen.

Broughton uses his first letter, "The Two Systems," to compare his situation with that of earlier civilians. Specifically, Broughton compares the relative benefits and deficiencies of the new competition system of which he is a part with the former Haileybury system, in which all civilians were trained together at the same college.[53] For Broughton, the most obvious difference between the two systems manifests itself as a personal disadvantage: "The sensation of loneliness is much aggravated by the present system of selecting and training the members of the Indian Civil Service…Haileybury formed a tie which the vicissitudes of official life can never break" (5). Broughton, who

[52] According to the commission appointed to create the competitive examination, a commission, which included Trevelyan's uncle, Thomas Babington Macaulay, "the competitive examination should be such as to require a very high degree of general education, but that it should not be such as to require any special or technical study of India" (Lowell 18). In other words, the competition examination tested general knowledge acquired at university. As such, Simkins self-assessment as being an intellectual is likely a euphemism for being a poor test-taker.

[53] According to H. Morse Stephens, the fact Trevelyan himself was not a competition wallah does not diminish the validity of his claims: "No one could be better fitted to form a fair opinion on the respective advantages of the two systems than the eldest son of Sir Charles Trevelyan, one of the most distinguished of the Haileybury men, and the nephew of Macaulay, the chief author of the system of open competition" (342).

earned his entrance into his position through a competitive exam, did not attend a college like Haileybury in which his fellow classmates would become fellow civilians. As such, he has formed no personal connections with any of the civilians who are also starting or near the beginning of their careers, which exacerbates the sense of isolation he feels now that he is in India. He has no friends in India with whom he can share his feelings, which partly explains why he maintains such "a full account of his Indian experiences" with Simkins—not only did he promise to tell Simkins all about his experiences, he has no one else to talk to (3). Because of this sense of isolation, he tends to believe that the old system is preferable to the new system because, as he claims, "while our seniors persist in looking on us as a special class, we have no bind of union among ourselves" (5). Even the natives detect a hierarchical difference between the old and new civilians: "they say that another caste of Englishman has come out" (6). Everyone, it seems, identifies them as different.[54] The fact that they are considered to be inhabitants of a new rung on the colonial hierarchy merely exaggerates the sense of difference and distance between Broughton and virtually everyone else in India.

Isolation is but one of the many disadvantages of the new system. Another problem with it is the background of the new recruits. Rather than being solely from the gentlemanly class, they also come from the middle class. Broughton explains that what makes this class difference problematic is the lack of class-specific skills in the new group of civilians: "It is impossible to believe that any class of Englishmen are deficient

[54] Broughton is not alone in his identification of difference between the two groups of civilians. Stephens treats it as a point of common knowledge: "against the higher intellectual attainments of the rank and file of the Competition Wallahs of the new generation, must be set the camaraderie of the Company's Haileybury nominees" (237).

in natural courage; but familiarity with arms and horses can only be acquired by men constantly exercised in field sports; and to field sports the new civilians are not addicted as a class" (6-7). In making this assertion, Broughton clearly ascribes to the belief that the English possess certain inherent attributes. In this case, the most obvious marker of Englishness is "natural courage." However, while all Englishmen regardless of class possess courage, not all Englishmen share the same background and the same abilities. Only the upper classes have the leisure and income to become experts in field sports. More than a matter of class distinction, this lack undermines the civilians from lower classes to perform their jobs correctly and effectively. Broughton maintains, "[t]he individual members of an imperial race settled in small numbers throughout a subject population must be men of their hands," and when he says "of their hands," he means they need to be able to ride horses for long distances and use weapons (7).

Despite the seemingly overwhelming disadvantages of the competition system, Broughton does acknowledge at least one advantage that underscores his belief that "the prizes of the Civil Service are too rich to be placed in the lap of any one man" (8). While it is unclear from the context of the letter, the prizes to which he alludes seem to be figurative because, as he clearly points out, the life of a young civilian is not initially financially lucrative; however, the potential for a comfortable life, advancement, and freedom from monotony make it a desirable career. Therefore, it should be open to men

of all classes.[55] Another prize, perhaps the most valuable prize—yet a prize not valued by the older set of civilians—seems to be the potential to do good work in India:

> the system of appointment by directors worked well, because it was founded on the principle of personal responsibility…The chief disadvantage lay in the fact that the lads, brought up in Anglo-Indian families, and among Indian associations, from an early age, looked upon India as their birthright, and failed to acquire the larger views and wider interests of a general English education. (9)

Clearly, for Broughton, at the heart of the problems inherent in the Haileybury system, which seems superior in almost every other way, is its connection to the Anglo-Indian. Here, Broughton establishes a very different distinction between the two types of civilians, a distinction based on identity: for him, the ideal civilian, or more generally, the ideal colonizer, is the Englishman, not the Anglo-Indian. The Anglo-Indian, in his estimation, lacks the personal conviction to act in the best interest of India once they are appointed to the civilian class. By claiming that the Anglo-Indian sees his position as a birthright, Broughton implicitly argues that the Anglo-Indian does not act for the Indian but for himself; his motivation is not civilization but self-interest. Furthermore, the distance from English culture and an English education manifests itself as self-

[55] Interestingly, it is the opening up of the Civil Service to men outside the gentlemanly class via competitive examination that many found problematic because it blurred class divisions. For example, in reference to the competitive examinations in the British Civil Service, a move advocated by Sir Stafford Northcote and Charles Trevelyan in their "Papers on the Re-Organization of the Civil Service," Anthony Trollope, a member of the British Civil Service, wrote, "'The gates of one class should be open to the other; but neither to once class or the other can good be done by declaring that there are not gates, no barrier, no difference. The system of competitive examination is, I think, based on a supposition that there is no difference'" (qtd. in Shuman 78).

centeredness and close-mindedness. Interestingly, the Anglo-Indian bears a distinct similarity to the Indian in this respect, for as Thomas Babington Macaulay proclaims in his "Minute on Indian Education," conveniently included as the last letter, the Indian and, subsequently English rule, will benefit from an English education: "We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect" (qtd. in Trevelyan 213). Ultimately, what Broughton implies is that the Anglo-Indian has become less English during his time in India—the Anglo-Indian is an Other. However, unlike the colonizer represented in earlier works, like *Vanity Fair*, *The Newcomes*, and *Cranford*, being an Anglo-Indian is not a necessary category for the colonizer; it is only a quality attained after a significant amount of time, and it is a quality that can be avoided. While the impact of India on the colonizer is a significant aspect of his argument and will be discussed later, implicit in Broughton's statement is the conviction that the most significant difference between the new class of civilians and the old class of civilians is their cultural identity: the new civilians are English, while the old civilians are Anglo-Indians. Furthermore, being an Anglo-Indian prevents the old class of civilians from attending to their duty in an effective manner. In making this distinction between systems, between English and Anglo-Indian colonizers, Broughton makes an implicit comment against the Company, the establishment that trained the civilians and that relied on nepotism in making civilian appointments. In this

way, he engages in the universal blaming of the Company, an act which displaces blame from the English.[56]

To alleviate the problem he sees in the new system, Broughton offers a third system, one that borrows heavily from the two other systems:

> Such a college as I propose would retain all that was good in Haileybury, without its capital defect—an excessive *esprit-de-corps*, a way of thought too exclusively Anglo-Indian…It would again unite the members of the Civil Service, in the most indissoluble ties; and would prove an admirable corrective of a pedantic, unpractical turn of mind, or of a sedentary effeminate habit of body. (10)

The result of this new system would ensure that future civilians would have "no danger of turning into a community of Quihyes" (10). To be a Quihye is to be an Anglo-Indian and, thus, an exile. In preventing this dreadful fate, a fate suffered by previous generations of colonizers, Broughton's system assures that distance from England will have no deleterious effect on the colonizer; the new system will allow the English to retain their Englishness and to avoid complete social and cultural isolation in India during their years of service and in England once they return home.

---

[56] As Chakravarty notes, "by making the East Company the symbol of culpability, the excesses of arbitrary power and the consequent transgression of the ideal of trusteeship in which India was held, the Crown and Parliament finally ended the fearful license of the merchant as state that Burke and brought to notice at the end of the eighteenth century" (47). Despite the implication Chakravarty makes with his use of the phrase "merchant as state," it is important to realize that the Company had been losing power for decades, specifically, the 1833 Charter removed all commercial activities from the Company, effectively opening trade (Lawson 156). The Company, then, with no commercial activity, was simply a middle man: "What may never be known, however, is why the Company's bureaucratic shell was allowed to exist until 1858 when it had long ceased to have meaning as a trading power" (Lawson 162).

"An Indian Railroad," the second letter, continues the conversation about adapting to civilian life. Broughton, presumably referencing James Mill, who famously wrote his *History of India* without ever having set foot on Indian soil because he believed a person did not have to go to India to know India, admits that actually being in India alters one's perceptions of the place almost immediately: "A man gains new ideas, or, which comes to the same, gets rid of more old ones, within his first month on Indian soil than during any equal period of his life" (13). India, then, is a classroom. However, it is a classroom that only requires a brief period of attendance. He learns more in a month than he has ever learned in his life and, presumably, the knowledge gained in this time is enough to sustain him for the remainder of his time in India. In claiming this level of intellectual authority, of course, Broughton places himself in the role of Said's Orientalist: "To have such knowledge of such a thing is to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for 'us' to deny autonomy to 'it'—the Oriental country—since we know it and it exists in a sense, *as* we know it" (32). Interestingly, he later acknowledges that much of his prior knowledge of India was gained through reading, which turns out to be an entertaining but not an entirely practical frame of reference, thus betraying his original and, by extension, the general British public's relative ignorance of India. For example, he admits his ideas about the city of Patna were "composed in about equal proportions from the 'Arabian Nights' and Macaulay's Essay on Lord Clive" (20). In making this confession, he asserts that while half of his reading was factual, the other half was fantastical. Experience, as underdeveloped as it may seem to a casual observer, has

allowed him to separate the two and suggests that to actually understand the intricacies of colonial policy one must actually experience India first hand rather than through books.[57]

Ironically, his experience in India enables him to more effectively interact not with Indians but with Anglo-Indians, a process made difficult, if not impossible, by the lack of a common language. Broughton writes, "Anglo-Indians are, naturally enough, wont to interlard their conversation with native words…The habit is so universal that a Governor-General fresh from home complained in a published order that he could not understand the reports of his own officials" (13-14). In presenting the fact of the matter, Broughton acknowledges that this Anglo-Indian willingness to adopt native words is one of necessity. How else would they be able to communicate with natives? However, this habit prevents effective official communication and highlights the divide between the two parts of the civilian community and raises another question: how do the Anglo-Indians expect to communicate with the English? Rather than attempt to answer this question, he continues his discussion of language and explains that the Anglo-Indian dialect intersperses English adjectives and verbs with native nouns. Significantly, it is only words for things—place, objects, possessions—that become Indianized because this method allows the English to communicate what they want from colonial subjects and perhaps, as evidenced by Trevelyan's use of the term competition wallah as the title of the book, what they are. Inadvertently, Broughton creates a parallel between Anglo-Indians and Indians when he informs Simkins that English is not the only language that

[57] Here, Broughton exemplifies Said's argument about the significance of the accumulation of knowledge inherent in Orientalism: knowledge of subject races or Orientals is what makes their management easy and profitable; knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge, and so on in an increasingly profitable dialectic of information and control" (36).

has been modified through contact. Hindustani, the name he gives to the native language, has been Anglicized: "they have adopted many of our words, and altered them in the most curious manner to suit their own effeminate pronunciation" (15). While it is safe to assume that the English altered the pronunciation of Indian words to suit their own linguistic abilities, Broughton makes no direct mention of this. Apparently, it is a given, and therefore not worth mentioning, that the English borrowing of Indian words is not a sign of their inferiority but of their means of establishing authority. Regardless, the inability to communicate effectively does nothing to alleviate the isolation for the new civilian in India.

However, while the loneliness of a civilian career seems to be its most striking feature—loneliness is one of the first issues he discusses and part of what makes the old system, despite its nepotism and ineffectiveness, desirable is the sense of community it entails—he does present the civilian as a sound career choice in the letter "A Journey, a Grand Tumasha, and the Truth About the Civil Service Career." In stressing the benefits of the job, he enters the Victorian discourse on work. Duty and work, clearly, are two of the most identifiable attributes of the English: "it is affectation to deny that, as nations go, we honestly strive to learn what our duties are, and to fulfill them to the best of our abilities" (73). Since work is at the forefront of the national mindset, he presents India as a suitable site for the true Englishman. Work in India allows a sense of fulfillment and personal responsibility. As a result, being a civilian allows an Englishman to be his truest self:

> I know no better company in the world than a rising civilian…In most cases, the normal condition of a clever Englishman between the ages of twenty-two and thirty is a dreary feeling of dissatisfaction about his work and his prospects, and a chronic anxiety for 'a sphere.'…An Englishman cannot be comfortable of he is in a false position; and he never allows himself to be in a true position unless he is proud of his occupation, and convinced that success will depend upon his efforts. These agreeable sensations are experienced to the full by an Indian Civil Servant. It is impossible for him to have any misgiving concerning the dignity and importance of his work. His power for good and evil is almost unlimited. (78)

In India, the Englishman escapes the elements of contemporary life that make it difficult to achieve a sense of accomplishment. As he depicts it, work in England necessarily makes a man a drone. The work is tedious, the attention one should devote to duty is preoccupied with "a sphere" or station, and the outcome is self-defeat. Civilian life frees the Englishman from all of this. Civilian life becomes the position in which an Englishman can be an Englishman—he can devote himself entirely to his work because "besides the blessings of absorbing work and an assured position, a civilian enjoys the inestimable comfort of freedom from pecuniary troubles…There is no temptation to display; for every member of society know the exact number of rupees which you draw on the fifteenth of each month… [and advancement is available] to every subject of the Queen" (79-80). Since a civilian's salary is a matter of common knowledge, money

ceases to be an issue. Freed from the burden of trying to make others believe he has more money than he actually makes through ostentatious display of material possessions, the civilian works. This ability to live a life based on and sustained by work places the civilian in a unique position: "It is a rare phenomenon this, of a race of statesmen and judges scattered throughout a conquered land, ruling it, not with an eye to private profit, not even in the selfish interests of the mother country, but in single-mined solicitude for the happiness and improvement of the children of the soil" (81-2). Although he has previously offered the possibility of a satisfying career as the a primary reason for joining the Indian Civil Service, here, Broughton emphatically dismisses both self-interest and national-interest as motivating factors and identifies the sole purpose of the imperial project: to benefit the native population of India.[58] To be an ideal colonizer, a man must reject the superficial—wealth and prestige—and dedicate himself to the needs of others; in accepting this tenet as the cornerstone of the imperial mission, the civilian becomes a missionary, so to speak. At the very least, in living for and being defined by the work he does, which in this case is to improve the lives of Britain's colonial subjects in India, the civilian is an Englishman.

Motivated by the will to improve the situation of England's imperial subjects, Broughton describes the multiple ways in which England's imperial presence improves the lives of Indians. He clearly illustrates the fusion between the English and their

[58] The rhetoric of benefit was common in imperial discourse: "The promise of benefit to justify expansion and intervention has three main sources in the nineteenth century: the Evangelical Revival…; liberal-utilitarian theories of home and colonial improvement; and the bi-partisan high imperial sense of racial-national mission" (Chakravarty 54).

imperial project in his celebration of the technological progress of the railroad in the letter titled, appropriately enough, "An Indian Railway." He writes:

> Never was I so impressed with the triumphs of progress, the march of mind…. Those two thin strips of iron, representing as they do the mightiest and most fruitful conquest of science, stretch hundreds and hundreds of miles across the boundless Eastern plains—rich, indeed, in material products, but tilled by a race far below the most barbarous of Europeans in all the qualities that give good hope for the future of a nation.... Keep to the lines and you see everywhere the unmistakable signs of England's handiwork. (15-16)

For Broughton, the railroad stands as a physical manifestation of the ingenuity, industriousness, civility, and superiority of the English race. He corroborates this point by juxtaposing the railroad against the backdrop of an agrarian landscape and by directly referring to the Indians who work and inhabit this landscape as members of an inferior race. Civilization, then, as Broughton presents it here, is something inherently English; thus, the English and their Empire are represented as a civilizing force.

Significantly, it is at this point—when he has presented the English Empire as a civilizing force in India—that Broughton first acknowledges the Rebellion. The railway that awakens his adulation of English superiority also brings him to Bankipore and, thus, face to face with the physical remnants of the uprisings of 1857. He focuses his attention on the fortification built around the collector's office he sees there: "it was behind such slender defenses as this, that in many an isolated station a dozen or two of the Imperial

race stood at bay for months before a hundred times their number of infuriated enemies, disciplined by English skill, and armed from English arsenals" (25). Rather than reiterate the details of the uprising in Bankipore, he uses this place as a means of commenting on the Rebellion as a whole. In conjuring this image of English stations under siege, Broughton envisions the English as a people united by race, and since the English are, in his estimation, an imperial race, their presence in India is natural. Moreover, what saved the English then in the face of certain catastrophe was their Englishness, specifically the inherent English attribute of military skill; the English possess the discipline and the technological ingenuity to develop superior weaponry to defeat any adversary. Seeing these fortifications fills Broughton with national pride. More importantly, though, these fortifications remind him how tenuous the English hold on India is and how relevant the Rebellion still is in the minds of the English in India.

Not surprisingly, the Rebellion provides the backdrop for much of the remaining letters. After all, his Indian experience, the subject of his letters to Simkins, does occur in a post-Rebellion India. His most direct engagement with the Rebellion appears in the letter "A Story of the Great Mutiny." It is here that he discusses the siege at Arrah that Kipling will use as a starting point twenty five years later. In offering his version of the story of the siege at Arrah, Broughton seeks to illustrate the significance of the event by linking it to a heroic past: "Arrah is emphatically the Thermopylae of our race—hallowed, no less than those world-famed straits by superhuman courage and by memorable disaster" (43). Clearly, with his allusion to Thermopylae, a battle between the Persians and the Greeks during the Persian Wars in 480 B.C., Broughton seeks to capture

the historical significance of Arrah and what occurred there during the Rebellion. Of course, the strength of the parallel between the two events is significantly undermined by the fact that the outnumbered Greeks, unlike the outnumbered British, were all killed; the Persians won and advanced to Athens. This detail, however, is unimportant to Broughton. What matters to him is not the outcome—unlike the Greeks, the British survived—but the resilience of outnumbered men willing to sacrifice themselves for the benefit of the nation. This common denominator—resilience in the face of imminent and certain disaster—establishes a connection between the English and the Greeks and substantiates Broughton's belief that modern life has not weakened the English. Despite all evidence to the contrary, evidence he himself used to argue in favor of a civilian career, the resilience of the British and the victorious outcome at Arrah shows " that trade, and luxury, and the march of science, have not unnerved our wrists, and dulled our eyes, and turned our blood to water" (61). No modern conveniences or advancements, which may be construed as signs of weakness or effeminacy, can alter the inherent strength and virility of the English race.

However, while modernity seemingly has no diminishing effect on the English, particularly English men—their wrists are firm, their eyes are shiny, and their blood is thick—the same cannot be said of India. India, through the medium of its unhealthy climate, lays waste to the English constitution and prevents individual Englishmen from doing their duty over time. Ironically, Calcutta, the capital of British India, poses the greatest threat to the English:

> After his first year in Calcutta, an Englishman can no longer sleep as he once slept, or eat as he once ate, and it is lucky if he drinks no more than he once drank. If you asked him to run, he would laugh in your face…Above all, the mental faculties deteriorate surely and rapidly in this hateful climate. The mind, like the body, becomes languid and flabby and nerveless. (110, 112)

An appointment in Calcutta is equivocal to a death sentence. An Englishman, sound of mind and strong of body, is transformed by the Calcutta climate into a mass of flesh that cannot work effectively or properly. While Broughton intends to use his description of the Calcutta-effect on the civilian population there as corroborating evidence to support his proposition of moving the capital to Jubbulpore, a healthier and more centrally located city, implicit in his argument is that remaining in India for an extended period of time negatively affects the English.[59] In an Indian environment, the Englishman wastes away; what is left is an Anglo-Indian, a weaker, more effeminate, inferior version of its former self. There is nothing the English can do; the fact of the matter is that India cannot support the English because the English cannot adapt to this foreign, hostile environment. Of course, Broughton is not suggesting that the English leave India. Rather, in using the scientific expertise of Dr. Moore to solidify his claims, he is effectually proposing a different method of administration wherein civilians only work for a few years in India

[59] Broughton also believes that it is the climate of India that prevents it from being a viable option for large scale English emigration. Climate prevents India from becoming a settler colony: "It is impossible to induce men to work in a climate worse than that of Jamaica, for less than half the wages earned by a Dorsetshire peasant…Clerks, and factors, and engineers will never have any difficulty in earning a livelihood; but poor people, without capital or education, could not find employment in any considerable number. Besides, colonization is hopeless unless the colonist can manage to live himself, and rear his children and grandchildren" (121).

before returning home because "the melancholy truth is, that the European race dies out…An infusion of native blood is essential to the continuance of the race" (122). While his comment could be read as an argument in favor of miscegenation, the native blood he is referring to is not Indian blood but English blood. Therefore, to maintain their imperial authority, the British government must constantly replenish the civilian community with new recruits.[60] By implication, then, the colonizer must be English in that he will not stay long enough to become a degraded Englishman or, in other words, an Anglo-Indian. In post-Rebellion India, wherein England must justify its re-conquest of India, the need for strong, robust English colonizers is more necessary than ever, for as Broughton has implicitly argued in his consistently disparaging representation of the Anglo-Indian as a dissipated, self-interested shell of an Englishman, that the old colonial guard—embodied in the figure of the Anglo-Indian colonizer—cannot be relied upon. Only the English can hold India and benefit the Indians.

In the last letter, "Education in India," Broughton concedes that the Indians may not always share his positive view of the English because of what John Clive refers to as "the profound difference between the races" (321). To bridge this gulf between the races, a bridge that will help ensure the success of the British Raj, the English must first understand this difference:

> Our energy and earnestness appear oppressive and importunate to the languid voluptuous aristocracy of the East. Our very honesty seems

[60] Broughton continues his scientific rhetoric to support this claim: "The fact is, for the white man or his offspring, there is no such thing as acclimatization in India. As a rule, Europeans enjoy the best health, and suffer less from heat, during their first years of residence in this country… Exposure, instead of 'hardening' the system, actually has the contrary effect, and, the longer the Europeans remain in this country, the more they feel the effects of the vertical sun" (122).

> ostentatious and contemptible to the wily and tortuous Hindoo mind. That magnificent disregard of *les convenances*…is inexplicable and hateful to a race who consider external pomp and reticent solemnity to be the necessary accompaniments of rank, worth, or power. (Trevelyan 9).

In articulating the personal characteristics of the English race—energy, earnestness, honesty, understatement—Broughton contends that the misunderstanding between the races is largely a consequence of Indian inferiority. As such, the possibility of the two races uniting is a hollow dream. The differences between them are simply too great. Moreover, the relations between the races will only improve if the English themselves improve:

> The longer a man lives in this country the more firmly convinced does he become that the amalgamation of the conquerors and the conquered is an idea impracticable, and, to use an odious word, Utopian. But this does not imply that, as time goes on, as the native becomes civilized, and the European humane and equitable, the two races should not live side by side with mutual sympathy and self-respect, and work together heartily for the same great ends. (Trevelyan 226-227)

In stating the need for the Indian to become more civilized, Broughton reiterates his claim that the Indians are an inferior race. However, in calling on the Europeans, specifically the English, to behave in a manner more consistent with their superior racial qualities, Broughton shows that the English must provide the model for the Indian to follow. If the Indian is ever to be civilized, the English must consciously put their

Englishness—that is, their ingenuity, civility, morality, energy, industriousness, and honesty—into action at all times; the English colonizer must be above all else a proper English gentleman, and if he is, it is quite possible that the Indians will not only tolerate but welcome the English.[61] Ultimately, given the directive tone Broughton employs throughout, but especially at the end of this letter, *The Competition Wallah* can be seen as functioning as a conduct manual for those aspiring to serve in India and to conduct themselves as Englishmen.

But, significantly, this conduct manual also applies to the English in England. He ends the letter, and the novel, with a direct address to the home nation in which he makes evident that his overwhelming motivation for writing, or perhaps Simkins's motivation for publishing, these letters is the need for a change in attitude, a change necessary given England's new relationship with India. With his attention squarely focused on the non-official, Broughton demonstrates why the English at home need to be invested in India:

> However kind he might be to his native servants, however just to his native tenants, there is not a single non-official person in India, with whom I have conversed on public questions, who would not consider the sentiment that we hold India for the benefit of the inhabitants of India a loathsome un-English piece of cant. Hence comes the paramount necessity

[61] Another means by which the English colonizer can achieve this goal is to act according to the dictates of Christianity. In promoting the vision of the colonizer as simultaneously English and Christian, Trevelyan echoes the sentiments W.D. Arnold posits in his introduction to his novel *Oakfield* (1854): "But whatever the people of England may talk, or think, or do about India, whether they get their cotton from it or not, I know that all will still depend upon the Englishmen who are in India; and the most sanguine and the most conservative will hardly deny that form is wanted *there*…it cannot be denied that there is a want of earnestness, a want of moral tone, and, together with such superficial skepticism that would pass for freedom of thought, a want of liberality, greater than exists in corresponding classes of society at home" (vii-viii).

> that opinion at home should keep a close watch upon the conduct of the affairs in India. It is not enough that we send her out able and highminded rulers. While there, they must never forget that the eyes of England are upon them. (229)

He puts the English at home in the position of monitor of all that is done in India. The colonizers, whether official or non-official, act on the nation's behalf; therefore, the nation must ensure that the colonizer performs his duty satisfactorily.[62] By calling on the English at home to be vigilant, he is making the audience aware that the imperial mission is not performed in India alone but at home as well. For the English to do what they are supposed to do—improve the lives of Indians—the English, whether in India or in England, need to be involved.[63] This necessity makes empire a domestic policy. No longer can the English ignore or remain ignorant of India—they must remain abreast of all policies and advancements and actions. The English people must ensure that its nation does what it is supposed to do.

The Empire as English

For Trevelyan, then, the Rebellion serves as a turning point. The success of the imperial project, called into question and threatened during the Rebellion, requires a complete change in imperial administration and imperial attitude; the success of the

[62] The non-official "refers to that portion of the United Kingdom-born community in India who were not in the civil, military, or naval employ of the East India Company or the British Government" (Renford 1). In pointing a finger at the non-official community as being not in line with England's imperial project, Trevelyan simply carries the negative opinion of this population into the post-Rebellion discourse; back in the seventeenth century, the East India Company referred to them as "interlopers" (Renford 1).

[63] The extent to which the English at home need to monitor the actions of the English in India substantiates Broughton's claims that India has a degrading effect on any Englishman over time—knowing that the English at home are watching will help the colonizer to withstand the inclement physical and cultural conditions of India for a longer period of time. More importantly, though, it reinforces his assertion that the empire is not separate from the nation but part of the nation.

imperial project depends upon Englishness. Appropriately, then, the representation of the colonizer as English dominates those moments when writers choose to commemorate the English victory over the rebels, as Tennyson does in his poem "The Defence of Lucknow." Published in 1880, this poem illustrates the manner in which the Rebellion initiated a state of perpetual remembrance in the English consciousness. It was an event the English could never forget: "the Mutiny, as the rebellion came to be known, required a continuous commemoration from the faithful, an imperial thanksgiving never entirely without a trace of incredulity, and signifying always a caesural moment in the history of the British empire" (Chakravarty 4). As such, it is fitting that the Poet Laureate actively participated in this act of commemoration and praise for the English heroes of the Rebellion by writing about the success of the most celebrated hero, Brigadier-General Henry Havelock, at the site of his most celebrated victory.[64] It must be noted, though, that the choice of Lucknow as setting for this poem is no small point, as the other site most often associated with Havelock is Cawnpore, the site at which English men—and, more significantly, women and children—were massacred three days before Havelock's forces could reclaim the fort. However, in focusing on Lucknow, the site of a prolonged, devastating siege but of ultimate English success, Tennyson attempts to replace the memories of loss with memories of triumph.

In offering this commemoration of Lucknow, Tennyson relies on the collective English memory of the horrific events of this specific siege to promote his belief that the challenge to imperial authority in India was a direct challenge to both the English nation

[64] Significantly, this poem is not the only example of Tennyson's commemoration of Havelock via the Rebellion. He also wrote a poem about Havelock in 1858, "Havelock."

and the entire English race. The reliance on collective memory, not the historical record, is critical because, as Chakravarty notes, the connection to actual events is ruptured in poetry: "Unlike historiography or the novel, the poetry of the siege excised the sequence of causes that led to the tenacious popular insurgency in [Oudh], of which the events in Lucknow were only an early, dramatic crest" (107). Yet, not only do the causes of the siege seem insignificant, the details of the siege the poem relates are less the stuff of historical record than of mythology. Moreover, although it is not altogether surprising, it is worth pointing out that, as Gautam Chakravarty argues, the Rebellion, of which the siege of Lucknow was one of the most famous episodes, "highlighted the uneasy location of Anglo-India, understood as a political formation, as a community, and as a cultural identity" (92). From the perspective of Anglo-India, it was Anglo-Indians and not the English who were challenged during the Mutiny. However, in presenting the image of an England under siege, Tennyson reaffirms the identity discourse that equates Englishness with Empire and "adumbrates the future uses of the rebellion in high imperial propaganda and jingoism" (Chakravarty 107). He also chooses to commemorate this event in dactylic meter, the meter of epic poetry. As such, in his representation of the defenders of Lucknow as English, Tennyson adds to the long list of the English race's qualities begun by Trevelyan, gives voice to the rising English nationalism of the late Victorian era, and moves the siege of Lucknow from the annals of history to the realm of myth.

In the first stanza, the unnamed speaker, who speaks in a collective voice for all of the Englishmen in the fort, establishes the fact that the defense of Lucknow was a defense of England. The poem opens with the speaker directly praising the English flag:

Banner of England, not for a season, O banner of Britain, hast thou

Floated in conquering battle or flapt to the battle-cry!

Never with mightier glory than when we reared thee on high

Flying at top of the roofs in the ghastly siege of Lucknow – (1-4)

In addressing the flag, the speaker establishes a critical link. The flag, as symbol of England and the English people, flies valiantly and mightily over the fort. In fact, as the speaker informs the flag, never before has the English flag flown so strongly. With this statement, the speaker situates the defense against the rebels firmly atop a long list of English battles; this defense is the greatest battle in English history. By extension, then, in their defense of Lucknow, the Englishmen in the fort are defending England. Further, in presenting the fort as an English space, the speaker shows the way in which "Englishness has consistently been defined through appeals to the identity-endowing properties of place" even when that place is not actually within English borders (Baucom 4).[65] Although the speaker also addresses the flag as the flag of Britain, it is above all the flag of the English, which is confirmed in the repetition of the line "And ever upon the topmost roof our banner of England blew" at the end of each of the seven stanzas (6).

The second stanza marks a shift in narrative focus. The speaker turns away from addressing the flag to offering an account of what the English did to defend the fort. Throughout the next five stanzas, the narrator makes it clear that the only alternative to victory is certain and horrific death. As such, the dying words of Sir Henry Lawrence,

[65] In his analysis of the ways in which Englishness has been articulated through place since the middle of the nineteenth century, Baucom contends, "Englishness has been variously, though not exclusively, defined *as* a Gothic cathedral, the Victoria Terminus, the Residency at Lucknow, a cricket field, a ruined country house, and a zone of riot" (4).

who was instrumental in the fortification of Lucknow in the weeks preceding the siege and who died within three days of its beginning, become the English rallying cry: "'Never surrender, I charge you, but every man die at his post!'"(12). Despite the speaker's claims, however, there is no evidence to suggest that these were actually Lawrence's dying words. More accurately, after sustaining his mortal wound on July 2, Lawrence, rather than making pronouncements of English heroism, "spoke often of his friends and children of his dead wife and native servants, and of his colleagues, asking for forgiveness from anyone whom he thought he might have offended" (Hibbert 237). The words the speaker gives to Lawrence seem to belong to Havelock, who, in response to Colonel Inglis's inquiry regarding the arrival of the relief forces, proclaimed, "I can only say hold on, and do not negotiate, but rather perish sword in hand" (qtd. in Case 56). By putting Havelock's words into Lawrence's mouth, Tennyson solidifies his representation of the men of Lucknow as resolutely masculine and, furthermore, removes any potential bonds of sympathy between the English and the Indians in this decisive moment.[66] Additionally, in citing Lawrence, whose death, because it is specifically recognized, is figured as a tremendous loss, as the author of Lucknow's rallying cry, Tennyson commemorates, albeit with artistic license, Lawrence's contributions to the English cause. After all, he is the only other man directly named in the poem. Thus, with Lawrence's words ever in their ears, the English continue to fight thereby demonstrating

[66] Actually quoting Lawrence or referring to him as Lady Inglis did in her siege diary—"I do not think a better, kinder hearted man ever lived"—would diminish the effect that Tennyson is trying to create (8).

their bravery and loyalty.[67] Surrounded by gunfire and death—the narrator begins six lines in the second stanza with the word "death"—the English muster their innate courage. Moreover, since women and children are present—"God help them, our children and / wives!"—English chivalry is called upon, as well (9-10).

Outnumbered, betrayed, and confronted with the possibility of imminent death, the English rally on. But how? The speaker explains: "Handful of men as we were, we were English in heart and in limb, / Strong with the strength of the race to command, to obey, to endure, / Each of us fought as if hope for the garrison hung but on him" (60-2). In a word, their power lies in their Englishness, and it is this celebration of Englishness, an Englishness expressed through masculine behavior, that resounds throughout the poem. According to Ken McNeil, this juxtaposition of national and masculine identity is critical: "In the heroic myth of the Indian Mutiny, the core values of the nation—Christian fortitude, selfless regard for duty, and cool competency in the face of danger—were embodied in the character and actions of the British fighting man" (117). Accordingly, the superiority of the English race enables a handful of men to face "so many thousands" of the enemy (52). From the speaker's perspective, this discrepancy between the small number of English defenders and the masses of Sepoy mutineers, though a simple fact of the situation, is critical because it emphasizes the significance of the feat in much the same way that the outnumbered English at Arrah serves as the basis of Broughton's allusion to Thermopylae. The fact that the English succeeded despite

[67] In focusing on the actions of these men, the poem exemplifies "a tradition of heroic/English masculinity in India… [that] forms the staple of an increasingly strident metropolitan popular culture and national self-image from the late nineteenth century" (Chakravarty 137).

being so far outnumbered supports two claims: first, the direness of the situation, and second, the superiority of the English race. As far as the speaker is concerned, no other explanation is possible. The English persevered because of their Englishness. However, the narrator makes it clear that the suffering the English endured and the sacrifices they made while waiting for help were substantial:

> Ever the labor of fifty that had to be done by five,
>
> ……....
>
> Toil and ineffable weariness, faltering hopes of relief,
>
> Havelock baffled, or beaten, or butchered for all that we knew –
>
> Then day and night, day and night, coming down on the still-
>
> Shattered walls
>
> Millions of musket-bullets, and thousands of cannon-balls – (100, 113-18)

The few beleaguered English that survived had not only to defend the fort, protect the women and children, battle sleeplessness and disease, but they also had to continue their fight without the reassurance of knowing when their saviors, led by Havelock, would arrive.

In the end, "Havelock's glorious Highlanders" reach the fort in time to save the English from being consumed by their voracious, swarming enemy (124). The fact that the speaker names the Highlanders and qualifies the Highlanders as Havelock's here is significant, for, as Ken McNeil contends, "The Highland figure makes British masculinity 'visible'…in a way that no other figure does" (123). Introducing this obvious symbol of masculinity at this point solidifies the point that this poem is a commemoration

of the acts of English men in the moment of a national crisis. Incidentally, in identifying the Highlanders in this way, the speaker effectively expunges all of the other men under Havelock's command, "an assorted collection of about a thousand British troops from four different infantry regiments, less than 150 Sikhs…, a detachment of native irregulars…, volunteer cavalry…, shopkeepers…, and indigo planters," and Major-General James Outram, Havelock's commanding officer, which provides yet another instance of historical revision (Hibbert 203). However, although the speaker extends a celebratory and emotionally grateful nod to the Scots for rescuing them, and, in doing so, assures that the theme of masculinity resounds in the even the deafest ear, he closes by repeating that it is the English, who are treated throughout as a collective rather than individuals, who must truly be praised and honored, for it is the English who held onto Lucknow long enough for Havelock to get there: "'Hold it for fifteen days!' we have held it for eighty-seven! / And ever aloft on the palace roof the old banner of England blew" (131-2). The fact that these resilient English go unnamed is part of the point. The speaker, in identifying himself as merely one of many with the first person plural "we," creates a victory in which all of the English can share; this victory is a national, not an individual, victory. What the poem fails to account for, as anyone familiar with the siege of Lucknow is sure to notice, is what happened after Havelock and his "glorious Highlanders" breached the gates of Lucknow: the siege continued for almost two more months. Certainly, including the reality of deferred glory would in some way detract from the significance of Havelock's success; after all, his troops provided critical reinforcements for the beleaguered residents of Lucknow, and ultimately, it is not the

relief but the defense that the speaker commemorates. Because of the English and their Englishness—their bravery, loyalty, courage, chivalry, perseverance, capacity for sacrifice, and their ability to command, obey, and rule—the English flag remained flying over Lucknow and, thus, over India. In defending Lucknow, which Tennyson imagines as wholly English ground, the English defended the British Raj, the honor of their nation, and Englishness from the Indian invaders.

Kipling and the Unnarratability of the Rebellion

But, the inevitable question at this point, of course, is how did Kipling contribute to the discourse of the Rebellion? Given the significance of the Rebellion's impact on English attitudes toward India and the empire and the previously posited notion that Kipling serves as the voice of Anglo-India, it stands to reason that Kipling would have written about the Rebellion. Interestingly, in her review of contemporary mutiny novels, Gregg makes this same presumption. She notes the successes and deficiencies of several texts, including Flora Annie Steele's *On the Face of the Waters*, but rather than simply devote her attention on what has already been written, she ends the article with anticipation that the best example of this genre is yet to be written:

> When Mr. Rudyard Kipling's *magnum opus* appears, may it deal with the Mutiny, and may we be there to read it! He knows his India, he knows his British army, and—perhaps a greater achievement than either—he knows his Anglo-Indian in his habit as he lives. Nor is this all, for no sort or condition of men is alien to him, and he can see the good points in good

people—a much more difficult matter than seeing those of bad people. (231)

In making this assertion, Gregg points to two attributes that make Kipling the best hope for the genre: his knowledge of the Anglo-Indian and his knowledge of human character. She seems to suggest that his account, because of his unparalleled knowledge of the Anglo-Indian, will be more authentic than other narratives, a somewhat surprising claim given that Steele lived in India for a considerably longer period than Kipling ever did.[68] Moreover, in maintaining that writing about the Rebellion is predicated not so much on knowledge of history but on knowledge of the Anglo-Indian—a cultural type, not an individual—she implies that the subject, though interesting to all English people, cannot be written by any English person. It must be written by someone with an intimate knowledge of Anglo-India, both as a place and as a distinct community. Kipling, with his unrivaled understanding of human nature and India, is, in her estimation, the only writer who could do the subject justice; in her opinion, Kipling, *the* Anglo-Indian writer, not only should, but inevitably would, write a mutiny novel.[69]

However, despite Gregg's certainty of his future literary contribution to the genre, Kipling ultimately failed to write any mutiny novel, let alone *the* mutiny novel. And,

---

[68] Apparently, Gregg's problem with Steele's novel is not authenticity—she never makes a claim that the depiction of Anglo-Indian life is inauthentic—but the "obtrusion of the sex-problem [for which she offers a philosophy that will repair the relationships between men and women], and not the mingling of history and fiction, as she fears …spoils her book" (229). Interestingly, Kipling himself anticipated Steel's novel: "I know that she has had at least 25 years' experience of India and knows more about certain twists of the native mind than anyone I know. It seems to me that if you could get *her* novel you'd be likely to be buying something really good" (*Letters* 219-220).

[69] Kaori Nagai believes Gregg's sentiment about the lack of *the* Mutiny novel reveals "the growing uncertainty about the future of empire" (87). While his point is well taken, her comment seems to me to reflect the essentialist notion that as an Anglo-Indian writer it is Kipling's duty to write about it—after all, as an Anglo-Indian, what else is there for him to write about than this significant historical event?

coincidentally, since Gregg, critics have attempted to understand why Kipling did not write what everyone apparently expected him to write.[70] But why does the absence of a mutiny novel in the Kipling canon continue to be a subject of interest? Perhaps Anjali Arondekar offers the most concise explanation: "In a literary archive in which the glory of the Indian empire stretches to such extensive narration, the subjects Kipling does elide thus generate particularly nagging silences" (132-133). The fact that Kipling, who wrote about virtually nothing but India for a substantial portion of his career, did not write about the Rebellion, the alleged most significant event in the history of British India, draws attention by its very existence. Brantlinger, in his attempt to rationalize the silence, contends that while the Rebellion seemed a natural subject for fiction, as Gregg argues, the novels in this genre possess little, if any, literary merit. As such, he proposes, "Perhaps Kipling intuitively avoided a subject that so tempted other writers to bar the door against imaginative sympathy: great literature does not mix well with calls for repression and revenge" (Brantlinger 199). In offering this supposition, though, Brantlinger implies that what prevented Kipling from writing a mutiny novel was not his disinterest in the subject matter but his disinclination to align his work with non-"great literature." Yet, if Gregg's assessment of Kipling's work and grasp of human character is valid, Kipling could never have succumbed to the temptation that so obviously plagued other writers as Brantlinger suggests. As such, the real obstacle for Kipling is, more

[70] Despite the fact Gregg is the most frequently cited nineteenth century critic in any conversation concerning Kipling and the Mutiny, she is not the only nineteenth-century critic to weigh in on the issue. According to Arondekar, Frances Adams believed that "the absence of any substantial engagement with the 1857 Indian Mutiny is in fact *the* key to Kipling's success...It is only when sites of imaginative unrest such as the Indian Mutiny are controlled and/or disappeared, Adams argues, that any comfortable narrative relationship with India can be established" (133).

likely, the subject of the Rebellion itself, as Kipling himself suggests in a letter to his friend Robert Underwood Johnson in response to Johnson's suggestion that he write a mutiny novel:

> What you propose is an exceeding job and one altogether beyond my scope. I made a try at the same thing years ago in India and in turning over documents came across *one* file of John Lawrence's ordinary office letters for the month of June 1857. That cured me of it. Besides '57 is the year we don't talk about and I know *I* can't […] I'd try in a minute if I felt I had a call that way but I'm rather convinced I have not. (*Letters* 219-220)

Here, Kipling's statement about his inability to write about the Rebellion is in keeping with what Christopher Herbert identifies as "the widely expressed conviction that no correct account of the war could ever be written: commentators who said this meant ultimately meant that no factual history of the war could ever express the profundity of its consequences for the psyche of the nation" (55). Yet, in spite of Kipling's admission that he could not speak or write about it, he did, in fact, as he alludes in this letter, write about the Rebellion albeit in a less direct way than his contemporaries expected of him. In other words, he did not write a mutiny novel. Instead, "Kipling's engagement with the emotionally fraught issues of the Mutiny topic is, for the most part, oblique, allusive, and allegorical" (Randall 98). In an attempt to account for the silence in the Kipling canon, recent attention has been given to those texts in which Kipling does, in fact, "try" to talk about the Rebellion: two early articles, "In the Year '57," the piece he refers to in the

letter, and "The Little House at Arrah," and four short stories, "One View of the Question," "The Lost Legion," "The Undertaker," and "In the Rukh."[71]

Since Kipling's representation of the Rebellion seems to be an object of interest—one cannot help but wonder if Gregg ever read these stories, and if she did, what she thought of them—it seems worthwhile to see what he had to say. How does Kipling represent the Rebellion in his fiction? How does his representation reflect the impact the Rebellion had on both his and the public's imagination? How does his representation of the Rebellion affect his representation of the colonizer? Rather than use all of these texts to answer the questions at hand, I will focus on one—"The Little House at Arrah"—because despite the differences in setting, plot, and level of engagement with the Rebellion between these stories, this story exemplifies the complexity of Kipling's attitude toward the Rebellion, an event which, for him, exposes the limits of truth and the fictionality of history. Significantly, the fundamental issue Kipling addresses in this story is not the Rebellion but the retelling of the Rebellion story and, in turn, what the ability or desire to retell the story illuminates about the perception of the Rebellion and of the colonizer. Arondekar presents the case in a slightly different way: "While Kipling's fiction certainly participates in the literary rewriting of the Mutiny archive, it equally struggles with the 'nonnarratability' of the Mutiny as an object of representation" (134). In other words, the Rebellion, though constantly rewritten, resists objective

[71] Jane Hotchkiss and Don Randall read "In the Rukh," one of the Mowgli tales, as an allegory of the Rebellion. Randall argues, "Post-Mutiny allegories—that is, narrative sequences organized upon allusive evocations of Mutiny scenes, situations, and events—occurs most notably in the Mowgli tales of *The Jungle Books* … Kipling's jungle saga, I will argue, presents an allegorical, empire-affirming restaging of the history of British India, a restaging that is ordered upon yet unsettled by it inscription in the Mutiny crisis" (98). Similarly, Hotchkiss asserts that this particular story is "both a reflection of and an attempt to resolve, in fantasy, the anxieties that persist about the Mutiny" (436).

representation. While Arondekar raises a critical point here, her use of the term "nonnarratability" fails to fully capture the significance of Kipling's resistance or inability to narrate the Rebellion in his fiction. Accordingly, I intend to read Kipling's narrative engagement with the Rebellion in "The Little House at Arrah" as an instance of what Robyn Warhol refers to as the unnarratable, "that which 'cannot be narrated'" (222).

In "The Little House at Arrah," first published in the *Pioneer* on February 24, 1888, Kipling offers first an account of and then a visit to the site of the siege at Arrah, a 9 day siege during which 10 Englishmen and 56 Sikhs fought off 2500 rebels from the safety of what was not actually a house but a billiard room. During the siege, H.C. Wake, one of the Englishmen who survived the siege, afraid that neither he nor any other Englishman would live to tell the tale, kept a diary on the wall to record events for posterity's sake. Not long thereafter, the wall was white-washed over, effectively destroying this official record, but, so it seems, not the memory of the event, since Trevelyan offers a version of the siege in *The Competition Wallah*. Kipling, who won Trevelyan's book as a school poetry prize, uses Trevelyan's account of Arrah as an epigraph in this story: "Already the wall on which Wake wrote the diary of the siege is whitewashed; and the enclosure where the dead horses lay through those August days has been destroyed; and a party-wall has been built over the mouth of the well in the cellars, and the garden fence which served the mutineers as a first parallel has been moved twenty yards back" (qtd. in Kipling 1973). Here, what Trevelyan draws attention to is the ways in which the site of the siege has been transformed—Wake's diary is covered, the

enclosure is gone, the mouth of the well is obstructed, the garden fence is moved. Only the structure of the house remains intact. In choosing this epigraph, Kipling demonstrates that his subject of interest is not the siege at all but the connection between the acts of writing, rewriting, and remembrance. If all physical markers of the details of the siege are gone, how is it to be remembered? Apparently, the answer lies in the narratability of the event, for as Nagai argues, "Trevelyan's fresh account of the siege, narrated as if to reconstruct Wake's journal kept on the wall, had been wiped out by the end of the century, leaving a white surface to be reinscribed all over again" (Nagai 87). To remember means to reconstruct; the past is a product of the present's remembrance, which means that the past, that history, is always a narrative production, a product of the imagination. But what is important to consider here is that it is not the Rebellion that gets narrated—the siege of Arrah proves unnarratable—but the encounter with remnants of the Rebellion.

"The Little House at Arrah" opens with the dâk bungalow *khansamah* at Arrah telling the story of the siege.[72] He begins his account by informing the narrator that he has worked in the service of the English for forty-four years. This point, though seemingly superfluous, is significant because with this pronouncement, the *khansamah* professes his loyalty to the English and his age. By aligning himself, through his years of service, to the English, he immediately establishes his position relative to the incidents that occurred in Arrah in 1857; he is sympathetic to the English cause and, therefore, his story will present the besieged English in a positive light. Despite the significance of his

[72] *khansamah* = butler or house steward (Kipling, "The Little House at Arrah" 1979).

narrative position, however, it is the *khansamah's* age, not his loyalty, that most influences his narrative. In the course of telling what happened at Arrah, he undermines the authenticity of his account by admitting that he does not remember the details of the events: "The *sahib* must forgive me if I do not remember all, for I am an old man" (1973). Along with his admitted misremembering—a point he repeats eight more times—he also acknowledges that he received much of his information secondhand. The fact of the matter is that while he was in fact in Arrah during the siege, he was not a part of the events because the rebels had been ordered to kill any Indians who had served the English. He remained in his home until the rebels were driven away, and when it was safe, he resumed his post. And this is where his story ends.

Clearly, his faulty memory and secondhand information not only call the authenticity of his story into question, they actually result in an example of the unnarratable. His limitations preclude the possibility of telling the narrator what really happened, thus relegating his experience to the narrative realm of that which cannot be told. However, despite the narrative significance of this failure, the narrator is not at all concerned with that what he has just heard (or could not have heard because it could not be told) may not be true because he knows other, potentially more accurate, versions of the story exist. Specifically, the narrator points to Trevelyan's account:

> Trevelyan—now alas! a rail-straddling Liberal with jelly-fish convictions—tells the story of the 'little house at Arrah' better than the *khansamah* of Arrah dâk bungalow who specifically wished the public to understand that he is a very old man—perplexed with an English-speaking

> grandson whose education he cannot keep up—and terribly prone to forget where such all-important things as the bread, the whiskey and the mustard are kept. (1975)

As the narrator makes clear, the stories, like the men who tell them, could not be more distinct, and he deliberately presents them as antagonists. In one corner stands Trevelyan, the Liberal, weak-willed but gifted as a storyteller overly preoccupied with what he deems to be superficial, insignificant, superfluous details.[73] In the other, the *khansamah*, the loyal servant, forgetful and confused about both past and present, seemingly huddles as he apologizes for his faulty memory. Since he bothers to set these men and these stories against one another, it would appear that narrator reliability is the issue. Who is the winner? Who is the more reliable narrator? Kipling checks the stories against one another, yet as soon as he deems Trevelyan more reliable because his story is more accurate, he immediately dismisses it: "But these things are matters of history and are written in State papers" (1975). This dismissal is important in that it completely challenges the reader's expectations; accuracy and narrator reliability are not as important as Kipling has led the reader to believe up to this point.[74] In aligning Trevelyan's story with the official record, Kipling reveals that it is not the facts, nor the presentation of facts, but the perception of facts that matter. Narrative voice, then, not narrative

---

[73] In identifying Trevelyan as "a rail-straddling Liberal with jellyfish convictions," Kipling's narrator aligns himself with conservatism. It also serves as an example of Kipling's disavowal of liberal policies in India; Hagiioannu argues, "Kipling's early fiction was, to a large extent, a renunciation of modern variants on the utilitarian them of impersonal and indirect rule—attacking the utilitarian legacy at the deepest level of language and rhetoric" (15).

[74] Moreover, as Arondekar contends, "Instead of diluting the historical force of the Mutiny by exposing its 'fictions,' the story suggests more emphatically that the very turn to such fictionalization augurs well for the Mutiny's imaginative reign" (149).

reliability, becomes key. He is not interested in official claims, but in personal accounts, and, in turn, he accepts the notion that there are some things which cannot be and perhaps should not be told.

It is for this reason—to stress the significance of personal experience and to emphasize the temporal distance from the actual events and, thus, the narratability of the actual events—that the narrator decides to visit the little house at Arrah, which now serves as the home of the Judge of Arrah, for himself. In documenting his experience of the tour he takes with the Judge's servant, he creates his own version of the siege and thereby demonstrates that the significance of history is not its objectivity but its subjectivity, that which can be told. Fittingly, Kipling spends more time describing what he sees than retelling the story that has already been told to him and to his audience by the *khansamah*, and, presumably, Trevelyan. The first object of interest regarding the house in question—actually not a house at all but a billiard room separate from the main house—is its size and its suitability as a Judge's living quarters: "a very pleasant place 'to put a man up in' for a few days…He can step across to the Collector's bungalow for his meals, and enjoy peace and solitude when he wishes to work. But as a place of defense—as a refuge of strong men fighting for their lives—the notion is too absurd!" (1976). It is only in seeing the house for himself, rather than hearing (or reading) it described, that the narrator can appreciate the suffering the men endured. This reliance on personal experience to appreciate the story he has been told underscores the extent to which the siege falls into the realm of the unnarratable. If the purpose of narration is to relate what

happens and, by extension, to evoke a sense of understanding, all instances of the event's narration have failed. He can only understand from seeing, not from hearing or reading.

The smallness of the place alone makes the reality of the situation—66 men in all lived and fought there for 10 days—incomprehensible and, subsequently, remarkable. He can now, at least in part, understand what it meant to be there at that time. But only in part because so much of what he sees is not what was there during the siege. Structural changes create an obstacle to the past, but upon being invited to enter the house, the narrator admits, "Under the arches a man could, in some feable measure, enter into the spirit of the place, put himself back into the troublous past and think of things that are united, if the voice of the Empire speaks truth to the Spirit of the Times. But in the Judge's room the illusion vanished" (1977). In conjuring the notion of the spirit—of both the place and the Times—the narrator takes a shot at those who believe the past exists intact in the present moment, that the past can be adequately narrated, that the fact of the siege establishes a unity that transcends the limits of space and time. To be in Arrah in 1888 is to be in Arrah in 1857. Or so the "voice of Empire" would have him believe. The fact that the illusion vanishes the moment he walks into a room that is now occupied by a Judge is critical because it proves that the "voice of Empire," possibly the Liberal voice used by Trevelyan and the official record, is wrong. This epiphany is significant: "When the narrator can at last look with some irony at the physical remnants of the siege of Arrah, it is as if Kipling has managed a singular restitution, salvaging the Indian Mutiny from being a phobic site to more a space of cathartic scrutiny" (Arondekar 149-150). In this moment, the narrator realizes that there is no unity between past and present because

the present, though impacted by the past, is not the past; there is nothing in the room that connects it to the past in any demonstrable way. It could, suggests the narrator, be any civilian's room in any place in India, but with one exception: "Above the hearth where Wake wrote the diary of the long, long days from the 27th of July to the 4th of August, were stacked in orderly row the Codes of the Law" (1977). The Codes of the Law identify the room as that of a judge, as opposed to that of another member of the Indian Civil Service. What is to be celebrated here, then, is not the "spirit of the place" but the fact that the work of Empire continues almost as if the siege had never occurred in the first place.

Ultimately, it is the banality of the room in its present condition that should be acknowledged, not the siege, thus effectively moving the siege into the realm of the unnarratable. For Kipling, the conscious forgetting that he sees in the structural modifications made to the siege site paradoxically provides the most reverent form of commemoration:

> The French would have covered the building in a glass case, keeping intact each scar of musket and artillery fire. The Americans would have run a ring fence round it and exhibited it at 5 cents per head, a pensioned veteran in charge. We, because we are English, prefer to sweep it up and keep it clean and use it as an ordinary house in the civil lives for the benefit of Her Majesty's servants: just as if nothing worth mentioning had ever taken place in that unattractive compound. (1977)

Whereas the French seek to preserve the past and keep the past with them at all times and the Americans attempt to make money off the past and to create a function for veterans, the English forget and continue on with the work at hand.[75] True strength of the English reveals itself not in remembrance but through perseverance. As such, Nagai asserts, "the house of Arrah becomes important, not as a museum which retains every trace of the past, but as a site of conscious forgetting, of both white man's panic and native rebellion, only through which the cleansed house—the English home—can again operate as an office of Empire" (94). To put it another way, the house of Arrah becomes important because it becomes unnarratable. But the very fact that Kipling uses this known siege site as the foundation upon which he builds his argument about the value of forgetting is itself a retelling of the siege. By stripping the Arrah of its past, he constructs a new story of Arrah—a story that focuses on the present work of Empire rather than on the past trouble, work that has been done and will continue to be done by the English.

Contrary to the precedent Kipling establishes in "The Little House at Arrah," wherein silence constitutes its own form of rewriting and remembrance, other writers both before and after him were not as reticent when it came to the subject of the Rebellion. Trevelyan and Tennyson provide but two of the countless potential examples of this fact. Yet, while these and other writers, both directly and indirectly, use the Rebellion as a means of negotiating the change in the relationship between Britain and its most prized colony, Kipling illustrates the extent to which profound historical events,

[75] According to Alex Tickell, this insistence on English forgetting is repeated in his early journal articles on the Rebellion: "in Kipling's emerging political aesthetic, which depends so deeply on a cult of work as unselfconscious imperial duty, the idea of public 'memorialising' commemoration becomes strangely suspect and must be disavowed" (13).

perhaps because they are profound, resist narration and, thus, understanding.[76] If nothing else, Kipling's treatment of the Rebellion as that which cannot be narrated helps to explain why so many writers have attempted to but failed to provide the definitive account of the event. The subjectivity of history resists narration.

[76] Kipling does, however, stress that the work of empire is the work of the nation; hence, the "little house at Arrah" serves as a site of English imperial work. His failure to even mention the term Anglo-Indian reiterates his assertion that this space, much like the entire Indian colony, is an English space.

Chapter 3: Loafers in our Midst: The Colonizer in the "Great Cesspool" of Empire

In the aftermath of the Indian Rebellion, literary works no longer represent the colonizer as an Anglo-Indian to reflect the change in imperial governance: now that the Indian Empire is officially under the crown's rule, the work of Empire has become the work of nation. As such, rather than an alienated "Other," as the term Anglo-Indian suggests, the colonizer is an Englishman. Given the newfound relationship between Empire and nation, one would expect that this representation of the colonizer as Englishman working on behalf of Empire and nation would be a mainstay in the literature of the late-nineteenth century. Contrary to expectations, though, *The Sign of Four* (1890) and "The Adventure of the Speckled Band" (1892) by Arthur Conan Doyle and *Letters of Marque* (1887-1888) and "The Man Who Would be King" (1888) by Kipling—all of which emerge in a *fin de siècle* moment concerned with notions of imperial decline and of racial degradation—introduce another colonial character: the loafer. According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, a loafer is "one who spends his time in idleness." However, within the context of colonial discourse, the term is reserved for those individuals who fulfill no imperial function because they perform no imperial work.[77] Despite his advocacy of imperial work promoted in his fiction and poetry, Kipling presents the loafer

[77] Regarding loafers, Mark Paffard comments, "such men were an anomaly and sometimes an embarrassment in India's tightly organized white enclaves, and were regarded as vagabonds probably given over to alcoholism and liaisons with native women" (76-77). While Paffard does point to the fact that the loafer was perceived as a problem, his claim that the loafer was an anomaly seems exaggerated; see Arnold for evidence. If anything, the loafer, especially the loafer as a positive character, is an anomaly in literature of the period.

as a positive character, as a figure free from the confines of imperial bureaucracy and thus better able to explore and "know" India.[78] In his capacity to know India, the Anglo-Indian loafer outranks, so to speak, the average English colonizer in India. Moreover, it is knowledge—both its acquisition and use—that defines Kipling's colonizer, not idleness. Doyle, on the other hand, presents the loafer as an inevitable product of the imperial system. All men return to England marked by their colonial experience in some way or another and more often than not return with no form of gainful employment; in other words, all men return to England as loafers. Moreover, because he lacks purpose, ambition, duty, and work, Doyle's loafer is both a colonial failure and predisposed to criminal activity inside both the colonial space and the metropole.

Loafers in India

For Kipling, the colonizer's identity and success are the direct result of his knowledge of India, a knowledge that is best acquired through interaction with India and its people. As a result, his best colonizers—and, of course, by best I mean most effective colonizers—are those who use experience and experiential knowledge, rather than governmental mandates alone, to rule.[79] It seems Kipling acquired this position early in his career. Upon completing his English education, which began in 1870, Kipling returned to India in 1882 and began work as a sub-editor of the *Civil and Military Gazette* in Lahore, a city in the frontier province of the Punjab. While Kipling only spent five

[78] According to Singh, most of Kipling's work related to India was published between 1888 and 1891: "in most of these stories, remarkable for their variety both of treatment and subject-matter, Kipling celebrates and perpetuates a certain type of Anglo-Indian character with which he was thoroughly familiar, that is, the hard-working and self-sacrificing civil servant, or the subaltern doing his duty under difficult conditions" (68).

[79] See Arata and McBratney for a discussion of the significance of knowledge to imperial success.

years of his life in Lahore, 1882-1887, the Punjab, as it turns out, proved to be a significant location in Kipling's development as both a writer and as a man. Not only did Kipling describe himself as a writer of the Punjab, "explaining that his knowledge of India was confined almost exclusively to that province," his work, especially his early fiction, "evokes the 'non-regulation' ethos of the pre-Mutiny Punjab, in which the values of personal experience and influence are conveyed in a prose style uncluttered by European philosophical and theoretical assumptions" (Hagiioannu 3, 15). It is the work ethic of the Punjab, rather than the strict maintenance of governmental standards—many of which seemed out of touch and obsolete in the day to day workings of imperial administration—that appealed to Kipling, and it is for this reason, presumably, that he had such a difficult time adjusting to life in Allahabad, the capital of the North-Western Provinces, when he was transferred to the *Pioneer* in 1887.[80] Apparently, "to Kipling, the cautious editorial policy of the *Pioneer* had come to embody all that was dispiriting about modern India: it was boring, pseudo-official, and politically compliant" (Hagiioannu 36).

However, while Kipling, as aligned to the Punjab as he was, did not appreciate or go for the politics of Allahabad—he only remained in his position there for two years—his new job allowed him the possibility to travel places virtually unknown to the average Englishman or Anglo-Indian: the native state of Rajputana.[81] *Letters of Marque*, a series of nineteen letters published in the *Pioneer* from December 14, 1887 through February

[80] See Hagiioannu for a discussion of the politics of the Punjab and Kipling's admiration for its administrators, especially John Lawrence, the first Governor of the Punjab Province (1849-1859) and the brother of Sir Henry Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of Oudh, who was killed during the siege of Lucknow.

[81] The native states or Semi-Independent States of India were ruled by hereditary princes under the advice of the British Crown. They were not a part of the Empire of India proper.

24, 1888, is the product of this opportunity.[82] In a letter to his cousin, Margaret Burne-Jones, dated January, 25, 1888, Kipling explains his travels:

> Since November last I have been a vagabond on the face of the earth. But such a vagabondage! Did I tell you how the *Pioneer* took me over and bade me go out for a month into Rajputana [?]…I wrote a series of letters called "Letters of Marque"—by the way it is running still—and I railed and rode and drove and tramped and slept in Kings' palaces or under stars themselves and saw panthers killed and heard tigers roar in the hills, and for six days had no white face with me, and explored dead cities desolate these three hundred years, and came to stately Residences where I feasted in fine linen and came to desolate way stations where I slept with natives upon the cotton bales and clean forgot that there was a newspapery telegraphic world without. Oh it was a good clean life and I saw and heard all sorts and conditions of men and they told me the stories of their lives, black and white and brown alike, and I filled three notebooks…and I knew what it was to endure hunger and thirst. (Pinney 149-156)

Clearly, from his description, Kipling enjoyed this experience. Whereas others may not see the pleasure in being a vagabond or in being without home or income, Kipling presents it as an opportunity for action, thus dismantling the stereotype of the loafer as an idle man. In fact, his account is replete with active verbs—wrote, railed, rode, drove,

[82] According to Page, "a 'letter of marque' was a commission issued by a belligerent state to a private person permitting him to employ his vessel as a ship of war. A ship so used was a privateer." While there is no indication that Kipling was sent on this journey to gather way secrets, the title is apt in the sense that he was sent out alone, as a private citizen, rather than as a government agent. Obviously, the information he gained was used in a professional capacity, but he also received personal, private dividends as well.

tramped, slept , saw, explored, feasted, forgot—and thus a sense of movement and acquisition. The extent to which this life appealed to him is probably best summed up in the phrase, "it was a good clean life." Nowhere in this phrase does Kipling imply a sense of worry, danger, or degradation in tramping through a foreign place. Instead, it suggests that in his freedom of movement—perhaps a direct contrast to his life as a writer in an Allahabad office—he has achieved an ideal state of living: he has been rewarded with communication and communion with his fellow man and a deeper knowledge of the world in which he has roamed.

Fittingly, *Letters of Marque* examines the issues of freedom and knowledge inherent in the act of travelling. However, as Kipling makes clear from the very beginning, the type of travelling he advocates requires open-mindedness and lack of structure:

> it is good for every man to see some little of the great Indian Empire and the strange folk who move about it…It is good to escape for a time from the House of Rimmon—be it office or catchery—and to go abroad under no more exciting master than personal inclination, and with no more definite plan of travel than has the horse, escaped from the pasture, free upon the countryside. (5)

While it may seem that his endorsement for travel is ambiguous at best—every man should do it because it is "good"—the allusion to the House of Rimmon makes his intentions more clear in that it suggests that he forgives his audience the sin of worshipping the work of Empire rather than worshipping the true God. Given this,

"good" is equivocal to a moral imperative. Fittingly, since a man who enters this venture does so as a form of improvement or atonement, the underlying motivation has to be personal. Like the horse freed from its pasture, the traveler has absolute freedom of movement and of will; he go where he likes, when he likes, adapting himself to circumstances as they arise. Freedom, in a word, is his greatest asset and his greatest quality:

> It is good to be free, a wanderer upon the highways, knowing not what to-morrow will bring forth—whether the walled-in niceties of an English household, rich in all that makes life fair and desirable, or a sleepless night in the society of a goods-*cum*-booking-office-*cum*-parcels-clerk, on fifteen rupees a month, who tells in stilted English the story of his official life. (88)

When a man travels in freedom, he ignores the codes of conduct that dictate his official life and thus opens himself to the possibility of various experiences.

In this respect, the type of traveler Kipling describes in his opening pages is more of a vagabond, as Kipling himself was when he embarked on the journey to Rajputana, than a seasoned traveler or, to use Kipling's phrase, a globetrotter. According to Kipling, who creates a binary between the two types of traveler, the globetrotter is "the man who 'does' kingdoms and days and writes books about them in weeks" (5). The problem with the globetrotter, then, is that he thinks he knows a place intimately almost as soon as he arrives. Laboring under this assumption, he writes about his travels, creating travel books for his fellow globetrotters to use. As Kipling makes abundantly clear throughout the

letters, as well as in his use of the verb "does," a man who travels in this way only travels for the sake of fulfilling some sort of requirement—seeing an Indian kingdom is something one simply must do—and only sees and understands the surface, which is akin to complete ignorance.[83] To truly know a place, one must travel as, and preferably in the company of, a loafer.

Of course, the impetus for traveling as a vagabond is not simply the sake of the experience alone. Certainly, one motivation is and, should be, as discussed earlier, a sense of personal satisfaction and fulfillment; one should do it, Kipling believes, because it is "good." The other motivation is and, should be, quite simply, to fulfill one's imperial role more effectively. Kipling, who refers to himself as "the Englishman" in the letters, reflects:

> Were the Englishman a mere Secretary of State instead of an enviable and unshackled vagabond, he would remodel that Philanthropic Institution of Teaching Young Subalterns how to spell—variously called the Intelligence and the Political Department—and … would send him out for a twelve-month on the Road. Not that he learn to swear Australian oaths (which are superior to the ones in the market) or to drink bazaar-drinks (which are very bad indeed), but in order that he might gain an insight into

[83] While he does concede that the globetrotter does come away from his travels with some knowledge, mostly of hotels and food and what the guidebooks tell him, "he had undoubtedly lost much, and the measure of his loss was proven in his estimate of the Orientalism of Jeypore" (219). While this may seem rather ambiguous, looking back a page reminds one of what Kipling refers to here: "the Globe-trotter said to his wife, 'What I like about Jeypore"—accent on the first syllable if you please—"is its characteristic easternness.' And the Globe-trotter's wife said; 'Yes. It is purely Oriental'" (218). From Kipling's estimation they understand nothing; "easternness" and "Oriental" are simply abstract phrases with no real meaning.

> the tertiary politics of States—things less imposing that succession-cases and less wearisome than boundary disputes, but very well worth knowing. (130)

As a vagabond, Kipling, the Englishman, perceives himself to be the envy of other men, especially of imperial administrators, because unlike them, he is free. However, if he were to put himself in their position, he would make a journey such as his—alone, as a vagabond, in a native state—because it is only in this condition that a man can truly learn about the Empire and, thus, how to administrate it effectively. His derogatory epithet for the Intelligence Department, "that Philanthropic Institution of Teaching Young Subalterns how to spell," encapsulates what he finds lacking in the current system. Through their training, subalterns, or British officers, are taught to spell as if spelling were the foremost and only requirement of effective military command. Instead, they should be sent out into India and learn its ways and its people; by traveling as vagabonds and interacting with loafers, the subalterns would understand the underlying feelings, beliefs, animosities, and alliances between peoples and ideas. In effect, mandatory vagabond-traveling would provide an invaluable service to the Empire; its officials, free from the confines of official duty, would return to the Empire as more knowledgeable and thus more effective colonizers.[84]

Kipling further and perhaps most famously explores this relationship between the loafer, knowledge, and imperial authority in "The Man Who Would Be King," a short

[84] According to Sullivan, the issue of knowledge is critical to Kipling's imperial ideology: "knowledge of others reflects the power of the knowing colonizer who represents natives because they cannot represent themselves" (9).

story first published in *The Phantom Rickshaw and Other Eerie Tales* in 1888.[85] As the title of the collection indicates, this story about two loafers, Peachey Carnehan and Daniel Dravot, who unsuccessfully attempt to become Kings of Kafiristan, is eerie: two years after embarking on their conquest of Kafiristan, Carnehan, crippled and half mad, returns with Dravot's head in a bag to tell his tale to the narrator, a writer at a newspaper office. Upon being informed two days later that Carnehan has died, the narrator also learns that he had nothing with him when he passed. The head, it seems, has vanished or, perhaps, was never there to begin with. Along with the eeriness, a characteristic it shares with at least "The Phantom Rickshaw," this story also displays a frame narrative structure common in the early stories: "a survivor sees the forbidden and tells of the dismemberment, madness, or death of another who ventured where frame narrators fear to tread" (Sullivan 16). The frame narrative demonstrates the extent to which Kipling's narrators, much like Kipling himself, acquire knowledge of India through interactions with others. The narrator is not the protagonist, but his character shapes the narrative in that it is he who controls access to the narrative and who influences his readers' impression of the characters within the frame.[86] This sense of the frame narrator's narrative control is further exemplified by the fact that this is more than a story about

[85] This tale, apparently, was inspired by Kipling's meeting with an unnamed Freemason and may allude, in part, to Josiah Harlan, a nineteenth-century American adventurer in Afghanistan and Punjab, who earned the title Prince of Ghor for his military and political actions there (McGivering).

[86] Regarding this particular example of a Kipling frame narrative, Sullivan maintains, "the incident chosen for retelling is, as always, a source of displaced personal and political anxiety for the narrator who assumes a stance at once invulnerable, distant and ironic, but whose rhetoric inadvertently reveals his vulnerability and collusion" (99)

loafers; this story is, significantly, an allegory of Empire.[87] But the question begs to be asked: What role do loafers play in this allegory? Why are the would-be-kings, the colonizers in this tale, loafers? These questions, surprisingly, are generally overlooked. Sullivan, who acknowledges that the narrator "compels us to read [the allegory's] meaning through the complex negotiation between the embedded and the frame narrative" and, thus, acknowledges the significance of the relationship between the narrator and the loafer-protagonists, fails to address the fact that these protagonists are loafers (100). Instead, Sullivan, like Hagiioannu, refers to these characters as adventurers, which puts the emphasis on their ambition rather than on the freedom and knowledge their status entails, as Kipling does.[88] By failing to properly acknowledge them as loafers—the narrator himself refers to them as loafers—Sullivan and Hagiioannu neglect the implications that their self-identification as loafers and as Freemasons has on their actions. According to John Kucich, who points out the significance of the multiple allusions to Freemasonry in the story, "Freemasonry had been deeply rooted in British India since the eighteenth century, where, somewhat paradoxically, it served to open up social intercourse across class ranks for soldiers of the British Army, who were sometimes frustrated by the closed hierarchical stratification both of military life and the caste system in India" (153). Given this, I contend that their loafer status has significant impact on the allegory's meaning. Specifically, through the loafers and Freemasons

[87] Both Paffard and Sullivan categorize the story in this way. For example, Sullivan claims, "The Man Who Would be King" is "Kipling's most powerful allegory of Empire and kingship, a story of control, desire and subversion, of authority and its discontents, and of the 'worst muckers' as world makers and destroyers…Dravot's and Carnehan's conquest of Kafiristan, accomplished with twenty Martini rifles, a knowledge of British military drill, and a mystique of divine right based on a garbled, half-forgotten version of Masonic ritual, sounds remarkably like a seedy version of the British Raj" (99-100).
[88] Actually, Hagiioannu defines loafer as "a roguish adventurer" (39)

Dravot and Carnehan, Kipling explores the significance of knowledge, the power of representation, and necessity for loyalty to the colonial endeavor. He also suggests, albeit implicitly, that the loafer is not a lazy ne'er-do-well, but an innovator and a man of action; he is a man who attempts to assert a place for himself outside of the confines of the social hierarchy. Ultimately, Carnehan and Dravot fail neither because colonialism is undesirable—this story is not an anti-imperial allegory—nor because they are loafers. They fail, quite simply, because Dravot betrays the oath upon which the endeavor was founded and neglects the implications of their decision to pose as both gods and kings. A man who would be king, regardless of his knowledge and vision, can never be just a man, especially a disloyal man.

The story opens on a train, and it is clear from the beginning that the narrator, like Kipling himself, admires loafers. Due to financial difficulties, the narrator is travelling Intermediate rather than First- or Second class. Regarding the Intermediate car, of which his reader may be unaware, the narrator reveals, "there are no cushions in the Intermediate class, and the population are either Intermediate, which is Eurasian, or native, which for a long night journey is nasty, or Loafer, which is amusing though intoxicated" (153). The Intermediate, then, defines both a type of railroad car and a class of passenger. With the exception of the occasional native contingent, the Intermediate, as an individual, is without distinct race or class allegiance. The narrator confirms the double meaning of the term Intermediate when he, an Intermediate passenger himself, confides that Intermediates "in all weathers are most properly looked down upon" (154). In other words, no one aspires to travel in or to be an Intermediate. The fact that this car

is generally populated by Eurasians and loafers shows that this is a class—and a car—that people enter because they do not belong elsewhere. The loafer, because he lacks occupation and legitimate income, does not belong with other whites; as a result, he, like the railroad car in which he travels, is Intermediate.

Although the narrator seems to distance himself from the Intermediate class—he is only there because he is momentarily out of money—he identifies with the loafer Carnehan, his fellow Intermediate-passenger. Carnehan, he declares, "was a wanderer and a vagabond like myself, but with an educated taste for whisky. He told tales of things he had seen and done, of out-of-the-way corners of the Empire into which he had penetrated, and of adventures in which he risked his life for a few days food" (154). In many ways, this description mirrors Kipling's representation of the loafer in *Letters of Marque*: the loafer is a drinker, a storyteller, and a risk taker.[89] While the narrator may lack the penchant and aptitude for consuming excessive amounts of whisky and disdain the necessity of having to travel Intermediate, he is, at least in one regard, like Carnehan: he is "a wanderer and a vagabond." Tied to nothing in particular, these men, as wanderers, are free to travel, to experience India, and to do what they need to do to survive. Due to his self-made freedom, Carnehan, like the loafers Kipling himself met, possesses, or at least believes that he possesses, more knowledge of India than the bureaucrats. Carnehan, under the impression that the narrator is, in fact, a fellow loafer

[89] Incidentally, these attributes are not exclusive to the loafer within the Kipling canon. They also belong to Privates Mulvaney, Ortheris, and Learoyd, recurring characters in Kipling's short fiction and the protagonists of several short stories, including all of those in the collection *Soldiers Three*. Regarding the similarity between the loafer and soldier, John A. McClure, who does not actually use the term loafer but instead refers to the character as "the freebooting gentleman-rover," contends that there is a difference between the loafer and the soldier; since the loafer "does without official license and support… [he] can take even more liberties with conventional codes of conduct than the soldier" (21).

and not simply a reporter temporarily short on cash, tells him, "'If India was filled with men like you and me, not knowing more than the crows where they'd get their next day's rations, it isn't seventy millions of revenue the land would be paying—it's seven hundred millions'" (154). The narrator, impressed with the way in which Carnehan has acquired his knowledge of the land and inexplicably flattered that he has been identified as a loafer, feels inclined to agree. Only a man who has known hunger and has had to devise a scheme to alleviate this hunger—only a man who works out of need rather than want or according to orders dictated from above—understands how to make the most effective use of a situation. For the narrator, there is wisdom in a man who sees things from the ground and not from the level of an administrator.

Of course, the opening frame does not end here. Carnehan asks the narrator to pass along a message to a fellow loafer, a man later introduced as his friend Daniel Dravot. Apparently, Carnehan has become privy to some information and plans to enter a Native State and blackmail a rajah with it. The narrator agrees to meet Carnehan's friend at the Marwar Junction in eight days. In the meantime, he embarks on a journey of his own into the Indian Desert:

> When I left the train I did business with divers Kings, and in eight days passed through many changes of life. Sometimes I wore dress-clothes and consorted with Princes and Politicals, drinking from crystal and eating from silver. Sometimes I lay out upon the ground and devoured what I could get, from a plate made of leaves, and drank the running water, and slept under the same rug as my servant. It was all in the day's work. (155)

Through his manner of conducting business, the narrator confirms his sense of allegiance to the loafer. What matters to him most is not whether or not his accommodations are comfortable or his food extravagant, but that he does what he needs to do to get the job done. Paradoxically, work motivates him to live the life of a loafer while in the Indian Desert, and it is his sense of kinship with the loafers that motivates him to pass along the message on the prescribed day. All that he has to show for his allegiance is the satisfaction of having done his duty to his friends. Interestingly, he extends this duty to reporting the men, whom he fears will come to face troublesome consequences if they impersonate news correspondents in a Native State, to the authorities to be deported. Although he admires the loafers for their freedom and their cavalier attitude to authority in its many forms, he also sees the potential danger in their lifestyle. There are certain things that a man should not do, and, apparently, impersonating a news correspondent, a figure who represents communication and knowledge, which may be deemed dangerous in certain places, is one of them.

Incidentally, it is the narrator's decision to turn his friends in in order to protect them that brings them back into his life. Soon after returning from his journey, the narrator becomes "respectable," as he phrases it, "and returned to an Office where there were no Kings and no incidents outside the daily manufacture of a newspaper" (158). Being respectable means returning to official work. Being respectable also means returning to a life of routine and boredom. Generally disinterested in his own job—a job that seems to exacerbate both the tediousness of daily life and the distance between India and the rest of the world—and forced to live vicariously through those who are free from

the confines of the "Office," the narrator finds unexpected relief from his mundane existence when the loafers return. Together now, Carnehan and Dravot have come to ask him for advice and for information, which they see as their due after being deported at the narrator's implicit behest. Before posing the questions for which they have come to have answered—specifically, they seek official knowledge of Kafiristan in the form of books and maps—Carnehan reveals their motivation for embarking on their imperial enterprise:

> "This country [India] isn't half worked out because they that governs it won't let you touch it. They spend all their blessed time in governing it, and you can't life a spade, nor chip a rock, nor look for oil, nor anything like that without the Government saying—'Leave it alone and let us govern.' Therefore, such *as* it is, we will let it alone, and go away to some other place where a man isn't crowded and can come to his own. We are not little men, and there is nothing that we are afraid of except Drink, and we have signed a Contrack on that. *Therefore*, we are going to be Kings." (161)

Herein resides the true issue: there is only space in India for the Government. If one chooses to make a life in India, one must give up personal ambition and simply do what the Government allows. The Government provides no space in India for a man to make his own way. For Carnehan and Dravot, men who have already been many things in India—soldiers, sailors, compositors, photographers, proof-readers, street-preachers, news correspondents, boiler-fitters, engine-drivers, and petty contractors, "and all that"—their solution to the problem that is India is to become colonizers in their own right, to

take over Kafiristan and make it their own (161). For them, being a colonizer is synonymous with being free; it is only through ruling over others that these men can achieve their goal of self-determination. Unsurprisingly, given the fact that he undermined their previous scheme by having them deported, the narrator, though bemused, is generally pessimistic about their chances: "'You *are* fools…You'll be turned back at the Frontier or cut up the minute you set foot in Afghanistan. Do you want any money or a recommendation down-country? I can help you to the chance of work next week'" (163). Although not a bureaucrat himself, the narrator is a part of the system and thus understands no other way to make a living in India; he admires their determination and vision and envies their adventures, but he fears that the risk they are choosing to take is too big. A careful man himself, the narrator reveals the limits of his sense of kinship with the loafers; for him, being a loafer is appropriate for short periods of time but too dangerous in the long term. Carnehan and Dravot, men who have loafed throughout India for years and fully appreciate the limitations it poses to ambitious men, are willing to take the chance. Their desire for self-determination and autonomy trumps any danger Kafiristan may present, which is why they refuse the narrator's offer to live a life of officially sanctioned work and insist on moving forward with their plan to live and work on their own terms.

Humorously, as the narrator presents it, for men such as Carnehan and Dravot, information, although potentially useful, is not necessarily mandatory for a scheme such as this. As Dravot reveals in his description of Kafiristan, they have devised much of their plan with very little knowledge of Kafiristan:

> "By my reckoning it's the top right-hand corner of Afghanistan, not more than three hundred miles from Peshawar. They have two-and-thirty heathen idols there, and we'll be the thirty-third and fourth. It's mountaineous country, and the women of those parts are very beautiful…And that's all we know, except that no one has gone there, and they fight, and in any place where they fight a man who knows how to drill men can always be a King." (162)

In Dravot's estimation, what makes this plan viable is, ironically, their lack of official information about Kafiristan. To them, it matters less what Kafiristan is like—its people, its culture, its landscape—than the fact that it is virtually empty; they can make it their own and adapt their skills to circumstances as they arise. Success lies in their ability to fight, to train men, and to be idolized. Everything else, like the names of tribes, for instance, is superfluous.[90] In fact, they have come to read the narrator's books and atlases less as a means of filling in the gaps in their knowledge than in confirming their route and their belief that Kafiristan is, after all, an empty place and therefore theirs for the taking. The challenge in becoming kings, therefore, has little to do with Kafiristan and everything to do with their personal conduct, as evidenced by the contract Carnehan and Dravot have drafted and the narrator has copied and kept as an artifact:

> *This Contract between me and you persuing witnesseth in the name of God—Amen and so forth.*

[90] Dravot, who is reading John Wood's *A Journey to the Sources of the Oxus* (1841), states, "'They're a mixed lot…and it won't help us to know the names of their tribes. The more tribes the more they'll fight, and the better for us'" (163).

(One) That me and you will settle this matter together; i.e. to be Kings of Kafiristan.

(Two) That you and me will not, while this matter is being settled, look at any Liquor, nor any Woman black, white, or brown, so as to get mixed up with one or the other harmful.

(Three) That we conduct ourselves with Dignity and Discretion, and if one of us gets into trouble the other will stay by him.

Signed by you and me this day.

Peachey Taliaferro Carnehan.

Daniel Dravot.

Both Gentlemen at Large. (164)

Clearly, from the phrasing they employ in this document, this endeavor relies on their loyalty to one another. Not only do they swear to be kings together—that is, they will share the power and the spoils equally—they also acknowledge that their shared success depends on their individual behavior as gentlemen, a term they use for men who act with dignity and discretion and who avoid drink and women. In other words, to be kings, they must forswear earthly pleasures. Their success will be their only reward. Furthermore, in signing this contract as gentlemen and in pledging to act together to be kings, these men renounce their loafer status and accept their new role as colonizers and governors. Regarding the last line of the contract, Carnehan concedes, "'there was no need for the last article…but it looks regular. Now you know the sort of men loafers are—we *are* loafers, Dan, until we get out of India'" (164). Here, Carnehan offers some insight into

his own perception of what being a loafer entails. For him, a loafer is a man who uses the knowledge he has acquired of India and the Native States to survive outside the confines of the imperial bureaucracy. Personal needs, not imperial standards, dictate his actions, and he does what he needs to do to get by with as little work or physical labor as possible. Life for the loafer, although difficult and unstable at times, is a life of relative leisure. However, it is not the life of a gentleman. To be a king a man must set himself to a higher standard and act like a gentleman—he must be discreet, dignified, and willing to abide by and uphold rules—since a king, by definition, has to rule his kingdom and serve as a representative of divine authority. As such, a king must be a gentleman. A king is not and cannot be a loafer.

Although the narrator remains skeptical of their chances at success, his lighthearted exchange with the men—he refers to their plan as an "idiotic adventure" dumbfoundedly rather than maliciously—reveals his bemused admiration for men would risk so much with no tangible assurance of a reward or even of survival (164). An unhappy cog in the imperial machine, he understands, at least in some way, the desire to create something for oneself, like a kingdom, even if he lacks the will to attempt such an endeavor of his own. They leave, and he returns to his work. His life continues to be defined by monotony. Regarding the passage of time, he simply states, "a few great men had died in the past two years, the machines worked with more clatter, and some of the trees in the office garden were a few feet taller. But that was all the difference" (167). Resigned to the reality of his situation—things happen on the other side of the world but not here—he is completely surprised when an apparent stranger enters the Office: "[I]

turned to go when there crept to my chair what was left of a man. He was bent in a circle, his head was sunk between his shoulders, and he moved his feet one over the other like a bear. I could hardly see whether he walked or crawled—this rag-wrapped, whining cripple who addressed me by name, crying that he was come back" (167). Within a few moments he realizes that the deformed body before him belongs to his friend Carnehan. The man who left the Office to be a king has returned as something less than a man. His extreme physical deterioration, though significant, pales in comparison to the impact the experience has had on his sanity and his sense of self. Determined to tell the narrator his story before he loses complete control over his mind, Carnehan begs him for his undivided attention until his tale is complete: "'Keep looking at me, or maybe my words will go all to pieces. Keep looking at me in my eyes and don't say anything'" (168). On the verge of losing everything—he has virtually lost his body and is afraid of losing his mind—he perceives the narrator's eyes as having the power of sustaining his sense of being. He needs an audience to feel that he exists at all because the experience has already robbed him of his identity. In response to the horrified narrator's prompts to remember the tale he is determined to tell—"'What did you and Daniel Dravot do when the camels could go no farther because of the rough roads that led into Kafiristan?'"—a bewildered Carnehan responds, "'What did which do? There was a party called Peachy Taliaferro Carnehan that was with Dravot. Shall I tell you about him?'" (169). He no longer recognizes himself as the man who left for Kafiristan. He is merely a shell of that man and, as such, consistently refers to himself in the third person for the duration of his tale.

Obviously, the failed conquest of Kafiristan has been devastating to Carnehan and has resulted in Dravot's execution. Although Carnehan alludes to Dravot's demise early on, he does not reveal the circumstances of his death until after recounting all that transpired once they entered Kafiristan. To make a long story short, Dravot and Carnehan, using their military background and knowledge of Freemasonry to their advantage, convince the Kafiristanis that they are gods, which allows them to assume their desired position as kings. But, as Carnehan's crippled body illustrates, the success they obtain is short-lived. The reason for this is simple: Dravot decides he must have a wife. Aware that this desire breaks the contract he and Carnehan drafted, Dravot justifies his disloyalty first by claiming a king requires no contract and then by arguing a wife will allow him to sire a son and heir. Carnehan, however, fails to be compelled by this logic and insists that Dravot listen to reason: "'For the last time o' asking, Dan, do *not*… It'll only bring us harm. The Bible says that Kings ain't to waste their strength on women, 'specially they've got a new raw Kingdom to work over'" (179). With the Bible on his side, Carnehan tries to convince Dravot that he has missed the point of what being a king means. Unlike the loafer who does what he pleases, a king must keep his image intact; if his kingship depends upon his people's belief that he is a god, he must do everything in his power to maintain it.[91] Dravot, ignorant of the power of representation, dismisses Carnehan's words and takes a wife with predictably fatal consequences. Dravot's new

[91] John A. McClure reads this power of representation in terms of the imperialist's imperative to assert his superiority at all times: "[The imperialist's], as Kipling makes clear time and again, is to perpetuate the myth of intrinsic inferiority [of the natives] both in the colonies and at home...[this story provides evidence that] "the imperialist's life depends on the maintenance of this illusion; the man who would be king must convince his subjects that he is not just accidentally and temporarily but fundamentally and permanently their superior" (24).

wife, afraid of her husband, bites him. When the Kafiristanis see the blood on his neck, the game is up. Carnehan and Dravot are exposed for what they truly are—"'Neither God nor Devil but a man!'" –and a mutiny erupts (182).[92] Eventually, the charlatans are captured. Dravot is killed, and Carnehan is first crucified and then sent back from whence he came with Dravot's head as a reminder of the time when two men attempted to be kings of Kafiristan.

Ultimately, Carnehan's pitiful tale and the narrator's compassion for what remains of the man show that this story is not a warning against colonialism but a cautionary tale about the power of representation in a colonial context. Throughout the tale, even when he refers to the loafers' plans as dangerous and foolhardy, the narrator maintains a consistently positive perception of them; the risk takers he first admired become tragic victims of hubris. As Sullivan astutely argues, the narrator's sympathetic treatment of Carnehan and Dravot can be attributed to an ideological bond that exists between the three men: "what [the loafers] share with the narrator is a sense of defeat by India ruled as it is by a displaced establishment in competition with each other" (105). Ultimately, what the tale of Carnehan and Dravot reveals is the extent to which the bureaucracy defeats men in India, either figuratively, as in the case of the narrator, or literally, as in the case of the loafers—their inability to find autonomy within the rigid

[92] Significantly, Bart Moore-Gilbert maintains, Carnehan and Dravot interpret this mutiny "as their own 1857" (*Kipling* 132). While Moore-Gilbert argues that this allusion to 1857 marks the entire campaign in a negative light and thus substantiates his claim that Kipling does not admire the loafers at all, it should be noted that nowhere in his work does Kipling point to the Rebellion as evidence that the British should not be in India; rather, he uses the Rebellion as a means of advocating his view of imperial work as discussed in the previous chapter.

social hierarchy of India has drivien them across hostile borders and Dravot's failure to keep his word and understand what it means to be a king resulted in both of their deaths.

Loafers in London

Kipling, of course, is not alone in his sympathy for colonizers. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a physician turned author knighted for his service during the Boer War, "was a patriot and a champion of Empire…[who] viewed Empire as a vast, heterogeneous global unity…[and] thought that Empire could have a salutary effect on British manhood, countering the perceived degeneracy of turn-of-the-century English culture" (Siddiqi 64-65). Based on this characterization, it would seem that Doyle's fiction would clearly bear the signs of his pro-imperial position. However, as with many aspects of life and literature, things are generally more complicated than they may originally appear. For example, within the Sherlock Holmes canon, for which Doyle, much to his chagrin, achieved his literary celebrity, Empire is consistently presented as an insidious danger that needs to be contained and controlled rather than as a respite from and a solution to English degeneracy at home.[93] Interestingly, the loafer, the figure so clearly admired by Kipling, is the recurring character through whom Doyle explores the potentially devastating implications of imperialism on both England and the Englishman.

In the opening chapter of *A Study in Scarlet*, the first Sherlock Holmes tale, Watson, Holmes's friend and Arthur Conan Doyle's narrator, describes the circumstances of his return to England after first sustaining a bullet wound in the second Afghan war and then surviving enteric fever at the base hospital in Peshawar:

[93] See Siddiqi and McLaughlin for further discussion of this apparent contradiction in Doyle's work.

> I had neither kith nor kin in England, and was therefore as free as air—or as free as an income of eleven shillings and sixpence a day will permit a man to be. Under such circumstances I naturally gravitated to London, that great cesspool into which all the loungers and idlers of the Empire are irresistibly drained. There I stayed for some time at a private hotel in the Strand, leading a comfortless, meaningless existence, and spending such money as I had, considerably more freely than I ought. (4)

Along with setting up the circumstances which led to his meeting and subsequently living with Holmes at 221B Baker Street—he lacks family connections, and he possesses neither the income nor the financial discipline to live on his own—this passage also famously identifies London as the "great cesspool" of Empire.[94] Consequently, like the irresistible pull London has on these "loungers and idlers," Watson included, scholars, myself included, gravitate to this passage as the foundation of their various claims about the significance of Empire in the Holmes canon.[95] Specifically, with his use of the cesspool metaphor, Watson depicts London as a contaminated center, a final repository for imperial dregs: returned colonizers. In other words, London produces nothing; London merely attracts and holds refuse. Decidedly negative, "Watson's account [of London as cesspool] undermines the popular notion of London as the beating heart of

[94] By "famously," I, of course, draw attention to the fact that the cesspool metaphor has drawn the attention of numerous critics before me, including Kuchta, McLaughlin, Siddiqi, Childers, Fluet, Mehta, and McBratney. For instance, McLaughlin argues, "what is crucial is not whether he accurately portrays London as the festering effect of Britain's imperial activities during the preceding centuries and, in the process, ignores London's role as Empire's enlightening agent and first cause; instead, it is his evocation of an Empire imagined as one vast plumbing network in which London is neither beginning nor end, but rather a location—a 'pool'—into which things flow, and out of which things ooze and bubble" (2-3).

[95] Joseph Kestner stands as an exception in that he claims that Doyle's "persistent querying of the Empire in the Sherlock Homes canon" begins with *The Sign of Four*, the second Holmes story (7).

Empire, so that rather than spending the nation's life blood, the city is debilitated by congestion, contamination, and, above all, poor circulation" (Kuchta 83). [96] Interestingly, what debilitates London and makes the "heart" of the Empire inefficient is the accumulation of returned colonizers or, as Yumna Siddiqi, who carries on the discourse of sanitation inspired by Watson, refers to them, "the human waste of Empire" (82).[97] The cesspool metaphor, then, establishes a concrete connection between metropole and periphery, two imperial spaces usually seen as distinct and separate.

Along with the revelation of this connection, of course, is Watson's personal identification with these colonial dregs.[98] Like Kipling's narrator, he, too, identifies with the loafer. With no tangible business or family connections there, Watson does not choose but is drawn to London and becomes one of many aimless and shiftless returned colonizers who populate the metropolis. McLaughlin, for one, reads the aimlessness of Watson and his fellow returned colonizers as potentially positive; caught up in London's gravitational pull, the same pull that incidentally dismantles the boundary between metropole and Empire, these returned colonizers experience a sense of freedom:

---

[96] Like Kuchta, Childers and McLaughlin also use language of the body, specifically the circulatory system, to discuss the cesspool metaphor: "The London to which he returns is indeed the heart of the Empire, but that organ no longer functions efficiently. Rather than the pump that keeps men and materials moving along the arteries feeding the farthest-flung extremities of Empire, it has become a backwash of imperial detritus, susceptible to infection from without and sepsis from the pool of filth that has accumulated within" (Childers 202), and "In Watson's account, the metropolitan capital is not described as the life-sustaining heart of the Empire from which all good things emanate, but rather the 'cesspool' into which the scum of the Empire (including his battered self) are concentrated" (McLaughlin 28).

[97] Siddiqi refers to this class of colonizers as the "imperial lumpenproletariat" (82).

[98] According to Childers, "when Watson counts himself among the 'idlers and loungers,' he insinuates not only that the answers are much more complicated than merely distinguishing English from other; he also implies that the very boundaries defining what it means to be English (and therefore ostensibly pure and untainted) were increasingly indistinct and permeable" (203). I would argue that this is not a situation unique to the *fin de siècle* but one exacerbated by the rhetoric of high imperialism and the image of Anglo-India and Anglo-Indians offered by Kipling.

> This collapse of boundaries also becomes a source of pleasure—specifically, the indulgently languid pleasure of 'loungers and idlers,' of being carried along with the imperial flow, of relinquishing demands of the 'white man's burden,' even if, and in some instances because, that means being passively and 'irresistibly drained' into the undifferentiated muck of the cesspools of Empire. (3)

While the absence of the imperial burden of responsibility may be a relief, there is nothing in Watson's word choice in the passage quoted earlier to indicate that he views his present circumstances with pleasure. Aside from the very obvious fact that being drained into a cesspool would be anything but pleasurable, Watson focuses on the failure, not the pleasure, which has brought him and others to this city, this cesspool. Specifically, regarding his own experience during the second Afghan war, Watson bluntly states, "the campaign brought honours and promotion to many, but for me it had nothing but misfortune and disaster" (3). By focusing on his own failure, Watson seeks to make clear that the work of Empire does not always end in fortune and glory but, more often than not, in pain and misery.[99] Wounded, weary, and without luck, work, or disposable income, Watson whiles away his time in London; his idleness brings him no pleasure.

[99] According to Mehta, "although the Second Afghan War was unprovoked, unsuccessful, and so unpopular it ended the careers of Viceroy Lytton in India and Prime Minister Disraeli In England, neither its humiliating failures nor it publicized brutalities are evident in Watson's prologue, where he remarks instead only that the 'campaign brought honours and promotion to many,' though not to him" (635). One reason for what Mehta perceives as omission is what Empire comes to mean: a place where men fail and the implications of this failure in a domestic context.

Although Watson is eventually able to pull himself out of the cesspool and to cut his ties with the "loungers and idlers" of Empire, others have not been so fortunate.[100] These others play an important role in the Sherlock Holmes canon. According to Siddiqi, "the poor white 'idlers and loungers of Empire' have become a social menace and must be properly dealt with" (77). In drawing attention to their race—white—and class—poor—Siddiqi suggests that the factor that makes these men a menace is the combination of their class status and their lack of work since, by definition, loungers and idlers do not work.[101] Therefore, while Stephen Arata maintains that Watson presents this group of men as "incipiently criminal" and "colonials … corrupted by their experiences," I maintain that in using the terms "loungers and idlers" Watson draws the reader's attention not to criminality but to the inherent lack in these men—the lack of purpose, the lack of ambition, the lack of duty, the lack of work (Arata 140). Significantly, given that these men are defined by what they lack, they challenge accepted notions of colonial masculinity, a masculinity traditionally defined by colonial service or, to put it another way, colonial work. Obviously, Watson eventually salvages his own masculinity from the taint of his colonial failure, that is, his failure to complete his colonial work successfully, by joining forces with Sherlock Holmes.[102] His case, however, is the exception rather

---

[100] Of course, it could be argued that his prolonged association with Holmes, though on one hand the means by which he is able to transfer himself from the cesspool to middle-class sensibility, allows him to maintain some ties to his loafer status, especially after his marriage. Specifically, accompanying Holmes on his cases provides him a respite from his middle-class life as doctor, husband, and author. With Holmes, he is free to travel through the city and countryside. During the cases, his only responsibility is to his friend.

[101] See Arnold and Siddiqi for discussion of poor whites in British Empire. Siddiqi explains while poor whites may have been useful to colonial society, they had to be properly interpellated by imperial ideology, as well as suitably disciplined and regulated" (77). Further, Siddiqi points out that failure to find work is often linked to a damaged body (84).

[102] Several critics identify Holmes as instrumental in Watson's "salvation." He reclaims his ties to Englishness and English masculinity through his association with Holmes. Their relationship brings

than the rule in the Holmes canon as evidenced by the fact that several of the antagonists in the Holmes stories have returned to England from the four corners of the British Empire.[103]

Yet, while it is surely significant that Watson and many of the Holmes villains come from the Empire and share the experience of a colonial past, it is important to remember, as Yumna Siddiqi astutely reminds us, that "the history and nature of British imperialism varied, and … [as such, these] narratives of returns have different cultural contexts" (236). As such, I will limit my examination of the representation of *fin de siècle* colonial masculinity in Sherlock Holmes to two cases—Jonathan Small in *The Sign of Four* and Dr. Grimesby Roylott in "The Adventure of the Speckled Band"—for the simple reason that both of these men are returned Anglo-Indians.[104] Unfettered by notions of colonial duty and, as a result, a demonstrable sense of accepted colonial masculine behavior, Jonathan Small and Dr. Grimesby Roylott, the "loungers and idlers" under investigation, continue their personal crime sprees in England until they are stopped by Sherlock Holmes. Ultimately, I argue, it is Small's and Roylott's lack of colonial work

---

Watson into contact with multiple forms of work: detection, medicine, and writing. See Childers for discussion of Watson as "the reintegrated colonial" (204-208) and Siddiqi for a reading of Watson reabsorption into the British middle class via Holmes (82).

[103] For example, Sterndale Tregennises from "The Adventure of the Devil's Foot" has spent time in Africa; Charles McCarthy and John Turner from "The Boscombe Valley Mystery" share an Australian past; Colonel Sebastian Moran, described by Holmes as "the second most dangerous man in London," served in the Indian Army and is featured in "The Adventure of the Empty House" ("Empty" 778).

[104] Incidentally, the relationship between colonial work and colonial masculine identity is especially relevant in the cultural context of British India because the type of colonial work done in India. Most of the work was either performed by military personnel or by civil servants, and the amount of time spent in India to accomplish this work differed greatly from the nature and duration of colonial work in other colonies. India was not a place to go for a brief period of time to reinvent oneself through the acquisition of a quickly made fortune; India was a place of military intervention and sometimes tedious, certainly never ending, administrative duty. In other words, India was not a settler colony like Australia, New Zealand, or Canada, for example.

and their subsequent position outside of the prescribed bounds of colonial masculinity rather than their colonial experience alone that provides the foundation of their criminality in London, the heart of Empire.[105]

Published in 1890, *The Sign of Four*, a tale of robbery and revenge that begins in India and ends in London, "merges two subgenres that were popular in late-nineteenth century Britain: … the invasion narrative and the mutiny narrative" (McLaughlin 20).[106] This confluence of genres and settings is significant because, according to Jaya Mehta, "England, modern, industrial, and no longer romantic, now imports the raw material of adventure from its colonies, refining them into domestic romance, as it drains India's resources and manufactures them into English wealth" (611). In other words, England's dependence on India is twofold; it relies on Indian resources to produce English goods and English capital, and it depends on India as a source of adventure and thus fiction. Incidentally, this second form of dependence—the reliance on India as a both a setting and as a source of modern romance—situates Mehta's reading of the novella within Brantlinger's concept of the imperial gothic, "the three principle themes of [which] are individual regression or going native; an invasion of civilization by the forces of barbarism or demonism; and the diminution of opportunities for adventure and heroism in the modern world" (230). More than a helpful generic category, though, the imperial

[105] In presenting this argument, I seek to provide an answer the following question: if return from colonies to metropole was common, why does Doyle present it as problematic? (Siddiqi 233).
[106] See Jaya Mehta and Stephen Arata for a comparison of Doyle's novella to Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone*. In terms of plot, Arata points out that "in each book an unscrupulous imperial soldier steals an Indian treasure and returns with it to England, setting off a series of events that result in mystery, crime, and domestic unrest" (133). Regarding the thematic similarity between the two novels, Mehta argues, "the fact that each of these novels chooses a colonial Indian origin for its 'mystery' dramatizes the multiple senses that cluster around the word—the criminal, the undiscovered, the inscrutable, the exotic—all with colonial reference" (612).

gothic underscores the extent to which contemporary masculinity, at least as it is imagined in this novella and in the Holmes canon as a whole, is a product of exposure to what is outside England. The manner in which a man confronts and responds to this exposure shapes his masculinity; either he conforms to standards of English masculinity, or he does not and, as a result, becomes "Other" (and "Othered"), as in the case of Small.

To summarize the convoluted plot, Mary Morstan, daughter of a former officer in an Indian regiment, seeks Holmes's service in the hopes of learning the identity of the self-proclaimed "unknown friend" who requests a meeting with her, the source of the pearls she has received every May 4 for the past six years and of finding her father Arthur, who disappeared shortly after arriving home from India in 1878, approximately ten years earlier. Thanks to Holmes and her "unknown friend, Thaddeus Sholto, the son of her father's friend and fellow convict-guard officer in the Andaman Islands, Major John Sholto, Mary Morstan's questions are soon answered. Thaddeus, a small, nervous aesthete and a loafer in his own right in that he performs no work informs her that her father died while having a quarrel with his father about an Indian treasure. He also identifies himself as the "unknown friend." He sends the pearls as a way of alleviating his guilt over his father's decision not to give Mary a share of the treasure which, after being hidden since his father's death, has recently been recovered.[107] Thaddeus's decision to

[107] The clearly negative description Watson gives of Thaddeus, although partially comic, is significant. According to McLaughlin, "the grotesque Sholto is a product of Britain's imperial mission, not simply as a drug user but, … , also as the beneficiary of tainted, ill-gotten colonial wealth…[In Sholto] Doyle conflates the decadence and the decline of rugged British masculinity with the fruits of Britain's imperial and colonial ventures " (59-60). While I agree there is a clear connection between decadence and declined masculinity in the character of Thaddeus, I would argue that it may have less to do with his relationship to "ill-gotten colonial wealth" and more to do with the fact that because he has inherited his wealth, he sees no need to do work to provide himself with an income and, since I maintain there is a link between work and

send Mary the pearls is in large part based on his father's deathbed confession—a death precipitated by the receipt of a letter from India in 1882—which he shares with Mary, Holmes, and Watson: "'I have only one thing,' he said, 'which weighs upon my mind at this moment. It is my treatment of Morstan's orphan. The cursed greed which has been my besetting sin through life has withheld from her the treasure, half at least of which should have been hers. And yet I have made no use of it myself, so blind and foolish a thing is avarice'" (145). With this confession, Major Sholto identifies himself as a victim of greed and Mary as a rightful heir to the fortune and thus establishes the major themes of the story: greed, rightful ownership, loyalty, and justice. Moreover, the apparent cause-and-effect relationship between the letter and his death establishes the fact that India, in some fashion, is connected to the case. After providing Mary with these answers, Thaddeus takes her, Holmes, and Watson, to confront Bartholomew about fairly splitting the treasure at his home, the home of their late father, Pondicherry Lodge. Named after the small and isolated capital of the Indian territories controlled by France, Pondicherry Lodge speaks to both the presence of the colonial in the metropole but also the psychology of Major Sholto. According to Todd Kuchta, the Pondicherry reference ultimately indicates Major Sholto's sense of entrapment and powerlessness…[and] reinforces Sholto's anxiety at being besieged by dangerous forces" (71-72). It turns out that Sholto's paranoia was not without warrant. Upon arriving, Holmes and Watson discover that Bartholomew has been murdered by an unknown suspect with tiny feet,

---

masculine identity, his masculinity is compromised by his lack of work. Furthermore, the text suggests that Thaddeus's wealth is not from the treasure—Major Sholto admits he never spent any of it—but from the money his father inherited from a rich uncle (231). How the rich uncle got rich is not revealed in the text.

poison darts, and an accomplice with a wooden leg—the type of man that Major Sholto feared most—and that the treasure has been stolen. After a series of investigations that culminates in a high speed boat chase on the Thames, Holmes gets his man and, more importantly, learns the details of the case from the surviving criminal, Jonathan Small.

Significantly, it is only after he has been captured and through his confession, which Watson titles "The Strange Story of Jonathan Small," that Small finally fully inserts himself into the narrative of the case. Up to this point he has been little more than a specter outside windows and a name on a piece of paper. In fact, it is as a name on a piece of paper that Mary saved from her father's belongings and shows to Holmes, that he first enters the story. As Holmes examines the paper, he shares his thoughts:

> "It is a paper of native Indian manufacture…It has some time been pinned to a board. The diagram upon it appears to be a plan of part of a large building with numerous halls, corridors, and passages…In the left-hand corner is a curious hieroglyphic like four crosses in a line with their arms touching. Beside it is written, in very rough and course characters, 'The sign of the four—Jonathan Small, Mahomet Singh, Abdullah Khan, Dost Akbar.' No, I confess that I do not see how this bears upon the matter. Yet it is evidently a document of importance." (138)

While Holmes finds little significance in the piece of paper at the time, he retains the information and uses it and other facts to name Jonathan Small as one of the prime

suspects after he finishes his investigation of the crime scene at Pondicherry Lodge.[108]

More than his name, though, Holmes has also determined that Small is a former convict with a wooden leg and that Small believes he has a right to the treasure which has recently been stolen from Bartholomew Sholto's home.[109] As is often the case in the Holmes canon, Watson is incredulous at Holmes's ability to ascertain so many details from what he perceives to be an inexplicable set of circumstances. Holmes, dismissive of Watson's incredulity, not only explains how the facts led to him to his "hypothesis," but also why Small sought the treasure and left the signature of the sign of four on Major Sholto's body:

> He comes to England with the double idea of regaining what he would consider to be his rights and of having his revenge upon the man who had wronged him…Mad with hate, …, against the dead man, he … leaves a memento of his visit in the short inscription upon the card…as a sign that it was not a common murder but, from the point of view of the four associates, something in the nature of an act of justice. Whimsical and bizarre conceits of this kind are common enough in the annals of crime and usually afford valuable indications as to the criminal. (174)

[108] These facts include the repeated appearance of the sign of four signature—Thaddeus reveals he found a similar paper on his dead father's chest, and Holmes and Watson find it on a paper near Bartholomew's dead body—Major Sholto's fear of men with wooden legs, the impressions of a wooden stump and single boot outside the window of the room in which Major Sholto died and inside the room in which Bartholomew Sholto was murdered. The other suspect, identified by the presence of a poison non-English thorn in Bartholomew's neck and small foot prints, is an Andaman Islander named Tonga. See Mehta and McBratney, who reads Tonga as evidence that "Doyle's novella works to legitimate the concepts of the racial and criminal type as they appear in the ethnography of the time," for a discussion of criminology and ethnography in the novella (150).

[109] Holmes also describes him as "poorly educated" (165). According to Kuchta, "emphasizing the suspect's mental inferiority and physical deformity, Holmes … sketches a member of the urban poor as clearly as his earlier description led Watson to envision 'a savage'" (73).

In his explanation, Holmes reveals that the issue of rights and justice, though seemingly universal, are more accurately a matter of perception. Small, double-crossed by Sholto, seeks revenge for his perceived loss, a situation so common in the annals of crime that it provides further support for his hypothesis. Holmes's conclusion is based on a single question: given the fact that Major Sholto was specifically afraid of white men with wooden legs, who other than Jonathan Small would or could leave the sign of four on the Sholto bodies?

The answer is, of course, no one. Holmes's hypothesis is proven to be correct after Small is captured by Holmes, Watson, and the incompetent police inspector Athelney Jones, whereupon Small tells his own story.[110] Holmes, confident that he knows all of how and why everything happened, still encourages Small to offer his own account of events. While this decision could be explained away as a matter of Holmesian convention—the precedent of allowing the captured suspect to speak for himself is first established in *A Study in Scarlet* when Jefferson Hope makes his statement—allowing Small to tell his own story allows the reader to better understand his motivations and, moreover, to complicate accepted notions of ownership, justice, loyalty, and the actions

[110] Regarding Small's capture—he jumps from the boat and his wooden leg gets stuck in the muck of the Thames—Childers contends, "as the drifter, the loafer, the lounger drained back into the cesspool of Watson's London, Small contributes to it putrefaction; yet the scene of Small being caught by and in English filth suggests that as much as he may have added to the pollution, it was already there and inescapable" (210). In the process of apprehending Small, Tonga is killed and the treasure is disposed of—both colonial participants are lost in the Thames, a fact which suggests that the foreign element can never be eradicated from the metropolitan center. McBratney argues the reality of Tonga in the Thames serves as "a reminder of a strange foreign criminality lying at the edge of the knowable and respectable English community" (157-8). Further, within the realm of Brantlinger's imperial gothic, the foreign invasion cannot be entirely repelled; instead, the foreign becomes a part of the nation.

of "good" men.[111] Specifically, Childers argues, "Jonathan Small's story plainly incriminates him and all English" of wrongdoing (209).[112] Before allowing Small his moment, though, Watson, as frame narrator, interjects. He wants the reader to see Small as he did the moment before the truth of his tale is revealed:

> He was a sunburned and reckless-eyed fellow, with a network of lines and wrinkles all over his mahogany features, which told of a hard, open-air life. There was a singular prominence about his bearded chin which marked a man who was not to be easily turned from his purpose. His age may have been fifty or thereabouts, for his black, curly hair was thickly shot with gray. His face in repose was not an unpleasing one, though his heavy brows and aggressive chin gave him, as I had lately seen, a terrible expression when moved to anger. (89)

Watson's description focuses entirely on his facial features. By drawing attention to his face, Watson participates in the contemporary discourse of criminal typology and "the idea that the type is a central human feature that determines human behavior, particularly in moments of atavism" made famous by the work of Cesare Lombroso (McBratney 158). Given the fact he is a criminal and an escaped convict, it seems reasonable to expect that Watson is reading the criminal type in Small. However, given that he begins his description with Small's complexion—he has "mahogany features"—it seems more

---

[111] While an aortic aneurism is the factor that precipitates Hope's statement, Holmes encourages Small to speak as a means of establishing that he is innocent of Bartholomew's murder: "'You must make a clean breast of it, for if you do I hope that I may be of use to you. I think I can prove that the poison acts so quickly that the man was dead before you reached the room'" (207).

[112] A fitting turn of events given Arata's claim: "In Doyle's Empire, everyone is a thief and no one can easily be blamed" (141).

likely that the type he is actually reading is that of the returned colonizer, specifically in this instance, the returned Anglo-Indian, not the criminal.[113] In his sunburned and heavily lined face, Watson reads his colonial past, a colonial past that years outside of the colony cannot erase and a colonial past from which he cannot escape. Yet Watson draws no link between his complexion, his colonial past, and his criminality. Instead, he twice comments on his chin as evidence of Small's determination and tendency toward single-mindedness, qualities, though befitting, are not limited to the criminal type or the returned colonial type. As a result, Watson's reading of Small's face forces the reader to consider the ways in which colonial service in India can affect an Englishman.

In his "strange story" of his past, Small tells the tale of a man plagued by personal limitations, bad luck, difficult choices, and the need for revenge. Moreover, "as his name suggests, Jonathan 'Small' is a commonplace man. A ne'er-do-well, a troublesome nonentity in his own culture" (Farrell 35). Originally from Worcestershire, Small admits that he never met the standards of respectability achieved by his family: "They were all steady, chapel-going folk, small farmers, well-known and respected over the countryside, while I was always a bit of a rover" (214). With the term rover, Small identifies himself as the antithesis of his family; they were stable, while he was not. Moreover, in failing to abide by his family's habits and customs and to participate in traditional work, Small characterizes himself as a man who has always existed, to a certain extent, outside the boundaries of traditional masculinity; he has always been a bit of a loafer. In fact, his

[113] The link between complexion and colonial service is long standing (see Chapter 1). First evidence in Holmes canon: Stamford, who introduces Watson to Holmes in *A Study in Scarlet*, declares, "'Whatever have you been doing to yourself, Watson? ...You are as thin as a lath and as brown as a nut'" (4).

reason for going to India had nothing to do with finding a place for himself in the world, serving his nation through colonial service, or even satisfying his roving nature. To spare himself and his family the indignity of being punished for getting "into a mess over a girl," as he calls it, he joined the army and left for India (214).[114] Yet, once in India, Small sees an opportunity to make something of himself and attempts to establish a recognizable and acceptable colonial masculinity through work, first as a soldier and then as an overseer on an indigo plantation after losing his right leg to a crocodile while taking an ill-advised swim in the Ganges.[115]

Unfortunately for Small, his attempt to overcome his injury, although initially successful, is short-lived. Shortly after beginning a job as a plantation overseer, the Sepoy Rebellion erupted and initiated a set of circumstances which forever prevented Small from fulfilling the expectations of a traditionally accepted colonial masculinity.[116] Of course, given the significance of the Rebellion to the English imagination, the subject of the previous chapter, the presence of the Rebellion in the story is more than a coincidence. In fact, Mehta points out that *The Sign of Four*, more than a representative

---

[114] Although the punishment for his "crime" is conscription in the army, I would argue that this does not provide evidence of criminal behavior but further proof of his alienation from traditional standards of masculinity.

[115] While losing his leg in this manner can simply be ascribed to his bad luck, Small's wound is often read of evidence of doubling, which, according to Barsham, is the central trope of the novella (121). For example, Mehta uses the wound to pair Watson and Small: "Watson's obscure leg wound…suggests the crippling legacies of imperial aggression, and the unacknowledged kinship of respectable 'half-pay surgeons' with colonial criminals" (Mehta 637). Of course, as I have argued earlier in the chapter, Watson does, in fact albeit implicitly, acknowledge his kinship with Small because he counts himself as one of the "loungers and idlers."

[116] The centrality of the Rebellion to the case, specifically as the backdrop for the original crime, can also be seen in "The Crooked Man" (1894). Because of their treatment of the Rebellion, these stories belong to what Ranajit Guha refers to as the prose of counterinsurgency: "by inscribing revolt within a narrative of crime…these stories not only diminish the political import of insurgency but also assert the need for, and rhetorically enact the gathering of, knowledge and the pursuit of order and control" (Siddiqi 88).

of the mutiny fiction genre, was "written at the inception of the second wave of popular English fiction about the Mutiny in the 1890s" (633). While it is beyond the scope of this chapter to explore the reasons or implications of the Rebellion's cultural resurgence in the *fin de siècle* in any detail, the fact that the Rebellion appears in several novels during this period calls attention to the way in which the Rebellion came to signify anxiety about Britain's colonial endeavors: "the compulsive, almost obsessional need to bring the Mutiny to account, to register every detail of its origins and to explain what could have brought such unimaginable 'treachery' and 'villainy,' is indicative of the extent to which the uprisings of 1857-58 challenged British claims to colonial authority" (Keep 212). While there seems to be little, if any, attempt to explain the Rebellion in the novel, it does serve a purpose. According to McLaughlin, "Doyle resurrects fears of the Mutiny in order to show his audience that the event is not so far removed from their daily lives. [Specifically, Small's] description of the Mutiny invokes the ultimate horror hinted at by *The Sign of Four*: a whole nation of devil-like Tongas let loose in rural England" (70-71).

Yet, along with the potential transference of the Rebellion to English shores, the Rebellion marks, for Small, at least, not a national or an imperial crisis, but the beginning of a personal tragedy:

> 'Well, I was never in luck's way long. Suddenly, without a note of warning, the great mutiny broke upon us. One month India lay as still and peaceful, to all appearance, as Surrey or Kent; the next there were two hundred thousand black devils let loose, and the country was a perfect hell. Of course, you know all about it gentlemen—a deal more than I do,

very like, since reading is not in my line. I only know what I saw with my own eyes.' (215)

Immediately, Small identifies the Rebellion as yet another source of bad luck. He neither cares nor knows how or why it started, and as Siddiqi elucidates, by referring to the rebels as "black devils let loose," Small "represents [them] as atavistic renegades rather than as political malcontents," thus depriving their cause of any authority or justification (90). He also emphatically diminishes his own authority by admitting his presumption that his listeners, who are of a higher class and thus more highly educated, are more knowledgeable of the details of the Rebellion as a historic event. Yet, as interesting as this admission may be, it does nothing to undermine his story because it is a rhetorical move that frees him—and, by extension, Doyle—from the burden of offering his version of the Rebellion. For both Small and Doyle, the details are already known and, therefore, do not need to be repeated. What needs to be told, in Small's opinion, is the way in which the Rebellion resulted in a situation that changed his life irrevocably for the worse. In his mind, the Rebellion initiated a series of events that have ended with him in custody in London. If not for the Rebellion, Small would be a free man. If not for the Rebellion, Small would not be a loafer.

According to Small, after the rebels attacked the plantation and killed all of the whites there—Small was spared the same fate because he was out in the fields when they arrived—he escaped to the city of Agra and joined a volunteer corps there to aid in the fort's defense. His assessment of the situation at Agra serves as his most extended account of the Rebellion itself:

> "As it proved, however, there was no great safety there, either. The whole country was up like a swarm of bees…It was a fight of the millions against the hundreds and the cruelest part of it was that these men that we fought against, foot, horse, and gunners, were our own picked troops, whom we had taught and trained, handling our own weapons and blowing our own bugle-calls." (216)

The bee metaphor, which further undermines the political justification of the rebels, draws attention to the well-established fact that the English were greatly outnumbered. However, as discussed earlier, while authors such as Trevelyan and Tennyson used this fact to commemorate the valor of the besieged Englishmen at Lucknow, Small conjures up the image of a small English force against an enraged rebel horde to illustrate the most devastating aspect of the Rebellion: broken loyalty. What is "cruelest" to Small is not the loss of life or even the challenge to British imperial authority. What is "cruelest" to Small is that these men, these mutineers, have turned against the very people who trained them; they have violated the trust that was placed in them when they were selected to join the imperial service and use British tools—military skill, weaponry, and bugles—to reinforce the severity of their betrayal. The extent to which Small feels a part of the imperial endeavor and, as a result, personally offended by the mutiny is revealed in his repeated use of the pronouns "we" and "our." Moreover, by highlighting the breach of loyalty, he foreshadows the ways in which loyalty—both loyalty kept and loyalty broken—has

played a significant role in his life.[117] Although he has become a loafer by circumstance, he defines himself as a loyal man.

Ironically, it is his sense of loyalty within the context of the Rebellion that transforms Small into a criminal and a loafer. While aiding in the defense of the Agra fort, Small is faced with the decision that will ultimately determine the course of the rest of his life. On the fateful evening of his turning point, two Sikh troopers under Small's command approach him and offer him an unenviable choice: "'You must either be with us now, or you must be silenced forever…Either you are heart and soul with us on your oath on the cross of the Christians, or your body this night shall be thrown into the ditch…There is no middle way. Which is it to be—death or life?'" (218-219). Understandably, Small attempts to get the Sikhs to explain so as to make a more informed choice. His initial fear is that the Sikhs want him to participate in an act of treason, that they want him to break his bond with his countrymen and compromise the integrity of the English claim on the fort. As a loyal Englishman, Small refuses to participate in any act against the fort; he would rather die than let the rebels win. The Sikhs allay his fear and propose an alternative bond of loyalty that will in no way infringe upon his loyalty to the English:

> "We only ask you to do that which your countrymen come to this land for. We ask you to be rich. If you will be one with us this night, we swear to you upon the naked knife, and by the threefold oath which no Sikh was ever known to break, that you shall have your fair share of the loot…I

[117] The significance of loyalty amongst loafers provides a striking parallel to "The Man Who Would Be King."

know that an oath is binding upon a Feringhee, and that we may trust you." (219)

What is interesting about the Sikh's rhetorical strategy is the way in which he presents the choice to join him and his compatriots as an opportunity that will not compromise but affirm his Englishness. By choosing to join the Sikhs, Small will participate in the centuries old English pursuit of riches in a colonial setting; after all, the possibility of getting rich, according to the Sikh, is the reason why all Englishmen come to India.[118] As such, once Small learns that the fort will remain safe and that he will get rich and have the opportunity to return to England a richer and thus better man to boot—"'I thought of what I would do in the old country with it, and how my folk would stare when they saw their ne'er-do-well coming back with pockets full of gold moidores"—he quickly chooses life over death and pledges his allegiance to the Sikhs (221). Thus, "the sign of four…symbolizes a unity and commitment that supersedes the ties of nation and race" (Siddiqi 91).[119]

Once they have Small's word, they explain their plan to rob the servant of a northern rajah, who values wealth over political conviction; the rajah's allegiance lies

[118] According to Childers, Small's inclusion of the Sikh's speech is significant because as a whole, what is "important in [Small's] narrative is the moral pollution that is tied to the English from the start. When the Sikhs give Small the opportunity to join them, clearly they are emulating Englishmen and Englishness in India" (219). The extent to which this statement is accurate is debatable. On one hand, the Sikhs ask Small to join them in what the English have always come to India for: to get rich. In doing so, they illuminate the true motivation for imperialism. On the other hand, once bound by the sign of four, the Sikhs and Small maintain their loyalty to one another in a way that is not seen between Englishmen—Sholto breaks his promise to both Small and Morstan—nor between the English and the Indians—bad policies and broken promises were some of the factors that precipitated the Rebellion.

[119] According to Siddiqi, the multi-racial nature of the group, though important, lacks true political significance: "the story acknowledges the possibility of a 'poor white' making common cause with Indians, but blunts the edge of this possibility by representing the subalterns as cohorts not in an insurgency but in a criminal conspiracy" (90-91)

with the side with the most power. As a result, the raja has split his treasure in half—he has kept gold and silver in his palace and sent his jewels to Agra—to assure himself retention of at least half his wealth, regardless of the Rebellion's outcome.[120] Significantly, the Sikhs view this duplicity, and not simply the proximity of the treasure, as justification for their actions: "'Having thus divided his hoard, he threw himself into the cause of the sepoys, since they were strong upon his borders. By his doing this, mark you, sahib, his property becomes the due of those who have been true to their salt'" (220). The Sikhs view the rajah's political ambivalence and treason with contempt. Moreover, Arata points out, the rajah's back story illuminates the fact that "however far back its history is traced, the treasure has always comprised the spoils of the unscrupulous" (141). In acting against the English by taking sides with the sepoys, but still hedging his bets by sending his jewels to Agra for safe keeping in case the English won instead, the rajah, according to the Sikhs, forfeits his claim to his own fortune. For them, disloyalty trumps ownership, and political allegiance to the English, ostensibly, obliterates any sense of wrongdoing associated with acts of murder and robbery.[121]

---

[120] See Mehta and Keep for a discussion of the link between the treasure and the Rebellion. Mehta contends, "the chief jewel in question is an immense diamond which is not only from India, but ambivalently figures India…[Moreover,] in the context of the Mutiny, Doyle's choice of name for the diamond ['The Great Mogul'] evokes a grim textual irony, as the last emperor of the once-mighty Moghul dynasty, who resurfaced from obscurity to become a political symbol during the revolt, was deposed by the British in 1857, while Keep argues, "the sheer excessiveness of the Agra treasure, its power to attract, to kill, and to elude capture, and perhaps most significantly, its imminent return to the shores of Great Britain in the form of a murderous conspiracy, is symptomatic of its origin in the discursive unmanageability of the Mutiny" (613-616, 212).

[121] It stands to reason that the importance of loyalty is, in large part, the reason why Small maintains that he, on behalf of the sign of four, has the only valid claim to the treasure. He has remained loyal to the end unlike Sholto who double-crossed Small, the Sikhs, and Morstan. Therefore, in Small's mind, Sholto's disloyalty completely undermines any claim he (or his heirs) have on the treasure.

Yet, despite the seemingly inherent Englishness of his decision to join the Sikhs and get rich, Small actually severs all claims to Englishness and an accepted colonial masculinity when he binds himself to their cause. As a co-conspirator and thief, Small has found a way to survive outside the prescribed bounds of official colonial work. He cares nothing about fulfilling a colonial duty; he only cares about becoming rich without having to do any work. In fact, his sole responsibility in the transmission of the crime is to allow the merchant into the fort and to stand guard. In other words, Small is a loafer. Shortly after the Rebellion the authorities learn of the murder, but, just as significantly, not the treasure. Ironically, Small's decision to choose life becomes a life sentence in an Andaman Island prison.[122] However, rather than lament the turn of events, certainly the easier and more predictable route, Small resolves never to give up hope that one day the four, despite the fact they are convicts, will reclaim the treasure from its hiding place in the Agra fort and be rich. His determination pays off. Night after night, he watches as the surgeon, for whom he works, prison officials, and soldiers, including Major Sholto and Captain Morstan, play cards, and he comes to the realization that the civilians always beat the soldiers. When he overhears Sholto admit to Morstan that his losses have ruined him, Small sees his chance. He informs Sholto that he knows the location of a large treasure and asks him if he thinks turning it over to the authorities will result in a reduction in his sentence. Although Sholto initially concedes that the treasure should rightly go to the government—the rajah, now deposed and in exile, is but a distant memory—he changes his mind after consulting with Morstan and informs Small of his decision: "'we have

[122] Actually, since he is a white man in cahoots with Indians, Small is initially sentenced to death; his sentence is later reduced to life.

come to the conclusion that this secret of yours is hardly a government matter, after all, but is a private concern of your own, which of course you have the power of disposing of as you think best'" (229). Greed and fear of ruin, it seems, have persuaded Sholto that personal gain is more important than allegiance to the imperial government. By claiming that the existence and location of the treasure, which he refers to as Small's secret, is a private concern, Sholto, in effect, serves as a double for Small in that both men put aside their ethical reservations at the prospect of getting rich.[123] He also, significantly, assigns all rights to the treasure firmly on Small. According to Sholto, it is Small's secret, Small's private concern, and thus Small's decision to do with it what he thinks is best. Small, as one of the four, refuses to make this decision himself. Instead, he consults with his compatriots, and together they decide to include Sholto and Morstan as beneficiaries—Sholto and Morstan will split a fifth share—in exchange for help in escaping the prison. Although Morstan attempts to negotiate a larger portion and to eliminate the Sikhs from the deal, Small stands firm—"'We have sworn it. The four of us must always act together'"—and a deal is "sealed by the most solemn oaths that the mind could think or lips could utter" (230). Small's insistence on maintaining his loyalty to the Sikhs combined with the fact that the agreement with Sholto is sealed with oaths, a formal demonstration of loyalty, reiterates his firmly established claim that loyalty serves as his guiding virtue.

The same cannot be said of Sholto. He goes to India and steals the treasure for himself. Thus, to all intents and purposes, Sholto, like Small, is a thief. This fact, though

[123] Kestner argues, "Small and Sholto constitute a condemnation so the grasping nature of imperialism and the economic impetus of the ideology of 'great expectations'" (67).

not explicitly stated outside of Small's narrative, has generated considerable attention.[124] On a very basic level, by pointing the finger at Sholto—his robbery stands as a significant link in the chain of events that has culminated in Small's arrest—" the criminality initially linked to Small and Tonga shifts to Sholto" (Arata 74). With the onus on Sholto, the facts of the case become rather more than less complicated. Who is to blame? Who is responsible? Who is the criminal? Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, Small focuses more attention on the broken promise than the loss of treasure in his implicit answer to these questions:

> "The scoundrel had stolen it all without carrying out one of the conditions on which we had sold him the secret. From that day I lived only for vengeance. I thought of it by day and I nursed it by night. It became an overpowering absorption with me. I cared nothing for the law—nothing for the gallows. To escape, to track down Sholto, to have my hand upon his throat—that was my one thought. Even the Agra treasure had come to be a smaller thing in my mind that the slaying of Sholto." (231)

While he consistently passes the responsibility of blame onto others, most obviously, Sholto and the Rebellion, throughout the narrative, Small never attempts to persuade his audience that he is innocent. He is a thief and an accomplice to murder. These are crimes he acknowledges and accepts. However, as he tries to make clear, he is not a criminal by

[124] Kuchta offers a particularly compelling argument: "In the final chapter of the novel, the criminality initially linked to Small and Tonga shifts to Sholto…Small is no more—and in some ways much less—a criminal than Major Sholto, proving himself faithful to his Indian confederates and honoring the pact made under 'the sign of four.' In contrast, Sholto does not even recognize honor among thieves…Recognizing Sholto as the instigator of reverse colonization allows for a retrospective reading of the novel in which Sholto himself emerges as the agent of decay" (74-78).

nature but by circumstance. In the face of a given situation, he has consistently chosen the option that will prolong his life and will optimize his opportunities; he is simply a loafer. The issue he takes with Sholto, the issue that compels him to devote his life to avenging what he perceives to be the wrong perpetrated by Sholto, is that he broke his promise. This breach of contract provides an interesting parallel between this story and "The Man Who Would be King." In both stories, this breach leads to the loafer's downfall. Specifically, it is a breach of contract, more than the loss of treasure, which drives Small to live for vengeance and presumably results in a life sentence, while Dravot's breach of contract exposes him as mortal and leads to his execution and Carnehan's psychological breakdown and eventual death. Although certainly wronged by Sholto, Small's position as an escaped convict coupled with his inability to seek any other livelihood than one founded on the principle of revenge places him firmly in the position of "lounger and idler" destined to commit crimes in England.[125]

The inability to escape a criminal past also plagues Dr. Grimesby Roylott, the villain of "The Adventure of the Speckled Band," a story published in 1892 in the collection *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. In his particular case, though, Roylott's status as both a criminal and a loafer—and thus as a cultural and social outsider—is compounded by his psychological degeneration, which is both hereditary and influenced

[125] While many, including Mehta, McBratney, and Thompson, argue that the novella ends with Holmes's triumph in that he removes the colonial threat—Tonga is dead, and Small is on his way to prison—the implications of Small's narrative suggest that the possibility of containment is a mere illusion for the simple fact that "the arrest of a single individual turns out to be idly irrelevant to the larger pattern of criminality revealed in the narrative" (Arata 143). Furthermore, Kuchta revises the traditional view of Holmes in a productive way, "Doyle offers a less reassuring picture of Holmes's powers. Holmes traces a suburban crime to the slums of darkest London, only to reveal its ultimate sources in the figure of the retired Anglo-Indian, whom popular discourse constructed as both a typical denizen of suburbia and a cause of physical, moral, and national degeneration" (61). See Kuchta for a discussion of *fin de siècle* perceptions of the Anglo-Indian.

by his colonial experience. Because his degeneration comes from two fronts, Roylott symbolizes the ways in which the English colonizer, degenerated by modern life, can be easily corrupted by the colony and degenerate even further. In Doyle's view, which contradicts Kipling's perspective in this regard, there is no place where an Englishman can be safe of the degeneration supposedly inherent in this period.

Regarding the case, the year is 1883 and, again, Holmes's client is a woman, Helen Stoner. Helen hires Holmes to discover the connection between the sound of a late night whistle and her twin sister Julia's death two years prior because she has recently heard the whistle herself and is afraid for her life.[126] In reporting the details of the case, Helen begins with a rather unflattering portrait of her stepfather's family:

> 'I am living with my stepfather, who is the last survivor of one of the oldest Saxon families in England, the Roylotts of Stoke Moran, on the western border of Surrey….The family was at one time among the richest in England…In the last century, however, four successive heirs were of a dissolute and wasteful disposition, and the family ruin was eventually completed by a gambler in the days of the Regency.'(400)

Grimesby, significantly the last of the Roylotts, is explicitly characterized by his ancestors' dissipation; he is the sole survivor of a degenerate and practically extinct aristocratic line. Attempting to reverse his fate, Roylott earned a medical degree, went to

[126] In terms of chronological sequence, then, this case precedes *The Sign of Four*. Watson reveals that while "the events in question occurred in the early days of my association with Holmes," he did not write about the case sooner because Holmes's client wanted to keep the matter a secret (397). The fact that the client is now dead frees Watson from his obligation. Incidentally, his motivation for returning this particular case stems from two factors: it is a singular case, and he wants to dispel rumors about the nature of Dr. Grimesby Roylott's death.

Calcutta, and established a large practice. Without realizing it, Helen offers more than incidental details; she introduces the theme of degeneration and alerts Holmes to the underlying motive and the perpetrator of the crime. Grimesby Roylott, a returned colonizer without money of his own, murdered Julia, and attempts to murder Helen, out of greed. However, the question remains, what effect did his colonial experience have on his subsequent actions in England? Was he a victim, so to speak, of colonial circumstances, like Small, or is something else at work here? How does his inherited degeneration influence his colonial experience?

Lisa Fluet, in her analysis of this particular returned colonizer, begins her argument with the famous cesspool metaphor:

> the routing of this particular 'lounging' and 'idling' Anglo-Indian from British society…depicts the punishment of a weak Englishman who, in succumbing to the physical and cultural effects of the colonial spaces, consequently failed to exploit his Indian medical practice for the restoration of his ancient Saxon family and estate—Roylott's crime is, in short, a compound of 'orientalization' and self-alienation from professional desires and aims. (135)

In making this claim, Fluet points to Roylott's colonial experience as the determining factor of his criminality. While I concur that Roylott's colonial past is significant and decidedly criminal, I contend that his "orientalization," rather than a tangible result of his experience, is actually a consequence of his inherited and inherent degeneration. Always already degenerate, Roylott, a convicted murderer, returns to England and commits

further crimes in order to forestall his complete financial ruin. Therefore, his criminal actions are not solely the result of his inability to withstand the influence of his colonial surrounding but his inability to stave off an inherited psychological condition, combined with his inability, as an Orientalized returned colonizer, to reintegrate into British society.[127] His status as a returned colonial and his criminal past preclude Roylott from establishing a stable, acceptable masculinity through work and, thereby, position him in the undesirable category of loafer.[128]

Of course, Roylott, despite being the heir of a degenerate family, did not always exhibit this trait. In fact, his decision to earn a medical degree and his initial success as a doctor in Calcutta serve as a testament to his fortitude and his ability. Through skill and determination, he attempts to turn the tide of his family's misfortune. In this respect he is much like Small; he arrives in India with the intention of overcoming his past by creating a new personal and familial identity founded on the premise of duty and work.[129] Also like Small, though, Roylott's initial success and stable colonial masculinity irrevocably deteriorates with a single criminal act: "'in a fit of anger, however, caused by some

---

[127] In making her argument, Fluet implies that criminality is a uniquely Indian quality, which, it seems to me, is an instance of orientalism in and of itself.

[128] Fluet admits that "it was not uncommon…for a physician with a successful background in Indian practice to find the acquiring of a practice in the now 'unknown circumstances' of London difficult—even without the capital crime and prison sentence which Roylott, of course, has attached to his name" (144). Incidentally, while I focus in this paper on the way in which the colonial experience compromises his masculinity, Kestner argues that he subverts his masculinity in an entirely different way: he belongs to a group of characters in the Holmes canon who "become perverse fathers and stepfathers through ruthless exploitation of patriarchal dominance and abuse of their role as paterfamilias in the domestic sphere" (17).

[129] In regards to his decision to become a doctor, Fluet contends he does not do it out of interest in medicine, in healing patients, or in aiding the imperial cause, but in making money: "Roylott's choice of a private Indian practice betrays an interest in amassing a considerable income, presumably for the restoration of his family name and estate" (140). Given his position as a poor aristocrat, the last of the family line, no less, it seems curious to expect any other motive. After all, regardless of the reality of the situation—for example, Roylott ultimately fails at realizing this goal—India was generally perceived as a place where a poor man could make money and a name for himself.

robberies which had been perpetrated in the house, he beat his butler to death and narrowly escaped a capital sentence. As it was, he suffered a long term of imprisonment and afterwards returned to England a morose and disappointed man'" (400).[130] By attributing the murder to "a fit of anger," Helen attempts to explain the discrepancy between cause and effect; beating a man to death in retribution for the theft of personal belongings is, she is aware, extreme, to say the least. While she never maintains Roylott's innocence or justifies his action, she does attempt to offer an explanation for both his initial crime and his more recent violent outbursts and isolationist tendencies that transfers some of the blame off of Roylott's shoulders: "'violence of temper approaching to mania has been hereditary in the men of the family, and in my stepfather's case it had, I believe, been intensified by his long residence in the tropics'" (401). In Roylott's case, his aristocratic degeneracy existed as more than a superficial tendency toward extravagance and sloth that could be overcome through conscientious industriousness; it manifested itself as an inherent mental affliction that no amount of hard work could overcome. Therefore, while Helen's claim that tropic exposure directly resulted in this criminal act, the fact that this predisposition to violent mania was a hereditary trait undermines the strength of her suggestion.[131] It seems more likely that the manifestation of the mental illness weakened him to such an extent that he could be more easily

[130] While Helen is never more explicit about the length of his imprisonment, she offers several facts—she was two when her mother married Roylott, her mother died eight years ago shortly after they returned from India, her sister died two years ago—that allow one to calculate the length of the sentence; according to my figuring, Roylott was imprisoned for approximately twenty years.

[131] Fluet explains that "the traditional invisibility of mental illness…compels Helen Stoner to imagine a palpably, biologically other colonial sphere as the catalyst to the violent manifestation of Roylott's 'hereditary mania' in England" (150). It seems that the colonial space is being used as a scapegoat here, for one can presume that the other Roylotts, equally predisposed to fits of mania, did not travel to India (or any other colonial space) and, thus, that their psychotic breaks occurred while they were still within the presumably safe and stable confines of England. Just because Helen thinks it does not make it true.

influenced by his colonial surroundings.[132] Despite his best efforts—or any efforts, for that matter—he could not overcome this hereditary defect, and after serving a long prison sentence, he, although broken and disappointed, returns to England with his wife, Helen's mother, and his two stepdaughters with the intention of once again starting over. However, soon after their return, his wife was killed in a railway accident, and he abandoned all efforts to establish himself as a doctor in England, thus effectively taking on the role of a "lounger and idler." Instead of defining himself through work, Roylott is defined by his unofficial title of "the terror of the village," his association with gypsies, and his "passion" for Indian animals (401).[133]

Before Holmes and Watson can leave London to investigate the details of the case further, Roylott bursts into Holmes's sitting room unannounced. Although his presence does nothing to further the plot of the story, along with Helen's extended discussion of the Roylott family and her stepfather's violent tendencies, it points to the good doctor as the focal point of both the narrative and the case. Fittingly, then, Watson offers a detailed description of the antagonist:

> Our door had been suddenly dashed open, and… a huge man had framed himself in the aperture. His costume was a peculiar mixture of the professional and of the agricultural, having a black top-hat, a long frock-

[132] In making this claim, I challenge Fluet's argument that Roylott's criminality is based on the extent to which he has been "'Orientalized' in body, mind, and murderous practices" (135). His characterization as a degenerate aristocrat complicates her reading of this criminal. As such, I believe it is more accurate to contend that his mental illness is what allowed him to become so thoroughly "Orientalized." If it were simply a case of colonial exposure, the hereditary illness would be a superfluous detail.

[133] Along with the swamp adder, his weapon of choice, Roylott also owns a baboon and a cheetah, which roam free on the property. I will address the swamp adder more directly later. In the meantime, it should be noted that while a cheetah is (or at least was at the time) indigenous to India, a baboon is not.

> coat, and a pair of high gaiters, with a hunting-crop swinging in his hand. So tall was he that his hat actually brushed the cross bar of the doorway, and his breadth seemed to span it across from side to side. A large face, seared with a thousand wrinkles, burned yellow with the sun, and marked with every evil passion, was turned from one to the other of us, while his deep-set, bile shot eyes, and his high, thin, fleshless nose, gave him somewhat the resemblance to a fierce old bird of prey. (407-8)

Virtually superhuman in stature and grotesque in appearance, Roylott's predominant feature is his size. His exaggerated physique—he literally fills the door—in combination with his hostile temperament immediately identifies him as unstable and threatening, while his cross-class and cross-occupational ensemble classify him as a man without a specific vocation or social station. Moreover, in focusing the latter part of the description on his face, Watson attempts to convey that not only does Roylott, like Small, bear the mark of his colonial experience—he has been forever burned yellow by the sun—but of his psychological degeneracy—he cannot hide his evil and criminal proclivities, for they are cast into his wrinkles. Interestingly, in Roylott's case, the coloring of his skin, more than a simple sign of exposure to a tropical clime, is a sign of his "orientalization."[134] No

[134] For Harris, Roylott's Orientalization dominates the text. According to him, "Dr. Roylott is persistently and relentlessly Orientalized" (459). Fluet's reading of this passage likewise focuses on the link between Roylott's body and a commentary on imperialism: "The first half of Watson's account, depicting a larger-than-life Roylott, accords with the sort of late nineteenth century rhetoric of an 'imperial race' whereby the physical health and strength of the individual settler is equated with his nation's racial destiny and expression…The second half of Watson's account, however, suggests that Roylott's massive, 'English' body, with all the physiological justification of British imperialistic expansion that it would seem to represent, nevertheless betrays signs of the debilitating effects of the colonial sphere" (151).

one can view this man without seeing him as what he has become—a degenerate and a criminal and an Anglo-Indian.

However, despite the obvious hints at criminality revealed in his person and his character, Holmes initially suspects the gypsies of the crime. A bit of investigative work into the statutes of Helen's mother's will leads him away from the gypsies and to the actual culprit and his motivation.[135] In an attempt to secure the entirety of his dead wife's inheritance, which he needs because his family fortune is long gone and, further, because as a "lounger and idler" he fails to secure his own income through work, Roylott killed his stepdaughter Julia before she could marry and claim her share of it. The fact that Helen, who has recently become engaged herself, has turned to Holmes saves her from sharing her sister's fate. Holmes and Watson travel to Surrey to investigate Helen's, formerly Julia's, and Roylott's rooms. Through a series of observations and deductions during a night spent in Helen's room—the dummy bell-pull over a bed fixed to the floor, the ventilator between Julia's and Roylott's rooms, and a saucer of milk and a small dog lash in Roylott's room—Holmes comes to the conclusion that Roylott is the murderer and that the murder weapon is a snake. The speckled band to which Julia referred before she died is a swamp adder, the deadliest snake in India. When Holmes sends the snake back

[135] Holmes's summary of the will's contents: "'The total income, which at the time of the wife's death was little short of £1100, is now, through the fall in agricultural prices, not more than £750. Each daughter can claim an income of £250, in case of marriage. It is evident, therefore, that if both girls had married, this beauty would have had a mere pittance, while even one of them would cripple him to a very serious extent'" (409). Fluet finds this motive unsatisfactory: "The almost commonplace nature of his motive—particularly in this, arguably one of Conan Doyle's most well-crafted and famous stories—betrays, I would argue, the tale's more pressing concern with criminalizing and ultimately vanquishing, the 'stranger who is not a stranger,' the failed colonial medical professional, and thus inadequate representative of Britain-as-imperial-power" (133). I contend that while commonplace, the motive fits Roylott's character as it has been presented by Helen: he needs money to restore the family name and due to his criminal record cannot (or chooses not to) earn money on his own.

through the ventilator, it kills its owner and thus brings Roylott's criminal life to an end. While countless sources point to the fact that the swamp adder is a fictional species, what matters more is that the snake is poisonous.[136] According to Harris, during the nineteenth century "criminal poisoning was [perceived as] a crime peculiar to the tropics, which meant that cases of homicidal poisoning in London suggested that Britain's imperial expansion had allowed the vice to spread from the colonial dominions to the heart of the metropolis" (449). Incidentally, death by poison also occurs in *The Sign of Four* except in that case it is a native, not a native Englishman, who administered the fatal substance to his victims. The fact that Roylott uses poison as his weapon of choice, then, is symptomatic of his colonial experience: ""As Holmes puts it … using an exotic organic toxin is an idea which would only 'occur to a clever and ruthless man who had an Eastern training.' To clever and ruthless men who have *not* participated in Britain's exploitations and occupations, this idea does not appear to occur" (Harris 452). Ironically, Roylott, contaminated by a colonial experience characterized by the murder he commits in a colonial space and by hereditary degeneracy acquired from his aristocratic Anglo-Saxon ancestor, dies from the poison he introduced into England to bolster and secure his social position.[137] In other words, Roylott falls victim to the erroneous premise that colonial

[136] Several sources point out that the swamp adder is not, as Holmes claims, the deadliest snake in India for one of two reasons: 1. the swamp adder is not an actual, but a fictional species, or 2. the swamp adder (Proatheris superciliaris) or swamp viper, its more widely recognized common name, is native to East Africa, not India. Laurence M. Klauber, completely in jest, offers an entirely different explanation: citing evidence that Roylott was involved in a breeding experiment, Klauber claims that the reptile in question is a hybrid between a snake and a Gila monster. Moreover, given Holmes's vast knowledge, it is not he who misidentifies the creature, but Watson, who mishears and misquotes Holmes original statement: "It is a sampaderm, the deadliest skink in India."

[137] Kestner contends, "the fact that the mode of death, an 'Indian swamp adder,' originates from Roylott's contact with the colonies, condemns the colonial enterprise, as does the presence of a cheetah and a baboon from India on the grounds of Stokes-Moran, indicating Roylott's savage and uncivilized disposition" (90-

experience provides an easy road to financial gain. Corrupted by ignorance and by greed, Roylott, ultimately, is the victim of his own colonial failure and the symbol of colonial failure in general.

Despite the differences in representation or perception of the loafer offered by these Kipling and Doyle, the loafers in question—Carnehan, Dravot, Small, and Roylott—are all resolutely Anglo-Indian. As such, by focusing specifically on the characters as loafers, a colonial class largely unregarded and overlooked in colonial discourse analysis, I hope to draw attention to the way in which the attitude toward the colonizer as Anglo-Indian is, significantly, dependent upon his location. Moreover, although the loafer is defined by his lack of imperial work, the character of the loafer functions as a medium through which questions of imperial fitness and the impact of imperialism on both the individual and the nation can be introduced. Whereas Doyle's loafers present a criminal menace because they return to England—even the non-criminals are loafers and thus a constant reminder of colonial failure—Kipling's loafers, though ultimately unsuccessful, remain a benign and admired presence because they remain in India and thus pose no direct threat to the English at home. Moreover, Kipling's loafers, because they possess knowledge of India, have the potential to enact beneficial changes when or if they return to an official position, as discussed in *Letters of Marque*. Regardless of his place, though, whether in England or India, the loafer, in failing to do the work of nation in the Empire, relinquishes his English identity and

---

1). I wonder to what extent it could be argued that this "savage and uncivilized disposition" is actually inherent rather than acquired through colonial contact. If this is accurate, it seems that this story offers an more disturbing picture of Englishness, that it is, to a certain extent, already corrupted and/or easily corruptible.

becomes an Anglo-Indian. However, the extent to which this shift in representation can be seen as inevitable, positive, or cautionary is, ultimately, a matter of perspective.

Chapter 4: Being Anglo-Indian: The Colonizer and the Fate of Empire

After the First World War, the British Empire was at its most expansive yet most precarious state. Fittingly, questions regarding the fate of the Empire and the tenability of maintaining the Empire dominate the late-imperial period.[138] For some, specifically those who maintained what Francis Hutchins refers to as "the illusion of permanence," the idea of Britain without its empire was unfathomable.[139] Unsurprisingly, many of the people who held this view were imperial agents. Given the fact that their livelihoods and sense of identity depended entirely on Britain's ability to maintain its status as imperial power, they supported any measure that would sustain the imperial status quo even in the face of dramatic changes initiated by the war.[140] For others, the preservation of empire was not only economically and politically unfeasible but increasingly detrimental to the nation and to national identity; to maintain its national integrity, Britain had no option but to abandon its empire and to adapt to the modern world that had been created by the war.

As evidenced by the work of Kipling, E.M. Forster, and George Orwell, the representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian serves as a common vehicle through

---

[138] This period begins with the end of World War I, for according to Charles Allen, World War I "stands as a divide between the old Imperial India of the Edwardian age and the newly self-conscious India of the twenties" (12).

[139] Ironically, according to Francis Hutchins, "the certainty of a permanent Empire…seemed to increase in proportion to its fragility, and to serve for many people as a defense and retreat from reason long after the course of events had proved its impossibility" (xii)..

[140] According to Laurie Kaplan, the illusion of permanence is characterized by a sense of nostalgia, a hearkening back to an earlier and seemingly easier time: "for some Anglo-Indians, a vision of imperial permanence obscured the realities of the Indian political and social landscape, and their sense of complacency seemed a remnant of the nineteenth-century spirit of Empire" (160). For a longer discussion of this imperial perspective, see Francis Hutchins.

which authors articulate their perception of the relationship between empire and identity in late-imperial fiction.[141] Specifically, in the short story "The Son of His Father" (1893-1894/1923), Kipling, taking his expected pro-imperial stance, presents his most explicit articulation of his belief that the fate of the British Raj rests solely on the shoulders of the Anglo-Indians, specifically those Anglo-Indians born and raised in India, because they know India and Indians better than any colonizer born and raised in England ever could. Ultimately, for him, Anglo-Indian knowledge ensures indefinite British control over India and thus British strength. As such, the representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian allows him to perpetuate his belief that the Anglo-Indian is, above all, a national figure and that through his imperial service, the Anglo-Indian is English.

In contrast, Forster and Orwell use the representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian in their novels *A Passage to India* (1924) and *Burmese Days* (1934) respectively, to argue against the legitimacy the British imperial project.[142] For them, the Anglo-Indian colonizer, because of his imperial service, is not an Englishman, but possesses an identity antithetical to Englishness. While several critics have explored the anti-imperial theme of these novels, the representation of the colonizer and, more specifically, the way in which the imperial experience transforms an Englishman into an Anglo-Indian has been largely ignored. In the role of colonizer, the Englishman loses his individuality and humanity and

[141] Incidentally, John McBratney also uses these three authors in his argument about imperial theatricality: "Like ornamental theatricality, the everyday theatricality represented in this literature works to exhibit the power and legitimacy of British rule for a double audience (Britons themselves and Indians)" ("Theatricality" 20).

[142] These novels have been compared by various critics. According to Praseeda Gopinath, *Burmese Days* is generally considered the lesser of the two (217). However, Malcolm Muggeridge, in his analysis of the three major writers of the British Raj, *Burmese Days* is the better novel: "British rule in India and Burma has left only a very meager literary deposit. There is E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*, in my opinion a grotesquely overrated book; there is Kipling; and there is Orwell" (xiv).

becomes nothing more than a replaceable part in the imperial machine; he becomes an Anglo-Indian. Ultimately, Forster and Orwell use the Anglo-Indian to expose the lie of imperialism—the lie that empire exists for the good of the colonized and that empire recruits and produces strong English men—to show that empire does not benefit but degrades the English.

The Native-Born Anglo-Indian: The Future of Empire

In Kipling's view, knowledge of India provides the foundation of imperial fitness; a man who knows India can do the work of empire effectively. While this knowledge can be acquired through experience over time—a fact that means any man has the potential to be successful in India regardless of his birthplace—Kipling repeatedly represents the Anglo-Indian born in India as the consummate colonizer.[143] Due to the circumstances of his birth, the native-born, who is raised by Indian nannies and thereby has greater access to Indian customs, language, and perspectives in his youth, knows India more thoroughly than any native Englishman ever could: "because of his intimacy with Indians, he possesses, despite his British descent, a cultural and ideological value shaped as much by Indian customs as by Anglo-Indian mores" (McBratney, *Native Born* xiv). This bicultural perspective shapes the native-born Anglo-Indian for life and cannot be eradicated during the inevitable period of English education experienced by Anglo-Indian children.[144] As

[143] This character, John McBratney notes, can be found throughout Kipling's imperial fiction: "Kipling wrote about the hyphenated white male in many versions—in minor figures like the child Tods, the policeman Strickland, and Strickland's son Adam, but also in major characters like Mowgli, Kim, and the Roman Soldier Parnesius" (*Native Born* xvii). The term "native born" also happens to be a title of a poem, "The Native-Born," published in 1895.

[144] Kipling shares the experience of his own Indian childhood and English education in both fiction, "Baa Baa Black Sheep" (1888), and his autobiography, *Something of Myself* (1937). In both instances, he speaks of it fondly, as confirmed by the epigraph from the opening chapter of *Something of Myself*: "Give me the

such, the native-born Anglo-Indian enters his imperial service fully aware of what the colonized peoples and the imperial administration need and require from him, and since he has become fluent in native languages during his youth, he is better able to communicate with the colonized peoples.[145]

Originally published in two parts in *Today* on December 10, 1893 and January 6, 1894 and later republished in the collection *Land and Sea Tales: For Scouts and Guides* in 1923, "The Son of His Father" presents Kipling's clearest articulation of the positive attributes of the native born and the role of the native born in the Empire.[146] Given the fact that Kipling republished the story for a later generation of would-be-imperial servants in 1923—the scouts and guides named in the collection's title—it is certainly significant that Strickland, the District Superintendent of the Police, and "the most repeatedly examined of the country-born in Kipling" serves as the story's protagonist (McBratney 45). As a matter of fact, Strickland is featured in five earlier short stories—"Miss Youghal's Sais" (1888), "The Bronkhurst Divorce Case" (1888), "To be Filed for Reference" (1888), "The Mark of the Beast" (1888), "The Return of Imray" (1888)—and

---

first six years of a child's life and you can have the rest" (3). Kipling's continued intimacy with Indian culture was frowned upon by the Anglo-Indian community when he returned to India in 1882. Apparently, young Kipling preferred native bazaars to the club: "According to Lord Birkenhead, 'There was much adverse comment in the English community over the young Kipling's immersion in the bazaar and in other aspects of native life, and many gloomy forecasts were made of the manifold dangers lurking there-in for so young a man" (McBratney, *Native Born* 7).

[145] Regarding his own access to native languages as a child, Kipling recalls: "In the afternoons before we took our sleep, [my ayah] or Meeta [my Hindu bearer] would tell us stories and Indian nursery songs all unforgotten, and we were sent into the dining-room after we had been dressed, with the caution, 'Speak English no to Papa and Mama.' So we spoke 'English,' haltingly translated out of the vernacular idiom that one though and dreamed in" (*Something* 4).

[146] The Biblical allusion inherent in the title—specifically, Jesus is referred to as the son of the father—suggests that both father and son rule India with divine right. Kipling famously articulates his notion that God is on the side of the British and thus their rule is ordained by God in "Recessional" (1897).

acts as a minor character in the novel *Kim* (1901).[147] He is, according to Stephen Arata, "Kipling's Anglo-Indian *par excellence*" (162). As such, Strickland's return to prominence after a two decades long absence suggests that he is, once again, being used as a vehicle for Kipling's imperial vision. Specifically, the nostalgic return of Strickland, more than a simple instance of republication, a common occurrence in the Kipling canon, mirrors Kipling's nostalgic vision of the future of empire: with men like Strickland at the helm, men who have served the empire effectively through their knowledge of India, the empire will continue on as if nothing—that is, the Great War—had ever happened. Strickland and men like him ensure the permanence of empire.

The plot of the story centers on the actions of Strickland's son, Adam. The pride of his parents and of Strickland's subordinates, Adam is a boy destined to follow in his father's footsteps; after all, he is the son of his father. There is no question that he too will be a police officer or that he, like his father, will use his knowledge of the native population to his advantage for the good of the empire. The notion that the place of Adam's birth will have tremendous bearing on his future competency as an imperial agent is first introduced through a conversation between a group of native police officers, including a Naik, or corporal, whose wife is serving as Adam's wet nurse or, as they refer to her, his foster mother. Imam Din, the only officer named, believes that having a native foster mother will prove to be an asset to Adam in the future:

[147] Strickland is introduced as a man who knows the ways of Indians and uses this knowledge to his benefit, despite the negative reaction of his superiors, as a police officer in "Miss Youghal's Sais." The fact that he is native born is not mentioned until *Kim*.

> "I am glad…Those who drink our blood become of our own blood, and I have seen in these thirty years, that the sons of the Sahibs, once being born here, return when they are men. Yes, they return after they have been to Belait [Europe]…This child will also be suckled here, and he will have double wisdom, and when he is a Police officer it will be very bad for the thieves in this illakha." (1-2)

As Imam Din perceives the situation, the native foster mother will make Adam a member of "our" race endowed with knowledge of both his own English culture and the native culture through the simple act of feeding. His dual cultural access, this "double wisdom," gleaned at his foster mother's breast is the key to his future success in the police force, for the time spent in Europe will offer nothing but a bit of formal training. Almost from the moment of his birth, Adam is assured a place as a servant of empire; according to Imam Din, whose praise of Adam's prospects speak to his belief in the imperial enterprise, no other future is possible for him. Interestingly, while the Naik is proud of the fact that his wife is serving as foster mother—his connection to her automatically elevates his own position in the group—he does not believe that his wife's milk will have such a lasting effect for the simple fact that he does not believe the empire will exist by the time Adam returns to India as an adult. Imam Din dismisses this view as little more than an admission of ignorance. Whereas the Naik sees the British as weak for asking permission from natives before engaging in certain activities, Imam Din maintains this practice is merely a ruse to rule the country more strictly. To reinforce his position, Imam Din recalls the Rebellion of 1857: that year was supposed to mark the end of English

rule, but the prophecy never came true. [148] As such, Imam Din remains convinced that the empire will survive indefinitely: "'This Raj will not be talked down…So Strickland Sahib's boy will come back to this country, and his son after him'" (2). Experience has taught him that the empire, though seemingly weak, cannot be brought asunder. As such, not only Adam but Adam's own son will return to India to serve the empire.

The extent to which Imam Din's assertion is presented as an indisputable fact is corroborated by the story's plot wherein the central conflict is not between the English and the Indians but between father and son. Adam, although only a young child, becomes upset when his father physically punishes him in his ayah's presence; he believes being punished in front of a woman is a form of dishonor. He responds to the punishment by dismissing his ayah, spending the majority of his time with the native policemen, and, as it turns out, waiting for an opportunity to avenge his dishonor. Before he succeeds in restoring his honor, though, his parents, especially his mother, become concerned with his behavior and devise a means of saving money to send him to England to be educated the following year. After all, an English education, although a sad occurrence for both parent and child as it means several years of separation, is a fact of an Anglo-Indian childhood. However, his mother's concern for her son's fate emerged long before the incident with the ayah; she has been worried about him since he rejected the story of Genesis in favor of stories he has heard from Imam Din: "'It's awful,' said Mrs. Strickland, half-crying, "to think of his growing up like a little heathen.' Mrs. Strickland

[148] The fact that Imam Din alludes to the Rebellion is significant in that the this event resulted in a change in imperial policy: "after the Rebellion, more authoritarian Liberal administrators, led by James Fitzjames Stephen, renounced reform, advocating instead strong legal and bureaucratic control of the Indian populace they saw as distinctly alien: irredeemably infantile, savage, and corrupt" (McBratney, *Native Born* 18).

(Miss Youghal that was, if you remember her) had been born and brought up in England, and did not quite understand things" (3). The narrator's commentary establishes a division between the perception of the Anglo-Indian and the transplanted English. Because she was not born in India and lacks the "double wisdom" of the native born, Adam's mother fails to recognize the positive effects Imam Din's teachings will have on the future police man. She only sees an English boy who rejects what she perceives to be his native culture. While Strickland does not share his wife's concern—as a native born Anglo-Indian himself, he appreciates the value of an Indian childhood and realizes that Adam will one day accept English culture as readily as he now accepts Indian culture—he does seem to be afraid of the power Adam has achieved already in his life. Specifically, he does nothing to attempt to persuade Adam that he, as a child, does not have the authority to dismiss his own ayah. After conceding that the ayah will, in fact, have to be terminated—"'He told me just now that he wouldn't have her for a nurse any more…I suppose she'll have to go'"—the narrator interjects the following piece of information: "It is written elsewhere that Strickland was feared through the length and breadth of the Punjab by murderers, horse-thieves, and cattle-lifters" (6). The upshot of this claim is, of course, that Adam, unlike native criminals, does not fear his father. Instead, he views his father as an equal rather than as a superior.

In the meantime, he receives an education from the native police, and he later uses his acquired knowledge of native ways and beliefs to his advantage against his own father. Having decided that the most effective means of saving money for Adam's English education is to economize, the Stricklands decide to spend the summer at

Dalhousie, a less expensive hill station than Simla, their usual summer destination. On the way to the station, a groom, who had been ordered by Strickland to bring Mrs. Strickland's horse to Dalhousie, is attacked and robbed, and the horse is beaten. Strickland perceives the crime to be a personal affront—another official corroborates this supposition—and launches an investigation to apprehend the alleged perpetrators of the crime, the Shubkudder Gang. While he is in the process of corresponding with contacts in Peshawur, Strickland's assistant, "being young and full of zeal, sent up the most amazing clues" (11). Although no specific details are offered regarding these clues, Strickland's comments to his son make it clear that the assistant has not conducted himself properly:

> "Now that's just what I want the young fool not to do…He hasn't passed the lower standard yet, and he's an English boy born and bred, and his father before him. He has about as much tact as a bull, and he won't work quietly under my Inspector. I wish the Government would keep our service for country-born men. Those first five or six years give a man a pull that lasts him his life. Adam, if you were only old enough to be by 'Stunt'!"(11)

Ultimately, the problem with the assistant is that he is an Englishman born and raised. The unfortunate circumstance of his birthplace—he was not born in India and thus did not experience an Anglo-Indian childhood—make him unfit for imperial service. He will never know India well enough to do his job efficiently. Even Adam, who is only a child, would make a more suitable assistant in his father's estimation than the foolish and tactless Englishman. In making this pronouncement, Strickland not only voices Kipling's

belief that the native born Anglo-Indian is more suited to imperial service than an Englishman, he also elevates the native born child above Englishmen. In doing so, Strickland reaffirms Imam Din's early assertion that the English, because of the native born Anglo-Indian, will remain in India indefinitely. The native-born child thus serves as both steward and savior of the empire. Through him, British permanence becomes more than an illusion; it becomes a reality.

Ironically, the factor that will make Adam an effective policeman is also the factor that allows him to avenge his perceived dishonor. Strickland and his men succeed in capturing several members of the gang presumed to be responsible. Strickland, proud of the accomplishment, which he perceives as a demonstration of his strength and of his refusal to act as a victim, makes plans to visit the prisoners being held outside of Dalhousie. It is at this moment, a moment when his father seems most sure of himself, that Adam reveals the truth of the matter. It turns out that the groom was never robbed or beaten by the gang at all; he simply got drunk, caused a scene, was beaten into submission by shop owners, and lied to protect himself from punishment. What is more, Adam, as he jubilantly informs his father, is not the only person privy to this information: "'We *all* knew. We all knew. I and all the servants'" (14). By using "we," Adam not only includes himself as one of the knowing, he clearly aligns himself with the natives; he considers himself to be one of them. Upon hearing this news, Strickland is crushed. His son has deceived him, and he has been outsmarted by a drunken groom and dozens of men have been falsely accused and incarcerated as a result. It will take several months to correct the wrong and to reassert his authority in the district. His ability to reestablish

authority over his son is another manner. Adam, who refuses to appreciate the larger implications of making his father look incompetent to his staff and to the rest of the district, perceives his withholding of the truth as merely the culmination of a personal and private grievance: "'Father, *my* honour was lost when that happened…Now it is made whole again'" (15). As a native-born child, Adam understands the notion of personal honor above all else—he is praised by Imam Din for understanding honor when he dismisses his ayah—and realizes that he must reestablish his honor in order to be taken seriously. To him, his father is not a victim but an antagonist until his honor is restored; once this feat is achieved, they are equals.

Ultimately, given the elevated status of the native-born child, Adam should be seen as knowledgeable rather than treacherous. He acts not to degrade his father but to restore himself, for he knows that his future depends on his ability to garner respect from the natives, his subordinates. When he returns to India having completed his English education manner years later, he will enter his imperial service as a man of honor. Ultimately, his Anglo-Indian childhood, a childhood which taught him the significance of personal integrity and native ways, will allow him to continue the work his father has done. Through the son, the father, and thus the empire, will live on.

Joining the Herd: Becoming an Anglo-Indian

Published only a year after "The Son of His Father," *A Passage to India* (1924), E. M. Forster's last novel, presents the permanence of empire espoused by Kipling as both a delusion and a detriment. Coincidentally, it also serves as a prime example of the

anti-imperialist turn in fiction characteristic of the late imperial period.[149] Although Forster was an Englishman born and raised, India was more to him than a place on a map that provided a convenient setting for an argument against empire. Not only was it Britain's most important colony, it was a colony with which Forster had personal experience: he made two trips to India—first in 1912-1913, later in 1921-1922—during the novel's composition.[150] Whereas his first trip inspired the novel, the second trip altered his perception of both India and his project, as evidenced by a comment Forster made to Syed Ross Masood in a letter in 1922: "'When I began the book…I thought of it as a little bridge of sympathy between East and West, but this conception has had to go, my sense of the truth forbids anything so comfortable. I think that most Indians, like most English people, are shits, and I am not interested in whether they sympathize with one another or not'" (qtd. in Kuchta 167). Interestingly, much like Trevelyan and his *The Competition Wallah* (1864), Forster initially viewed his book as a means of healing a rift between the British and the Indians and thus stabilizing imperial relations. Time and more extensive experience proved to him that this goal would be impossible. In his mind, the firmly entrenched lack of sympathy between the two sides could never—no matter how strong or eloquent the prose—be breached. As such, the permanence of empire, like

[149] Of course, as Todd Kuchta and Brian May astutely report, not all critics agree that either Forster or his novel is anti-imperialist. See Said (*Orientalism*) and Suleri for discussions of the way in which Forster's supposed anti-imperialism is simply a front for an underlying Orientalism. It should also be noted that not all critics focus on the anti-imperial aspect of the novel. According to Benita Parry, for example, "it is also a metaphysical drama whose action passes across man's dilemmas as a social and sentient being to the subdued energies of his hidden and silenced psyche" (261).

[150] Forster's experience of India was both personal and professional. During the first trip, Forster travelled throughout the country with his close friend Syed Ross Masood. During the second trip, he served as Private Secretary to the Maharajah of Dewas. Incidentally, his second trip coincided with the Indian non-cooperation movement, which was motivated by the Amritsar massacre of 1919 and hostility toward Islamic movement of the Khilafat (Das 3). See Das for a discussion of the socio-historical context of the novel.

that espoused by Kipling, was nothing more than a delusion, a fantasy that obscured the truth.

Famously, Forster's central argument against imperialism is that it prevents personal relationships, especially cross-cultural friendships. While the impossibility of friendship may seem a trivial matter, Forster uses it to expose the way in which the inherent power structure of imperialism depreciates individuality and humanity of the English colonizer. Certainly, this focus is obviously Anglo-centric; however, it remains consistent with what appears to be the revised intention of his novel: to convince his audience that the empire must end. Since he is aware that his predominately British audience does not care how imperialism affects Indians, Forster concentrates on the impact imperialism has on the British. Specifically, Forster uses his representation of the colonizer as his strongest evidence against imperialism.[151] According to Forster's representation, the Englishman in his official capacity as colonizer ceases to be English and becomes an Anglo-Indian.[152] This shift from English to Anglo-Indian is inevitable. However, in contrast to Kipling's view of the Anglo-Indian as a positive figure who retains his Englishness through imperial service, Forster casts the transformation from English to Anglo-Indian as both negative and definite because it involves a change in

[151] Incidentally, Donald Watt explains, "when *A Passage to India* appeared in 1924, that aspect of Forster's novel that drew the heaviest fire from the reading public was his portrait of the Anglo-Indian" (524). However, the issue was not the extent to which Forster presented the Anglo-Indian as an Other but that his portrait was old-fashioned and thus offered an inauthentic view of the Anglo-Indian community. While Forster did concede that some of the details of the novel, like the Bridge Party, for example, were out of date, he maintained that is representation of the Anglo-Indian was accurate: "'The Anglo-Indian is not exaggerated in the least. He is like that only worse'" (qtd. in Watt 533).

[152] Hunt Hawkins makes a similar argument—"Forster intended to show how officialdom worked to corrupt the English, whether they began as good fellows or not"—however, he does not focus specifically on the transformation of the colonizer from English to Anglo-Indian, nor does he explicitly refer to the Anglo-Indian as the product of this corruption (56).

mentality—the Anglo-Indian is conservative, old-fashioned, racist, paranoid, mediocre, conforming—that is antithetical to Englishness. Ultimately, once Englishness is lost, so too is the legitimacy of empire.

Set in Chandrapore, India, the novel offers two distinct representations of the colonizer: Ronny Heaslop and Cecil Fielding. Using Albert Memmi's study of the colonizer and the colonized, which underscores the way in which the colonizer and the colonized are products of imperialism and the psychological implications of imperialism, as an interpretive lens, I read Heaslop as the colonizer who accepts, and Fielding as the colonizer who rejects (but ultimately accepts).[153] Significantly, Heaslop, as the colonizer who accepts, is consistently identified as Anglo-Indian and firmly aligns with the Anglo-Indian community in Chandrapore. His status as Anglo-Indian is openly acknowledged by all characters, and through this acknowledgement, the difference between the Anglo-Indian and the English is revealed. Interestingly, this difference is first defined by three Indians—Dr. Aziz, Hamidullah, Mahmoud Ali. Engaged in casual conversation, the three friends drift into a discussion of the possibility of friendship between Indians and Englishmen and, subtly, the transformation of Heaslop into an Anglo-Indian. Hamidullah, who received his education in England, maintains that friendship is possible; however, there is one caveat: this cross-cultural friendship can only occur in England.[154] In India, such a relationship is impossible because of the Anglo-Indian community:

---

[153] Ahmad M.S. Abu Baker also uses Memmi as a lens for reading the colonizer in the novel. However, he does not read the colonizer who accepts and the colonizer who rejects in terms of transformation from English to Anglo-Indian as I do.

[154] Later in the novel Hamidullah reflects on the change in his relations with the Anglo-Indians. Politics has made it decidedly and lamentably different than his interactions with the English in England twenty years earlier: "How happy he had been there twenty years ago! Politics had not mattered in Mr. and Mrs.

> ‘They come out intending to be gentlemen, and are told it will not do. Look at Lesley, look at Blakiston, now it is our red-nosed boy, and Fielding will go next. Why, I remember when Turton came out first. It was in another part of the Province. You fellows will not believe me, but I have driven with Turton in his carriage—Turton! Oh yes, we were once quite intimate. He has shown me his stamp collection…….’
>
> ‘They all become exactly the same, not worse, not better. I give any Englishman two years, be he Turton or Burton. It is only the difference of a letter. And I give any Englishwoman six months. All are exactly alike.’ (7)

Repetition provides the only evidence needed to support their claim. Every Englishman who arrives in India arrives with the intention of acting like a gentleman, that is, of maintaining his Englishness. However, the influence of the Anglo-Indian community proves too strong. In time, every Englishman who enters India becomes an Anglo-Indian and as a result gradually ceases to be a gentleman.[155] It happened to Lesley, Blakiston, Turton, and Heaslop, the red-nosed boy in question, and it will happen to Fielding. It simply cannot be avoided. The Anglo-Indian community will not allow it. Despite their individual intentions, the English who come to India to do the work of empire must abide by the dictates, both spoken and unspoken, of the Anglo-Indian community. By doing so,

---

Bannister’s rectory. There, games, work, and pleasant society had interwoven, and appeared to be sufficient substructure for a national life. Here was all wire-pulling and fear” (115).

[155] By ceasing to be gentlemen, these colonizers cease to fulfill the ideal of colonial masculinity established in the previous century. See Praseeda Gopinath for a discussion of the significance of the disintegration of imperial manliness in the late imperial period.

the colonizer loses an individual identity, hence the interchangeability of Turton and Burton, and becomes a member of the Anglo-Indian community.[156]

Ronny's transformation into an Anglo-Indian, a colonizer who accepts, proves to be a subject of major concern for his mother Mrs. Moore. In India to visit her son and to accompany Adela Quested, Ronny's potential future wife, Mrs. Moore finds her son and, through him, the imperial mission unrecognizable. She cannot understand what has happened to the son she knew in England or what people say about him. For example, during an evening at the Club, Mr. Turton, the Collector, taking a moment to compliment his new subordinate, informs Mrs. Moore and Adela that Ronny has the makings of a good colonizer. Apparently, Ronny's success has little if anything to do with his abilities—"It wasn't that the young man was particularly good at games or the lingo, or that he had much notion of the Law"—but everything to do with the fact that he is "dignified" (24). Although Mrs. Moore and Adela are more than a little confused by Turton's seemingly ambiguous compliment, Turton's praise of Ronny is important because it reveals that all that is needed to succeed as a colonizer is to be dignified; intelligence, skill, and aptitude are superfluous and thus inconsequential. Of course, by "dignified" Turton means that Ronny behaves within the confines of acceptable Anglo-Indian behavior. In other words, he follows the Anglo-Indian line, and that, according to Turton, is all that matters: "'the long and short of it is Heaslop's a sahib; he's the type we want, he's one of us'" (24). Turton praises Ronny not for who he is but because he fits

[156] The fact that English women "turn" before English men speaks to the fact that women were considered to be more conservative, less individualistic, and more prone to conforming to the dictates of the group.

the part that the community has prepared for him.[157] He follows the Anglo-Indian community's lead and thus becomes an Anglo-Indian.

Even though Ronny has been accepted by and welcomed into the Anglo-Indian community and thus considers himself a part of it, he acknowledges that it will take a long time before he actually knows the natives. In making this assertion, Ronny clearly contradicts Kipling's claim that the definitive characteristic of the Anglo-Indian is knowledge that enables efficient imperial work. To be an Anglo-Indian, at least in Chandrapore, one must simply accept the dictates of the Anglo-Indian community as true and live accordingly. Knowledge comes later, much later. Referring to Turton and the natives, Ronny explains, "'they know him—they know he can't be fooled—I'm still fresh comparatively. No one can even begin to think of knowing this country until he has been in it twenty years'" (27-28). Significantly, the idea that intimate knowledge of customs and native people allows for effective imperial service is completely absent from Ronny's assessment of the situation. All that knowledge allows is the ability to foil a scheme and to emerge unscathed. In other words, knowledge prevents the Anglo-Indian from being taking advantage of, not of performing actual work, which in Ronny's case is the work of a City Magistrate. Mrs. Moore, insistent that getting to know natives on a personal level would be an asset to him in his work, fails to understand the implication of Ronny's point: knowing individual Indians will result in no professional or personal benefit. As a colonizer, Ronny simply needs to know native types, not actual Indians. Besides, Ronny

[157] Mrs. Moore herself recognizes his transformation, which in her mind involves an unnecessary confirmation of opinions not his own, when she reflects on his participation in the club's production of *Cousin Kate*: "She noticed now how tolerant and conventional his judgments had become; when they had seen *Cousin Kate* in London together in the past, he had scorned it; now he pretended that it was a good play, in order to hurt nobody's feelings" (40).

has already learned the lesson that a colonizer does not fraternize with the colonized the hard way—he once asked a Pleader, a native who had brought a case to court, to have a cigarette with him, and the Pleader responded to the friendly gesture by informing everyone in the bazaar that he was "in with the City Magistrate" (28). He has not made a similar mistake again and now refrains from any personal interaction with natives, which is probably for the best anyway as the Anglo-Indian community frowns on this type of behavior. Mrs. Moore, despite what Ronny tells her, remains insistent in her belief that Ronny should get to know Indians and suggests that he invite Indians to the Club. He was pleasant and patient, and evidently understood why she did not understand. He implied that he had once been as she, though not for long" (28). Experience has taught him that his former views—his English views—have no place in India. Conscious of what the role of colonizer requires of him, he has traded his individual opinions for those of the Anglo-Indian community.

Ronny's patience with his mother during this and subsequent conversations serves a dual purpose. On one hand, it reveals the extent to which his ties to his former self have not been completely severed—he remembers a time when he did not think as he does now—but, on the other hand, it serves as an attempt to mitigate any conflict that may ensue and alienate Adela from the Anglo-Indian community, of which she will be a part if or when she marries Ronny, and its views. After all, having a wife who refuses to conform to the Anglo-Indian community would make Ronny's position infinitely more difficult. As such, when Ronny and his mother get into a disagreement about Aziz's conduct at the mosque that evening, Ronny becomes distressed when Adela gets

involved. Incidentally, the trouble centers on whether or not Aziz had the right to inform Mrs. Moore, who entered the mosque unescorted because she wanted to get away from the club for a few moments, that she needed to remove her shoes. Ronny perceives Aziz's conduct to be insolent and audacious. Mrs. Moore and Adela disagree. In fact, Adela insists that the situation is the same as if Ronny had asked a native to take off his hat in a Christian church and refuses to understand the matter from Ronny's point of view, a fact which bothers Ronny: "He wished she wouldn't interfere. His mother did not signify—she was just a globe-trotter, a temporary escort, who could retire to England with what impressions she chose. But Adela, who meditated spending her life in the country, was a more serious matter: it would be tiresome if she started crooked over the native question" (31). The native question—specifically, the question as to how the natives should be treated—is beyond the purview of the Anglo-Indian.[158] What matters to the Anglo-Indian and thus what should matter to Adela is not how the natives are treated but that the Anglo-Indians maintain authority. From Ronny's perspective, for Adela to concern herself with something as trivial as the native question could stall or prevent her necessary transformation entirely.

Although it is not customary for Anglo-Indians to engage socially with the Indians, Turton, as the head of the Anglo-Indian community, proposes the idea of a Bridge Party as a means of accommodating Mrs. Moore and Adela's fervent desire to meet Indians. As it turns out, the Bridge Party offers little opportunity to get to know

[158] Contrary to the Anglo-Indian view of the matter, John O'Leary contends, "How the imperial agent should behave towards the imperial subject at the day-to-day level of social interaction is a significant them of late imperial fiction" (82-83).

Indians at all. Instead, it further exposes Mrs. Moore and Adela to the mindset of the Anglo-Indian community. Even though there are actual Indians in their midst, the Anglo-Indians at the party refrain from engaging in prolonged conversation with them and discourage Mrs. Moore and Adela from doing anything so stupid as to believe that they will ever be friends with any of the Indian women. From the Anglo-Indian perspective, the reason for this is simple: the Anglo-Indians' racial superiority. According to one of the Anglo-Indian guests, who attempts to offer a reason for not introducing the English women to the Indian women, confesses, "'you're superior to them, anyway. Don't forget that. You're superior to everyone in India except one or two of the ranis, and they're on an equality'" (42).

This elevated sense of superiority—the Anglo-Indians place themselves on the level of Indian royalty—results in a palpable disconnect between Anglo-India and the India that surrounds it. Adela, who has yet to accept Ronny's proposal, recognizes this division and contemplates its implications for her while at the Bridge Party. As she looks at the hills beyond the confines of the club's gardens, she realizes that what she consistently refers to as the "real" India will always be out of her grasp and comprehension:

> How lovely [the hills] suddenly were! But she couldn't touch them. In front, like a shutter, fell a vision of her married life. She and Ronny would look into the club like this every evening, then drive home to dress; they would see the Lesleys and the Callendars and the Turtons and the Burtons,

> invite them and be invited by them, while the true India slid by unnoticed. (48)

As a member of the Anglo-Indian community, Adela's life will be spent strictly within the borders of Anglo-India: her home and the club. All she will ever see is the world constructed by the Anglo-Indians as a means of alleviating the distance they feel from England.[159] In this moment she is aware that her whole life will be defined by an unrequited and impossible dream: to be a part of the "real" India.

Adela's reluctance to become a full-fledged member of the Anglo-Indian community has not gone unnoticed. Ronny and Mrs. Moore are fully aware of her inner conflict, and they both identify the problem as Adela's insistence on being an individual. However, despite their agreement, they view Adela's potential future in India from very different vantage points. Ronny's primary concern is that Adela will have difficulty acclimating to the climate. According to him, "'there's nothing in India but the weather, my dear mother; it's the Alpha and Omega of the whole affair'" (50). Mrs. Moore, on the other hand, sees Anglo-India, particularly the Anglo-Indian attitude toward and treatment of natives—the native question—as Adela's fundamental problem. This idea infuriates Ronny as it once again exposes what he considers both his mother's and Adela's inability as outsiders to understand what the British position in India is really all about:

> "Here we are, and we're going to stop, and the country's got to put up with us, gods or no gods…what do you and Adela want me to do? Go

[159] Regarding the structure of the colonizer's community, Memmi writes, "in organizing their daily habits in the colonial community, they imported and imposed the way of life of their own country, where they regularly spend their vacations, from which they draw their administrative, political, and cultural inspiration, and on which their eyes are constantly fixed" (5).

> against my class, against all the people I respect and admire out here? Lose such power as I have for doing good in this country because my behavior isn't pleasant? … I'm out here to work, mind, to hold this wretched country by force. I'm not a missionary or a Labour Member or a vague sentimental sympathetic literary man. I'm just a servant of the Government; it's the profession you wanted me to choose myself, and that's that. We're not pleasant in India, and we don't intend to be pleasant. We've something more important to do." (51-52).

In relating the truth of empire—we are here to do work, not to be nice to natives—to his mother, Ronny demonstrates the extent to which he has accommodated himself to the mentality of Anglo-India. Ronny, as a colonizer, is motivated by professional duty alone, and as a colonizer, he does not have the luxury to take the native into consideration let alone be nice to him. Of course, it is his blind devotion to work that makes him a good colonizer and allows him to be read in terms of Memmi's model of the colonizer who accepts: "the man is generally young, prudent, and polished…No matter what happens, he justifies everything—the system and the officials in it" (46). Yet, when Ronny asks his mother if she expects him to stand up to the Anglo-Indian community on the natives' behalf and be pleasant, he insinuates that his own, individual opinion would be to do just that.[160] However, he realizes this move would be both idealistic and disastrous. The only

[160]John O'Leary interprets Mrs. Moore's insistent claim that the English are, in fact, in India to be pleasant as "curious" because "Empires are not by nature pleasant" (83). Mrs. Moore, whose understanding of Empire, is based on religion cannot grasp the reality of the situation as her son has. She insists, "'The English are out here to be pleasant…Because India is part of the earth, and God has put us on the earth in order to be pleasant to each other. God…is…love…God has put us on earth to love our neighbors and to show it, and He is omnipresent, even in India, to see how we are succeeding'" (53).

effect it would have would be his complete ostracization from the community and the end of his career. With no other opportunities available to him—this is the life that he prepared for, after all—he has no choice but to perform his duty as Government servant and uphold the Anglo-Indian standard.[161]

Fielding, in contrast to Ronny, has chosen a different path. Rather than give in to the mentality of the Anglo-Indian community, he holds himself apart, thus preserving his Englishness. Fielding, although a guest at the Bridge Party—he alone is impressed with Adela's wish to see the real India and to know Indians—is not fully introduced until later in the opening section of the novel. Significantly, it is through the revelation of his background that his ability to withstand the seemingly irresistible pull (or push) of Anglo-India is revealed. The answer, in part, seems to be related to his age:

> He was over forty when he entered that oddest portal, the Victoria Terminus at Bombay…Of his two carriage companions [on the train in India] one was a youth, fresh to the East like himself, the other a seasoned Anglo-Indian of his own age. A gulf divided him from either; he had seen too many cities and men to be the first or to become the second. (64)

[161] The conversation continues and Ronny makes it clear that there is nothing about his position that is either pleasant or honorable. His duty, the belief in which precipitated his transformation, is nothing more than a battle between two evils: "Every day he worked hard in the court trying to decide which of two untrue accounts was the less untrue, trying to dispense justice fearlessly, to protect the weak from the less weak, the incoherent against the plausible, surrounded by lies and flattery. He expected no gratitude, no recognition for his…It was his duty. But he did expect sympathy from his own people, and except from new-comers he obtained it" (52). The sense here is that there is really no such thing as justice in India because there are no clear winners and losers. Right and the wrong are not easily discernible and are perhaps not even present. Ronny can do nothing but make the most of a perpetually and inherently bad situation.

The fact of his late arrival—he is over forty—and his life experience predispose him, apparently, to resist the pull of Anglo-India. He will remain an Englishman who happens to work in India—he is the principal of a school. He is the colonizer who refuses.[162]

Even his subsequent time in Chandrapore seems not to have had a negative impact on Fielding's individual identity; however, the survival of his individuality has resulted in other problems. Specifically, it has had a negative impact on his social life: "He did succeed with his pupils, but the gulf between himself and his countrymen, which he had noticed on the train, widened distressingly. He could not see at first what was wrong. He was not unpatriotic, he always got on with Englishmen in England, all his best friends were English, so why was it not the same here?" (64). The reason, of course, is that survival in Anglo-India or, perhaps more accurately, the survival of Anglo-India depends upon the people who reside there to take on the same ideas. These ideas, as has already been explained in the case of Ronny, are conservative in nature. They are the sentiments of an exiled people who rely on their perception of superiority as a means of surviving. This tactic transforms them from being English, liberals capable of forming individual thoughts, into Anglo-Indians, who act not as individual but a herd. Although cognizant of the gulf between himself and the Anglo-Indians, he refuses to abandon his principles for their standards. Therefore, his insistence on maintaining his individualism and thus his Englishness sets him apart: "The world, he believed, is a globe of men who

[162] According to Memmi's terminology, a European in a colony can be defined by one of three terms: colonial, colonizer, colonialist. However, only two terms—colonizer and colonialist—actually exist. The colonial, as defined by Memmi "is a European living in a colony but having no privileges, whose living conditions are not higher than those of a colonized person of equivalent economic and social status…All right! Let us say right away, despite the apparently drastic nature of the statement: a colonial so defined doesn't exist, for all Europeans in the colonies are privileged" (10). Based on this statement, all Europeans in the colonies are colonizers; a colonialist is simply another term for the colonizer who accepts (45).

are trying to reach one another and can do so by the help of good will plus culture and intelligence—a creed ill suited to Chandrapore, but he had come out too late to lose it" (65). The reason that his English creed does not work in Chandrapore is because the Anglo-Indian mindset, as already established in the discussion of the Bride Party, fundamentally rests on racist beliefs. As a result, "the remark that did him most harm at the club was a silly aside to the effect that the so-called white races are really pinko-grey. He only said this to be cheery, he did not realize that 'white' has no more to do with a colour than 'God save the King' with a god, and that it is the height of impropriety to consider what it does connote" (65). According to the dictates of the Anglo-Indian community, Fielding's failure to take race seriously and to understand that the survival of the imperial enterprise depends on the strict adherence to the doctrine of the racial superiority of whites is tantamount to treason and blasphemy. However, despite his obvious lack of what the Anglo-Indians deem to be correct racial sentiment, Fielding is not ostracized from the community. In fact, the men seem to like him—perhaps they envy his ability to maintain his Englishness—or at the very least tolerate him.[163] This toleration seems to be mutual. Fielding, regardless of his attitude toward the Anglo-Indian position, does nothing to help the Anglo-Indians change their ways or to make them see the implications of the position they have taken. He simply accepts as fact that the Anglo-Indian community is a united front that refuses to deviate from its entrenched position and in response creates a place for himself on the periphery of the community.

[163] The Anglo-Indian women are, interestingly, another story altogether. It is the women who identify him as not being a sahib and thus not being a member of the community because "he took no notice of them, and this, which would have passed without comment in feminist England, did him harm in a community where the male is expected to be lively and helpful" (65).

Given Fielding's liberal ideas and liberated status and Aziz's lack of political convictions (at least in the first half of the novel) and belief that Fielding is different from the Anglo-Indians, it is not surprising that Forster uses these characters to explore the possibility of friendship between an Englishman and an Indian.[164] To foster this budding friendship that began at a tea party Fielding hosted at the college shortly after the Bridge Party, Fielding visits Aziz at his home unannounced. Aziz, who is ill and attended by his Indian friends at the time, is not pleased but embarrassed, and it all goes wrong. What is important about this scene, though, is not Aziz's embarrassment but the further illumination of Fielding's character. During the course of the conversation, Fielding admits that he like most educated people in England is an atheist and concedes that the lack of belief in God has resulted in a decline in morality. Speaking freely, as is his habit, Fielding does not realize, as the Indians quickly do, that he has exposed the falsity of one of the supposed truths of empire, specifically, that England is justified in controlling India because it is morally superior. Pretending not to consider the political implications of his admission, Fielding attempts to divert the question regarding the basis of England's imperial justification and explains that the only justification he can comment upon is his own. He came to India for a job but has no idea why England is in India. The Indians, refusing to give up the point, namely, that by Fielding's own admission he has exposed the hollowness of England's view of empire as a civilizing mission, ask Fielding if it is fair that if Englishman obtain a job for which an Indian is equally qualified:

[164] This friendship is the focus of Sara Suleri's analysis of the novel. She argues that it revises the imperial erotic, which is usually occurs between male and female. In Forster's novel, it is between male and male: "race is thus sexualized" (133). Moreover, she contends that "their friendship plays out a subterranean homoeroticism that functions as a figure for the limits of colonial epistemology" (142).

> There is only one answer to a conversation of this type: 'England holds India for her good.' Yet Fielding was disinclined to give it. The zeal for honesty had eaten him up. He said, 'I'm delighted to be here too—that's my answer, there's my only excuse. I can't tell you anything about fairness. It mayn't have been fair I should have been born. I take up some other fellow's air, don't I, whenever I breathe? Still, I'm glad it's happened, and I'm glad I'm out here. However big a badmash one is—if one's happy in consequence, that is some justification.'(121).

Fielding's response serves only to problematize the issue further. According to his explanation, the only reason to do anything is personal pleasure. By taking this line of reason, Fielding attempts to make the empire both amoral and apolitical. The Indians, who present their nation as highly spiritual, see difficulty in his ideology and his methods. Rather than presenting an informed argument, Fielding, despite his supposed exceptional attributes, actually displays ignorance of imperialism. His position is not an enlightened one but that of a man who has benefitted from a situation but refuses to acknowledge it.[165]

Of course, everything changes when Aziz takes Adela and Mrs. Moore to visit the Marabar Caves and experience the "real" India.[166] During the outing Adela accuses Aziz of sexually assaulting her. Adela eventually recants her statement at the trial, which results in Aziz's immediate release, but the incident proves to have a tremendous effect

[165] As Memmi makes clear, "colonial relations do not stem from individual good will or actions; they exist before his arrival or his birth, and whether he accepts or rejects that matters little" (38).
[166] The Marabar Caves have been read in a number of ways: "these hermeneutical lacunae have been taken to represent practically anything and everything" (Kuchta 165).

on all parties involved, especially Adela, Aziz, and Fielding. Although Fielding initially supports his Indian friend and in the process rejects Anglo-India, he eventually comes back into the fold, so to speak, by helping Adela after the trial. When he returns to India two years later, he returns a different person: he is an Anglo-Indian. In the meantime, though, the incident has the effect of creating a rallying point for the Anglo-Indian community—anyone who is not with us is against us—that is taken to its most literal and extreme level. Turton's response to Fielding's attempt to accompany Aziz to the police station—Turton interprets it as a sign of solidarity with the enemy—sets the tone for the rest of the community. Although Fielding attempts to explain that it is all a misunderstanding, Turton refuses to give his claims any credence. After all, Turton has twenty five years of experience in the country; the details of the case pale in comparison to his accumulated experience:

> During those twenty-five years I have never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to intimate socially….Newcomers set our traditions aside, and in an instant what you see happens, the work of years is undone and the good name of my District ruined for a generation…That a lady, that a young lady engaged to my most valued subordinate—that she—an English girl fresh from England—that I should have lived—' (182)

The problem, according to Turton, is the fact that the trip to the caves happened in the first place. While he refrains from blaming either Adela or Mrs. Moore directly, he contends that people new to India and people who refuse to understand fall in line with

the spoken and unspoken directives of the Anglo-Indian community are a danger not only to themselves but to the stability of empire. Adela, implicitly to blame because she could not leave India well enough alone—she insisted on seeing the real India—is transformed through her (alleged) victimhood into an emblem of English womanhood and as such provides a resonant allusion to the Rebellion.[167] Moreover, Turton uses this invocation of the Rebellion to assess Fielding's allegiance to Anglo-India:

> He had not gone mad at the phrase 'an English girl fresh from England,' he had not rallied to the banner of race. He was still after facts, though the herd had decided on emotion. Nothing enraged Anglo-India more than the lantern of reason if it is exhibited for one moment after its extinction is decreed. All over Chandrapore that day the Europeans were putting aside their normal personalities and sinking themselves in their community. Pity, wrath, heroism, filled them, but their power of putting two and two together were annihilated. (183)

In this moment Fielding, ever the outsider, distinguishes himself even further by insisting on the preservation of reason and facts. Refusing to abandon his convictions or his friend, Fielding detaches himself from the Anglo-Indians, who at this point more than any other are defined by their singular mentality. The severing of ties between Fielding and the Anglo-Indians is, of course, mutual. Just as he rejects them for their lack of reason, they reject him for weakening their position: "If you leave the line, you leave a gap in the line" (190).

[167] See Sharpe for a discussion of the connection between Adela and the Rebellion.

Yet even in his rejection of Anglo-Indian and alignment with Aziz, Fielding comes to the realization that he is now, more than ever before, alone. He is no more like the Indians than he is the Anglo-Indians: "At the moment when he was throwing in his lot with Indians, he realized the profundity of the gulf that divided him from them" (192). In making this revelation, Fielding gives voice to the conundrum of the colonizer who refuses: "to refuse colonization is one thing; to adopt the colonized and be adopted by them seems to be another; and the two are far from being connected" (Memmi 22-23). However, even in his refusal of Anglo-India, Fielding does not want to refuse colonization entirely. He wants to retain his job but realizes his decision to side with Aziz over Anglo-India will have a devastating impact on his career: "He regretted taking sides. To slink through India unlabeled was his aim. Henceforward he would be called 'anti-British,' 'seditious'—terms that bored him, and diminished his utility" (193). In the hour of his friend's greatest need, he becomes consumed with the implications his involvement in the case will have on his own future and finally comes to terms with the reality of empire: every decision is political.

In the end, Fielding abandons Aziz to aid Adela who has been abandoned in turn by the Anglo-Indian community after she failed to testify against Aziz. Soon after Fielding leaves India and returns to England. Two years later, Fielding, with his new wife and brother-in-law, the children of Mrs. Moore and the half-siblings of Ronny, returns to India. Time has had an effect on Fielding; he is now accepts his role as colonizer and become an Anglo-Indian. Ronny, his brother-in-law, for one, is happy for the change as he reveals in a letter to Fielding: "'I'm relieved you feel able to come into line with the

Oppressors of India to some extent. We need all the support we can get'" (345). Ronny's relief stems from his conviction that Anglo-India is under perpetual attack; its stability rests on the shoulders of the colonizers. Although Fielding offers no response, he has, as the narrator attests, made the conscious decision to accept his role as colonizer and all that came with it: "He had thrown in his lot with Anglo-India by marrying a countrywoman, and he was acquiring some of its limitation, and already felt surprise at his own past heroism. Would he to-day defy all his own people for the sake of a stray Indian?" (358). The answer to this question is, of course, no. With a family to support and an experience of disappointment, Fielding cannot do anything but align himself with Anglo-India.[168] Conveniently, Fielding and his family are travelling through the native state where Aziz, whose experience during the trial has prompted him to identify himself as an Indian nationalist, now lives with his three children, and the former friends reunite. Regardless of the fact that the gulf between them is wider than ever, they, especially Fielding, want to rekindle their friendship. However, as only Aziz seems to recognize, the dream will remain unfulfilled until the day the empire crumbles. It is only at that point—when their friendship can exist as a relationship between equals—that their friendship will be possible.

Living a Lie: The Anglo-Indian and the "White Man's Burden"

Forster's vision of the end of Empire as the only means by which the colonizer can reestablish his humanity is repeated, albeit it in a much more explicit manner, by George Orwell in *Burmese Days* (1934). Predictably, Orwell's attitude toward Empire,

[168] Former disappointment aside, Maria Davidis reads his marriage as the factor that forces Fielding to join Anglo-India and prevents his friendship with Aziz (275).

much like Forster's and Kipling's, was a product of his background and experience. Notably, his anti-imperial position, introduced in this novel, dominates much of his later work.[169] Born in Bengal in 1903, Orwell, the son of a minor official in the opium department, left India in 1907 and was later educated at Eton. According to a friend there, young Orwell wanted nothing more than return to India: "'He used to talk about the East a great deal, and I always had the impression he was longing to go back there. I mean it was a sort of romantic idea'" (qtd. in Ingle 229). In 1922, Orwell got his wish: he joined the Imperial Police and served in Burma. However, the reality of his position soon eroded the romantic vision he had conjured up while at Eton. After one year, he felt nothing but isolation—from himself, from his fellow imperial servants, from the Burmese, and from the supposed values of imperialism (Ingle 230). In effect, Orwell, much like Fielding, was a colonizer who refused. Unlike Fielding, though, Orwell never accepted. He left Burma in 1927 after his first term of service and never returned, yet Burma, it seems never left him.[170] His experience left him with a pronounced disdain for imperialism, an oppressive institution that he believed degraded both the colonizer and the colonized.[171] In his estimation, the best thing for all concerned would be for the Empire to end.

---

[169] Orwell wrote two essays on Kipling and two essays about his own experience in Burma, "Shooting an Elephant" and "A Hanging." Moreover, according to Stephen Ingle, Orwell used "imperialism as a metaphor not only for the relationship between the classes in Britain but also for any relationship between those with and without power" (234).

[170] According to Douglas Kerr, Burma, as a place and as an experience, remained with him for years: "although he renounced his stake in Burma as a colonial possession, he was to acknowledge a disturbing sense in which Burma still possessed him, and this uncanny feeling of being possessed is connected to the writing of [this] novel" (150).

[171] Although, as Malcolm Muggeridge notes, Orwell's anti-imperialism is strong, his attitude toward the imperialist maintained a degree of ambivalence: "though in his political attitudes Orwell was ardently anti-imperialist, he continued to cherish a romantic notion of Empire builders valiantly bearing the white man's burden. They might be brutal and obtuse, but they had qualities of courage and endurance which Orwell greatly admired" (xi). While Muggeridge's claim itself seems to romanticize Orwell's attitude—his use of

Set in Upper Burma, the novel, Orwell's first, features the small and isolated Anglo-Indian community at Kyauktada.[172] It also introduces the anti-imperial theme that would dominate much of his later work. Here, as in Forster's novel, the term Anglo-Indian is more than a means of classification and is certainly not synonymous with English. Rather, Anglo-Indian is an identity defined by a shared mentality that is the inevitable outcome of imperialism, a system which benefits the colonizer at the expense of the colonized. As such, being Anglo-Indian cannot be avoided—it is both a byproduct of imperialism and a means by which it is perpetuated—and the Anglo-Indian will exist until the empire ends; no amount of reform will restore the Anglo-Indian's Englishness. However, the Anglo-Indian's existence is but one part of Orwell's indictment against imperialism. Through his scathing representation of the Anglo-Indian community and his protagonist, John Flory, an Anglo-Indian who inwardly rejects Anglo-India and his own Anglo-Indianness but cannot change his circumstances except through death, Orwell reveals the vacuity of "the white man's burden" popularized by Kipling and propagated through generations of imperialists: the colonizer is not a martyr but a profiteer.

Although the majority of the novel does focus on the Anglo-Indian community in general and on Flory in particular, it should be noted that the impetus of the novel's action is U Po Kyin's desire to be the first native member of the Club.[173] To achieve this end, U Po Kyin, the Subdivisional Magistrate, uses his knowledge of the Anglo-Indian

---

"white man's burden" is used in earnest and without sarcasm—it does seem that Orwell, a former colonizer himself, sympathizes with the colonizer for the hardships he endures, many of which are personal and psychological, in the name of Empire.

[172] Burma was a part of the British Raj until 1937 when a separate Burmese imperial government was instituted.

[173] Douglas Kerr, for one, refers to the novel as "thoroughly Eurocentric" (151).

community to his advantage. In fact, Emilenne Baneth-Nouailhetas argues, "his predominance in the plot and narrative is the result of his knowledge of the Other, the Anglo-Indian" (35). Subverting the traditional imperial roles in which the colonizer uses his knowledge of the native Other to his own advantage, as celebrated in Kipling's story, U Po Kyin shows that knowledge is not the sole domain of the colonizer. The Anglo-Indians, ignorant of and thus vulnerable to U Po Kyin knowledge, serve as mere puppets in his power play, and through a series of manipulative machinations that prey upon Anglo-Indian pride, paranoia, and obliviousness, U Po Kyin ultimately succeeds.

Not only is the Club the focal point of U Po Kyin's schemes, it is also, as is the case throughout the British Raj, the center of the Anglo-Indian community.[174] Yet, this Club has one particular distinction: "it was the proud boast of Kyauktada Club that, almost alone of Clubs in Burma, it had never admitted an Oriental to membership" (13). Given the fact that the novel is set during the mid-1920s, the fact that the Kyauktada Club is not only still segregated but proud of it speaks volumes about the setting and the Anglo-Indians inhabit it. According to Laurie Kaplan, the post-war years saw a movement for Club integration led and supported by British soldiers who returned to the empire after the war (161). Once the move to integration began, it spread throughout the empire.[175] Kyauktada Club's resistance to this trend reveals both the isolation and conservatism of its members and the psychology of the Anglo-Indian community. Regarding the demographics of the district, the narrator relates, "the population of the

[174] See Laurie Kaplan for a discussion of the significance of the club in late imperial British fiction.
[175] Of course, Club integration was not an easy process. It was met with more than a little resistance along the way: "at risk for the British was their idea of their own cultural identity, their sense of hierarchy and power, their concept of ceremony and ritual in exile" (Kaplan 162).

district [is] about four thousand, including a couple of hundred Indians, a few score Chinese, and seven Europeans. There were also two Eurasians" (13). Given the fact there are only seven Europeans—that is, Anglo-Indians— in the district and thus only seven members of the Club—Flory; Westfield, the District Superintendent of Police; Lackersteen, the local manager of the timber firm that for which Flory works; Mrs. Lackersteen, his wife; Ellis, the local manager of another timber company; Maxwell, the acting Divisional Forest Officer; and McGregor, the Deputy Commissioner and Club secretary—race proves to be a defining characteristic of the community. For them, maintaining an all-white club serves as a means of asserting racial authority and a sense of identity. Segregation means separation, and through separation, they hope to keep themselves—and their perception of themselves—intact.

The threat of integration provides the subject of conversation in the first Club scene, thus establishing the character of the Anglo-Indian community. Ellis initiates the conversation by drawing his peers' attention to the absent McGregor's notice on the Club board:

> "Just listen to this: 'It has been suggested that as there are as yet no Oriental members of this club, and as it is now usual to admit officials of gazette rank, whether native or European, to membership of most European Clubs, we should consider the question of following this practice in Kyauktada.'… He's asking us to break all our rules and take a dear little nigger-boy into this Club. *Dear* Dr. Veriswami, for instance. Dr. Very-slimy, I call him. That *would* be a treat wouldn't it? Little pot-bellied

> niggers breathing garlic in your face over the bridge-table. Christ, to think of it! We've got to hang together and put our foot down on this at once. What do you say, Westfield? Flory?" (17)

In drawing attention to the notice, Ellis, significantly, finds fault with both its tone and content. Since Ellis is clearly a racist, it is obvious what he objects to: he does not want a person of what he deems to be an inferior race to be allowed into his Club and thereby to be considered his racial and social equal. Yet, while his perception of racial superiority does explain his objection to the notice's content, it is his objection to the tone and the implicit directive of the notice that proves most interesting. When he complains that McGregor is asking that they break "our" rules so as to adopt the trend of other Clubs in the Raj, he is arguing that "our" Club—because it is "ours"—is outside of the domain of official jurisdiction. In making this rhetorical move, Ellis projects his feeling of persecution onto the entire Club.[176] Given the double-fronted assault from both the imperial government and the natives, "we" have no choice but to defend ourselves, our rights, and "our" club. As such, when he encourages Westfield and Flory to speak up, he does so in such in such a way so as to preclude any opposition. Anyone who dares voice a contradictory opinion would be, according to the terms of discourse Ellis has established, a traitor. Understanding what is expected of him, Westfield neither confirms nor denies Ellis's position but resignedly concedes that the integration of the Club is inevitable: "'Way this country's going, you know'" (18). For Westfield, Club integration

[176] In her discussion of "the gradual progression of the devolution of imperial manliness in the long twilight of Empire," Praseeda Gopinath contends that "the defensive need to preserve racial lines, or the bond between Sahibs, overshadows gentlemanly behavior" (202, 213). Orwell himself addresses the lack of gentlemanly behavior in the Empire after the turn of the century in his first essay on Kipling, "Rudyard Kipling," published in *New English Weekly* on January 23.

is but one more example of the ways in which the country is slipping away, the ways in which the British are losing control. Flory, on the other hand, does not take the bait and remains silent. Ellis, vehement and vitriolic, interprets both reactions—Westfield's implicit acquiescence with government policy and Flory's silence—as challenges to the gauntlet he has thrown down and responds by escalating his position. Specifically, he proclaims that he will never abandon "our" club and "our" rules: "'I'll die in a ditch before I see a nigger in here'" (18). Ellis uses the word nigger here and several more times over the course of the conversation to confirm the racist foundation of his position. Yet, as implied by McGregor's reaction—"'I gather…that our friend Ellis does not welcome the society of—ah—his—Aryan brother?"—Ellis's word choice means something more (24). In choosing to repeatedly use this particular racial slur, which, of course, has traditionally been used as a derogatory reference to peoples of sub-Saharan African descent, Ellis denies any racial connection between himself and the Indians, his "Aryan brothers." His sense of allegiance is based solely on skin color, and he sees only two colors: white and black. Using any other term would mean an acceptance, however slight, of both racial kinship and diversity and would thus undermine the foundation of racial superiority upon which the Club and the Empire stand.

The extremist tenor of Ellis's invective becomes moderated when McGregor and Mrs. Lackersteen arrive at the Club and participate in the conversation, and the general consensus, echoing Westfield's initial comment, is that times have changed, particularly since the war, but not for the better. In fact, Westfield goes so far as to contend that the empire has reached its end: "'This country'll never be fit to live in again. British Raj is

finished if you ask me. Lost Dominion and all that. Time we cleared out of it'" (24). Although Westfield offers no particulars, it can be inferred that integration, in that it implies racial equality, will dismantle the racial hierarchy upon which the empire was founded and sustained for so many years. Without it there is no point in pretending that the empire will hold; without its foundation, the empire will crumble. The most practical response, contrary to Ellis's position, is not to fight but to surrender entirely. Regardless of the ambiguity of Westfield's statement, all of his companions agree with him because, according to the narrator, "no Anglo-Indian will ever deny that India is going to the dogs, or ever has denied it—for India, like *Punch*, never was what it was" (24). India, it seems, does not and has never lived up to the colonizers' expectations of it. The reality of the imperial experience has always paled in comparison to the idea of imperial experience, an idea largely imprinted on the colonizers' subconscious by Kipling. After all, he is the author attributed with creating British India for his audiences in Britain. In their recognition of a diminished and dismantled Empire, the Anglo-Indians bemoan the loss of the imperial idyll offered by Kipling.

In the face of the Empire's imminent demise, the Anglo-Indians, whether as a coping mechanism or as a defense mechanism, cannot help but offer their own analysis of what went wrong. Although they point the finger at different policies—Westfield blames the law and, via the law, the English in England who prevent the Anglo-Indians from doing what needs to be done; Ellis blames policies, like Club integration, that fosters the notion of racial equality; and Mrs. Lackersteen blames the natives of laziness and insolence since the war—they all agree that the imperial administration has failed to keep

the native in his place at the empire's expense.[177] However, whereas Ellis maintains that a demonstration of authority can right the ship, so to speak, Mrs. Lackersteen, speaking with the confidence granted by a burra sahib of Mandalay's opinion on the matter, confidently proclaims that the empire will simply dissolve without a fight from the British:

> "[I]n the end we shall simply *leave* India. Young men will not come out here any longer to work all their lives for insults and ingratitude. We shall just *go*. When the natives come to us begging to stay, we shall say, 'No, you have had your chance, you wouldn't take it. Very well, we shall leave you to govern yourselves.' And then, what a lesson that will teach them!" (26).

Simultaneously paternalistic and childish, Mrs. Lackersteen's position is founded on the premise that "the white man's burden," the unofficial mantra of imperial martyrdom espoused by Kipling in 1899, has lost its influence over younger generations of colonizers because the natives have made the work of empire harder than ever. It simply is no longer worth the bother. However, while the loss of empire may seem incommensurable, the British will ultimately find comfort in the natives' inability—and their acknowledgement of their inability—to govern themselves.

Unlike his peers, Flory does not engage in the conversation. In fact, he remains silent and leaves without saying a word.[178] Although his silence is perceived as evidence

[177] See Todd Kuchta for a discussion of *ressentiment* and the colonizer in late imperial fiction.
[178] Incidentally, the conversation about the end of Empire continues in Flory's absence. After taking a bit of respite by discussing Flory and his Bolshie tendencies, "the conversation veered back to the old, never-palling subject, the insolence of native, the supineness of the Government, the dear dead days when the

of his failure to conform to the group's point of view—they consistently identify him as a Bolshie but tolerate him nonetheless—his peers cannot fathom the depths of his inner rage and his low opinion of them:

> Dull boozing witless porkers! Was it possible that they could go on week after week, year after year, repeating word for word the same evil-mined drivel, like a parody of a fifth-rate story in *Blackwood's*? Would none of them *ever* think of anything new to say? Oh, what a place, what a people! What a civilization is this of ours—this godless civilisation founded on whiskey, *Blackwood's* and the 'Bonzo' pictures! God have mercy on us, for all of us are part of it. (27)

Based on Flory's insight, the previous scene at the Club can be seen not as a spontaneous reaction to McGregor's notice about the election of a native member but a monotonous performance of a play titled something like "The Dark Days of Empire." The performance, as always, is repetitive, predictable, and mundane. They never say anything new, and Flory is as tired of the play as he is of the players. They are conservative and superficial without a thought of their own; they simply mimic and repeat speeches they

---

British Raj was the British Raj …This topic was never let alone for long, partly because of Ellis's obsession. Besides, you could forgive the Europeans a great deal of their bitterness. Living and working among Orientals would try the temper of a saint. And all of them, the officials particularly, knew what it was to be baited and insulted…The life of the Anglo-Indian officials is not all jam. In comfortless camps, in sweltering offices, in gloomy dak bungalows smelling of dust and earth-oil, they earn, perhaps, the right to be a little disagreeable" (28). Although Orwell clearly presents these characters as being one-dimensional and insufferable, his narrator's assertion that the life of the Anglo-Indian is difficult can be seen as a means of offering a reason, but not an excuse, for their behavior. They are, after all, the product of the environment in which they live and work: "It is not the less bitter because it is perhaps one's own fault, to see oneself drifting, rotting, in dishonor and horrible futility, and all the while knowing that somewhere within one there is the possibility of a decent human being" (64).

have either heard or read elsewhere.[179] Yet, even though he faults them, he realizes that he too plays a role in the play, albeit it a non-speaking role, and is thus part of the problem. Whether or not he shares their opinions is of little consequence; his very presence in Burma indicates his participation in it, and even if he were to speak his mind openly, the fact of his situation—he is an Anglo-Indian colonizer in Burma—means that he cannot evade the clutches of either imperial blame or imperial guilt.

Aware that his position requires him to conform, at least superficially, to the dictates of the Anglo-Indian community, Flory reserves his true feelings for internal dialogues and for conversations with his friend, Dr. Veriswami.[180] Much like the performance in the Club, the exchanges between Flory and Veriswami take a familiar pattern: Veriswami defends the English, while Flory denigrates the Anglo-Indians. Imperialism, it seems, requires that everyone play a part. However, despite the monotony of the performance, it does allow Flory to voice his opinion, which, as it turns out, is not entirely anti-empire:

> "I don't want the Burmans to drive us out of this country. God forbid! I'm here to make money, like everybody else. All I object to is the slimy white man burden's humbug. The pukka sahib pose. It's so boring. Even those bloody fools at the Club might be better company if we weren't all of us

[179] In his second essay on Kipling, "Rudyard Kipling," published in *Horizon* in February 1942, Orwell identifies *Blackwood's* as a middle-class, pro-imperialist periodical: "Kipling's official admirers are and were the 'service' middle class, the people who read *Blackwood's*" (401).

[180] Although this relationship is apparently based on true feelings of friendship—the men genuinely like one another—they each also receive a superficial benefit: for Veriswami being a known friend of Flory, a white man, elevates his position in the district, while for Flory being a friend with Veriswami, a native, affords him the opportunity to speak his mind without repercussion. Since the relationship has more tangible benefit to Veriswami, it is in his best interest not to reveal Flory's seditious comments.

> living a lie the whole time… [the lie] that we're here to uplift our poor black brothers instead of to rob them….It corrupts us, it corrupts us in ways you can't imagine. There's an everlasting sense of being a sneak and a liar that torments us and drives us to justify ourselves night and day. It's at the bottom of half our beastliness to the natives. We Anglo-Indians could be almost bearable if we'd only admit that we're thieves and go on thieving without any humbug." (33)

In exposing the lie of the white man's burden—the lie that the foundation of and motivation for imperialism is not economic gain—Orwell, via Flory, is clearly taking Kipling and his pro-imperialists disciples to task. By pretending that imperialism is something else, that imperialism is an elaborate aid mission, the advocates of Kipling's version of the white man's burden make it harder for the people who are actually in the position of doing the work of empire because they must lie to themselves on a daily basis.[181] Over time, the conflict between reality and myth becomes personally overwhelming, and as a result, it becomes a definitive characteristic of the colonizer. Specifically, as Flory articulates the point, the foundation of which is that everything the British do in the Raj is predicated upon self-interest, the Anglo-Indian is neither defined by knowledge of India that makes ruling it possible nor by exile from the dominant culture but by his participation in the lie.

[181] Emilenne Baneth-Nouailhetas points out that in dismantling Kipling's version of the white man's burden, Orwell offers one of his own: "the white man's burden, such as it is transposed by Orwell, should not be understood as the weight of the moral duty extolled by Kipling in his famous poem. It is rather the burden of pantomime the colonials must constantly submit to, the rules they must obey in order to conform to their self-imposed 'ideal' image" (32).

It is his own participation in this lie that provides the source of Flory's internal conflict. Contrary to his deepest desire, which would be to rise up against the imperial system and leave it all behind, the lessons learned from fifteen years of imperial experience prevent him from acting; over all else, "in Burma one learns not to set oneself up against public opinion" (56). As an Anglo-Indian, he cannot bring himself to go against Anglo-India, to leave and seek a new life for himself. Yet what holds him back is not loyalty but a pervasive sense of being corrupt and having been corrupted by Burma and by imperialism from the very beginning. Even at the age of twenty four, only four years after he arrived in Burma, the power of the place and his position prevented him from participating in the war. Under the guise of patriotism, as it was defined by civilians in Burma at the time—in other words, remaining loyal to the job is more important than going away to Europe—Flory decided to stay and work; however, "in reality, Flory had dodged the War because the East had already corrupted him, and he did not want to exchange his whisky, his servants and his Burmese girls for the boredom of the parade ground and the strain of cruel marches" (59). Corruption, in this context, has nothing to do with the negative influence of Burma, or the East, in and of itself, but of imperial Burma. It is imperialism that corrupts the place and corrupts the man by transforming him from an Englishman into an Anglo-Indian. Under imperialism's influence, Flory could not then and cannot now comprehend another way of life, a way of life not defined by excess and greed, in all of its various forms.

Rather than fight for his country, Flory remains in Burma living his corrupt life and developing his own ideas through reading. The result of this accumulated

knowledge—his own idea of imperialism—does not make him a more effective colonizer, as in the case of a Kipling character, but a more bitter and aware colonizer:

> The Indian Empire is a despotism—benevolent, no doubt, but still a despotism with theft as its final object. And as to the English of the East, the *sahiblog*, Flory had come so to hate them from living in their society, that he was quite incapable of being fair to them. For after all, the poor devils are no worse than anybody else. They lead unenviable lives…On the other hand, the *sahiblog* is not to be idealised. There is a prevalent idea that the men at 'the outposts of Empire' are least able and hardworking. It is a delusion. (60)

Ultimately, what Flory's reading allows him to realize is the truth of the white man's burden. The fact that Orwell forces him to reiterate the notion demonstrates the extent to which Flory, much like he does at the Club and with Veriswami, is playing a role. He is a character in a novel, after all, and his function in this novel is to articulate and re-articulate Orwell's anti-imperial stance. Furthermore, by referring to the Empire as "a despotism," Orwell is subverting the eighteenth-century idea that the colonizer, the nabob, was corrupted by a corrupt East and would bring this corruption to England. As Orwell presents it, corruption is not a product of the place but an inherent feature of the system. It is the English, through their empire, that corrupt—and have corrupted—the East, not the other way around. Yet, in forcing Flory to repeat his idea, Orwell also accentuates the devastating impact imperialism has on the individual colonizer who would reject if he could:

> In the end the secrecy of your revolt poisons you like a secret disease. Your whole life is a life of lies. Year after year you sit in Kipling-haunted little Clubs…The time comes when you burn with hatred of your own countrymen, when you long for a native rising to drown their Empire in blood. And in this there is nothing honourable, hardly even any sincerity. For, *au fond*, what do you care if the Indian Empire is a despotism, if Indians are bullied and exploited? You only care because the right of free speech is denied you. You are a creature of the despotism, a pukka sahib, tied tighter than a monk or a savage by an unbreakable system of tabus" (61).

It is, of course, one thing to discover the truth of imperialism. It is quite another to extricate oneself. The fact of the matter that once a man enters into the system, he becomes both a pawn and a product of the system, and in making the decision to stay, even when he does not want to stay, the man who hates the Anglo-Indian is still an Anglo-Indian himself.[182] Furthermore, the problem that arises from this revelation is not that he feels guilty for oppressing the Indians, but that he feels oppressed himself because he is denied the right to speak openly. Once behind the mask, once an Anglo-Indian, he cannot defy the community and the system on which it stands without severe

[182] According to Emilenne Baneth-Nouailhetas, who focuses on the connection between Orwell's novel and the Kiplingian hypotext, "the mask of the 'pukka sahib' is not forced on the British by the projections of the colonised; it is the manifestation, in collective attitudes, or a perennial fictional ideal in the text, of a stratified hypotext where the same set of character types were regularly reproduced" (35-36). Within in the context of my own argument, I read the mask of the 'pukka sahib' to be the Anglo-Indian identity; it is not a mask that can be cast off within the confines of the Empire.

consequences. The Anglo-Indian community does not allow for individuals or individual thought; being Anglo-Indian is a shared identity.

With no hope of a physical escape, Flory turns to reading and to the possibility of marriage as psychological and emotional escapes from his potentially devastating internal conflict. For Flory, marriage symbolizes the beginning of a new life and a hope for a future in England. A wife, a woman he envisions as both an intellectual equal and a morally restorative figure, will help him endure Burma and ameliorate the corrupting influences of empire until he can retire to England: "They would buy a cottage in the country, surround themselves with friends, books, their children, animals. They would be free forever of the small of pukka sahibdom. He would forget Burma, the horrible country that had come near to ruining him" (62). In this vision of an idyllic English future, a vision based largely on nostalgia and thus not real, Flory's rehabilitation from corrupted Anglo-Indian to happy English pensioner is a decidedly passive process. He need do nothing but leave imperial Burma—the corruptor—for a free England—the redeemer. Just as there was nothing that he could have done to prevent Burma from having a negative effect on him, he need do nothing to save himself and reclaim his Englishness than remove himself from Anglo-India. The key to this goal, though, is that the woman will be "a civilized girl, not a pukka memsahib"—in other words, his wife must be from England; she must be free of the taint of Anglo-Indian society in order to fit his vision of the ideal partner. A memsahib, bound to the Anglo-Indian mentality would not understand him and would not be able to give him what he needs, a partner and a soul mate to share his life and to heal the psychic wound inflicted by imperialism.

Of course, it his desperate need for a wife who will ensure passage back to England that motivates Flory to pursue Elizabeth Lackersteen, the Lackersteens' niece. One would think that a man as intelligent as Flory would see her ignorance immediately—she is a racist philistine in search of a husband—yet his desire for companionship blinds him of her faults, and he sees her as the only possibility to end his loneliness. Despite his best and, to be honest, desperate attempts to win her favor and because of U Po Kyin's intervention—he pays Flory's former Burmese mistress to announce herself and her relationship with Flory to the church congregation after Sunday service—Flory fails to win her hand. Her rejection has a devastating effect on Flory; it destroys his will to live, and he commits suicide.[183] In the end, his refusal of imperialism is complete.[184] Unable to remedy his psychological conflict—he can neither accept imperialism nor remove himself from the Empire—Flory embodies the devastating consequences of imperialism on the colonizer. Ultimately, the tragedy of his inevitable death mirrors the fate of Empire; in the end, the Empire will destroy itself.

In her analysis of imperial masculinity in *A Passage to India* and *Burmese Days* Praseeda Gopinath argues, "The English gentleman at home and the imperial Englishman in the periphery, the pukka Sahib, are interlocked: forming a co-dependent relationship, where separating the one from the other spells the end for both" (205). She is correct, of course. Imperialism created an inextricable link between colony and metropole, and, as such, these spaces and the people therein rely on one another for definition. If the bond is

[183] Before killing himself, he kills his dog, Flo, his constant and loyal companion. While the act seems brutal and unnecessary, it is possible that he saw death as her only option. With him gone, there would be no one to care for her.
[184] After all, as Memmi elucidates, "to refuse means either withdrawing physically from those conditions, or remaining to fight and change them" (19).

severed, both sides cease to exist or, to be more precise, cease to exist in the same way. They will simply be defined by another context. While this point in and of itself is sound, my analysis of the representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian in the late imperial period complicates her assertion in that it illuminates the ways in which the imperial Englishman is consistently defined as an "Other" and thus always already separate from the Englishman in England. Moreover, the extent to which separation between the two results in their mutual demise is a matter of imperial perspective. Whereas Forster and Orwell represent the Anglo-Indian as a degraded and dehumanized byproduct of imperialism and thus separate from the Englishman, it seems that this separation would not be detrimental but beneficial for the English at home. On the other hand, although Kipling perceives a separation of sorts—the Anglo-Indian is distinct from the Englishman—this separation does not result in an end of either but in the perpetual survival of both. From Kipling's point of view, the English need the Empire but cannot do the work of Empire themselves. Instead, they rely on the Anglo-Indians to perform imperial work and thereby sustain the nation. In other words, the English and the Anglo-Indian are separate but indissoluble.

Conclusion

Rudyard Kipling's representation of the colonizer as Anglo-Indian and his concurrent elevation of the Anglo-Indian as not only an Englishman but as the savior of the Anglo-Saxon race is a distinct product of the late-nineteenth-imperial discourse. His representation is an anomaly, yet, despite this fact, his voice continues to dominate the contemporary imperial imagination. Why? Moreover, what does it mean if his voice drowns out all the other voices in the discourse? Obviously, these questions, posited in the introduction, are more easily asked than answered as evidenced by the fact that these are not new but long-standing questions. Specifically, George Orwell, writing in 1942, addresses the same critical conundrum:

> before one can even speak about Kipling one has to clear away a legend that has been created by two sets of people who have not read his works…Kipling *is* a jingo imperialist, he *is* morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting. It is better to start by admitting that, and then to try to find out why it is that he survives while the refined people who have sniggered at him seem to wear so badly. (Orwell, "Kipling" *Horizon* 397)

Here, Orwell clearly contextualizes the issue. The answer, it seems, has little if anything to do with Kipling or his work, but the way in which Kipling has been used. In other words, Kipling is not treated as an author but as an embodiment of an ideology, more

often than not, by people who have read little if anything of what he wrote. The same is as true now in 2012 as it was in 1942. Apparently, some things never change.

For Orwell, the answer to the question of Kipling's survival seems to be deeply rooted in what Kipling is and what Kipling is able to represent. Therefore, if Kipling is, as Orwell claims, a jingo imperialist, morally insensitive, and aesthetically disgusting, then perhaps Kipling's voice persists because his position is so easy to define, thus allowing the audience to choose a side without ever having to pick up (or even read) one of his books or poems, of which there are thousands. One is either pro-Kipling or anti-Kipling, it seems. However, regardless of the side one chooses, the fact that Kipling figures as the center of the discourse is a matter of significance; his dominance says more about us than it does about him.

Whereas Orwell believes the longevity of Kipling's cultural relevance can be primarily attributed to the devaluation of refined or complex thought in the contemporary world—"He dealt largely in platitudes, and since we live in a world of platitudes, much of what he said sticks"—I maintain that Kipling's voice dominates the discourse because it comes from the periphery ("Kipling" *Horizon* 410). While this assertion may seem paradoxical, it has been true since the 1890s. Specifically, when Kipling arrived in London in 1889, he joined an affiliation of writers, politicians, and historians, many of whom belonged to the Imperial Federation League, determined to inform the British public of the ways in which the Empire could offer a solution to Britain's national

decline.[185] According to John McBratney, "the impetus for federation [for many of these writers] had come from the imperial margins rather than from England itself. England was enfeebled, but the still rigorous imperial periphery might regenerate the core" (*Native Born* 5). This, of course, is where Kipling enters the picture. Amongst this group of writers who celebrated the positive influence of the colonies and the colonizer on the nation, Kipling held a unique position: Kipling was born in a colony. Writing from the vantage point of the Anglo-Indian, a man who existed somewhere between England and India, Kipling used his difference to his advantage. He spoke of imperialism with an authenticity inaccessible to English writers born and raised in England and as a result became the spokesperson of Empire.

As a marginal yet dominant figure, Kipling can be used to speak of imperialism—its rhetoric, its implications, its repercussions—as if the history of the British Empire and the British Raj is anything but complex. Believing that Kipling alone can represent centuries' worth of discourse allows contemporary audiences to distance themselves from the realities of the imperial past. After all, regardless of the side one takes, relying on Kipling as the representative of British imperialism allows one to effectively dismiss the past. It was either the best of times or the worst of times, nothing more. Of course, imperialism is more complicated than that. Besides, if imperial work is national work and an imperial identity is a national identity, as Kipling repeatedly articulates, why is the representation of the colonizer, especially the Anglo-Indian colonizer, so resolutely

[185] Established in London in 1884, the Imperial Federation League sought to create an imperial federation as an alternative to colonial imperialism. According to the league's loosely formulated plans, the colonies would join together to form a single state with its own parliament. See Duncan Bell for a discussion of the concept of "Greater Britain."

negative in the rest of the discourse of the British Raj? If Britain did define itself as an imperial nation and thus the colonizer stands as a representative of the concept of the British nation, what does it mean that the colonizer is consistently represented as "Other"? The short answer will have to suffice for now: Kipling's voice is not enough.

Bibliography

Allen, Charles. Ed. *Plain Tales from the Raj: Images of British India in the Twentieth Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Arata, Stephen. *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian fin de siècle: Identity and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Arnold, David. "European Orphans and Vagrants in India in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 7.2 (1979): 104-127.

Arnold, William Delafield. *Oakfield: or Fellowship in the East*. 1854. 2nd edition. A Garland Series. Victorian Fiction: Novels of Faith and Doubt. New York: Garland, 1975.

Arondekar, Anjali. *For the Record: On Sexuality and the Colonial Archive in India*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009.

Auerbach, Nina. *Communities of Women: An Idea in Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Baker, Ahmad M.S. Abu. "Rethinking Identity: The Coloniser in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India*." *Nebula* 3.2-3 (2006): 68-85.

Baneth-Nouailhetas, Emilene. "George Orwell and the 'White Man's Burden'." *Commonwealth* 17.1 (1994): 32-39.

Barsham, Diana. *Arthur Conan Doyle and the Meaning of Masculinity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000.

Baucom, Ian. *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Bearce, George D. *British Attitudes towards India, 1784-1858*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Bell, Duncan. *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.

Burke, Edmund. "Speeches on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings." 1788-1789. *Edmund Burke: Selected Prose*. Ed. Sir Philip Magnus. London: Falcon Press, 1948. 54-60.

Case, Adelaide. *Day by day at Lucknow: A Journal of the Siege of Lucknow*. London: Bentley, 1858.

Cass, Jeffrey, "'The Scraps, Patches, and Rags of Daily Life': Gaskell's Oriental Other and the Conservation of *Cranford*." *Papers on Language and Literature: A Journal for Scholars of Language and Literature* 35.4 (1999): 417-433.

Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Childers, Joseph W. "Foreign Matter: Imperial Filth." *Filth: Dirt, Disgust, and Modern Life*. Eds. William A. Cohen and Ryan Johnson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005. 201-221.

Christensen, Timothy. "Bearing the White Man's Burden: Misrecognition and Cultural Difference in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*." *Novel* 39.2 (2006): 155-178.

Clausen, Christopher. "Sherlock Holmes, Order, and the Late-Victorian Mind." *Critical Essays on Sir Arthur Conan Doyle*. Ed. Harold Orel. New York: G.K. Hall, 1992. 66-91.

Clive, John. "Peter and the Wallah: from Kinsfolk to Competition." *History & Imagination: Essays in Honor of H. R. Trevor-Roper*. Eds. Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Valerie Pearl, and Blair Worden. Holmes & Meier. 311-325.

Cole, Sarah Rose. "The Aristocrat in the Mirror: Male Vanity Bourgeois Desire in William Makepeace Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 61.2 (2006): 137-170.

"Competition Wallah." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. www.oed.com.

Danvers, F.C. "Origin of the East India Company's Civil Service and of Haileybury College." *Memorials of Old Haileybury College*. Hertford: Stephen Austin and Sons, 1894.

Das, G.K. "*A Passage to India*: A Socio-Historical Study." *A Passage to India: Essays in Interpretation*. Ed. John Beer. London: Macmillan, 1985. 1-15.

David, Saul. *The Indian Mutiny: 1857*. London: Penguin, 2002.

Davidis, Maria. "Forster's Imperial Romance: Chivalry, Motherhood, and Questing in *A Passage to India*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 23.2 (1999-2000): 259-276.

Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire, and the Imagining of Masculinities*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Dooley, D. J. "Thackeray's Use of *Vanity Fair*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11.4 (1971): 701-713.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. "The Adventure of the Devil's Foot." *His Last Bow.* 1917. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 2. New York: Bantam, 1986. 465-491.

---. "The Adventure of the Empty House." *The Return of Sherlock Holmes*. 1892. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 1. New York: Bantam, 1986. 759-781.

---. "The Adventure of the Speckled Band." *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. 1892. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 1. New York: Bantam, 1986. 396-422.

---. "The Boscombe Valley Mystery." *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes*. 1892. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 1. New York: Bantam, 1986. 306-330.

---. *The Sign of Four*. 1890. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 1. New York: Bantam, 1986. 121-236.

---. *A Study in Scarlet*. 1887. *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Novels and Stories*. Volume 1. New York: Bantam, 1986. 1-120.

Edwards, Owen Dudley. *The Quest for Sherlock Holmes: A Biographical Study of Arthur Conan Doyle*. Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1983.

Embree, Ainslie T. Ed. *1857 in India: Mutiny or War of Independence?*. Problems in Asian Civilizations Series. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1963.

Farrell, Kirby. "Heroism, Culture, and Dread in *The Sign of Four*." *Studies in the Novel* 16.1 (1984): 32-51.

Fenwick, Julie. "Mothers of Empire in Elizabeth Gaskell's *Cranford*." *English Studies in Canada* 23.4 (1997): 409-426.

Fluet, Lisa. "'Distinct Vocations' and the Anglo-Indian in Sherlock Holmes' England." *Victorian Review: The Journal of the Victorian Studies Association of Western Canada and the Victorian Studies Association of America* 24.2 (1998): 130-162.

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. 1924. San Diego: Harcourt, 1984.

Fowler, Rowena. "*Cranford*: Cow in Grey Flannel or Lion Couchant?" *Studies in English Literature* 24 (1984): 717-729.

Frazee, John. "George IV and Jos Sedley in *Vanity Fair*." *English Language Notes* 19.2 (1981): 122-128.

Froude, James Anthony. *Oceana: or England and Her Colonies*. 1886. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

Ganz, Margaret. *Elizabeth Gaskell: The Artist in Conflict*. New York: Twayne, 1969.

Garcha, Amanpal. *From Sketch to Novel: The Development of Victorian Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. *Cranford*. 1853. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2005.

Gilmour, Robin. *The Idea of the Gentleman in the Victorian Novel*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.

Gopinath, Praseeda. "An Orphaned Manliness: The Pukkha Sahib and the End of Empire in *A Passage to India* and *Burmese Days*." *Studies in the Novel* 41.2 (2009): 201-223.

Gregg, Hilda. "The Indian Mutiny in Fiction." *Blackwood's Magazine* 161 (Feb 1897): 218-231.

Hagiioannu, Andrew. *The Man who would be Kipling: The Colonial Fiction and the Frontiers of Exile*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Harris, Susan Cannon. "Pathological Possibilities: Contagion and Empire in Doyle's Sherlock Holmes Stories." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 31.2 (2003): 447-466.

Hawkins, Hunt. "Forster's Critique of Imperialism in *A Passage to India*." *South Atlantic Review* 48.1 (1983): 54-65.

Herbert, Christopher. *War of No Pity: The Indian Mutiny and Victorian Trauma*. Princeton: Princeton University press, 2008.

Hermansson, Casie E. *Bluebeard: A Reader's Guide to the English Tradition*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

Hibbert, Christopher. *The Great Mutiny: India 1857*. London: Penguin, 1978.

Hobsbawm, E. J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hotchkiss, Jane. "The Jungle of Eden: Kipling, Wolf Boys, and the Colonial Imagination." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 29.2 (2001): 435-449.

Hutchins, Francis G. *The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Ingle, Stephen. "The Anti-Imperialism of George Orwell." *George Orwell*. Eds. Graham Holderness, Bryan Loughrey, and Nahem Yousaf. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998. 228-247.

Inglis, Julia. The Siege of Lucknow: A Diary. London: James R. Osgood, McIlvaine & Co. 1892.

Jann, Rosmeary. *The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes: Detecting Social Order*. New York: Twayne, 1995.

Kapila, Shuchi. *Educating Seeta: The Anglo-Indian Family Romance and the Poetics of Indirect Rule*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2010.

Kaplan, Laurie. "The Unpleasantness at the Chandrapore Club, and the Mayapore Club, and the Jummapur Club: Forster., Scott, and Stoppard at the End of Empire." *Back to Peace: Reconciliation and Redistribution in the Postwar Period*. Eds. Aránzazu Usandizaga and Andre Monnickendam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007. 160-179.

Keep, Christopher and Don Randall. "Addiction, Empire, and Narrative in Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of Four*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 32.2 (1999): 207-221.

Kerr, Douglas. "Colonial Habitats: Orwell and Woolf in the Jungle." *English Studies* 2 (1997): 149-161.

Kestner, Joseph A. *Sherlock's Men: Masculinity, Conan Doyle, and Cultural History*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1997.

Kiesel, Alyson J. "Meaning and Misinterpretation in *Cranford*." *ELH* 71.4 (2004): 1001-1017.

Kipling, Rudyard. “A Song of the English.” *The Seven Seas*. 1896. New York: D. Appleton, 1899.

---. “Baa Baa Black Sheep.” 1888. *Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 135-170.

---. “The Bronkhurst Divorce Case.” *Plain Tales from the Hills*. 1888. London: Penguin, 1987. 214-219.

---. “In the Rukh.” *Many Inventions*. 1893. *The New Readers’ Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

---. *Kim*. 1901. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

---. *Letters of Marque*. New York: Frank F. Lovell, 1890.

---. “The Little House at Arrah.” 1888. *The Readers’ Guide to Rudyard Kipling’s Work*. Ed. R.E. Harbord. Section IV. Canterbury: Messrs. Gibbs & Sons, 1965-6. 1972-1979.

---. “The Lost Legion.” *Many Inventions*. 1893. *The New Readers’ Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

---. “The Mark of the Beast.” *Life’s Handicap: Being Stories of Mine Own People*. 1899. London: Penguin, 1987. 195-207.

---. “Miss Youghal’s Sais.” *Plain Tales from the Hills*. 1888. London: Penguin, 1987. 51-56.

---. “The Man Who Would be King.” 1888. *Fictions of Empire*. Ed. John Kucich. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003. 152-186.

---. “The Native-Born.” *The Seven Seas*. 1896. New York: D. Appleton, 1899.

---. “One View of the Question.” *Many Inventions*. 1893. *The New Readers’ Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

---. “Recessional.” 1897. *The New Readers’ Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

---. “The Return of Imray.” *Life’s Handicap: Being Stories of Mine Own People*. 1899. London: Penguin, 1987. 208-219.

---. *Something of Myself*. 1937. *Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

---. "The Son of His Father." 1893-1894. *Land and Sea Tales: For Scouts and Guides.* 1924.

---. "To Be Filed for Reference." *Plain Tales from the Hills*. 1888. London: Penguin, 1987. 270-277.

---. "The Undertakers." *The Second Jungle Book*. 1895. *The New Readers' Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

---. "The White Man's Burden." 1899. *The New Readers' Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

Klauber, Laurence M. "The Truth about the Speckled Band." *The Baker Street Journal, an Irregular Quarterly of Sherlockiana* 3.2 (1948): 149-157.

Knox, Vicemius. *The Spirit of Despotism*. 1795. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*.

Kuchta, Todd. *Semi-Detached Empire: Suburbia and the Colonization of Britain, 1880 to the Present*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010.

Kucich, John. *Fictions of Empire: Complete Texts with Introduction, Historical Contexts, Critical Essays*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.

Kumar, Krishan. *The Making of English National Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2003.

Lansbury, Carol. *Elizabeth Gaskell: The Novel of Social Crisis*. London: Elek, 1975.

Lawson, Philip. *The East India Company: A History*. London: Longman, 1993.

Lindner, Christoph. *Fictions of Commodity Culture: From the Victorian to the Postmodern*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

"Loafer." *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. www.oed.com.

Lowell, A. Lawrence. *Colonial Service: The Selection and Training of Colonial Officials in England, Holland, and France with an Account of the East India College at Haileybury (1806-1857) by H. Morse Stephens*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1900.

May, Brian. "Romancing the Stump: Modernism and Colonialism in Forster's *A Passage to India*." *Modernism and Colonialism: British and Irish Literature, 1899-1939*. Eds. Richard Begam and Michael Valedez Moses. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007. 136-161.

McBratney, John. "Racial Criminal Types: Indian Ethnography and Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of Four*." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 33 (2005): 149-167.

---. *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space: Rudyard Kipling's Fiction of the Native-Born*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2002.

---. "Imperial Theatricality in British India from Rudyard Kipling to George Orwell." *South Asian Review* 25.1 (2004): 16-38.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

McClure, John A. *Kipling and Conrad: The Colonial Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

McLaughlin, Joseph. *Writing the Urban Jungle: Reading Empire in London from Doyle to Eliot*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2000.

McMaster, R. D. *Thackeray's Cultural Frame of Reference: Allusion in The Newcomes*. Montreal:McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991.

McNeil, Kenneth. *Scotland, Britain, Empire: Writing the Highlands, 1760-1860*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2007.

Mehta, Jaya. "English Romance; Indian Violence." *The Centennial Review* 39.3 (1995): 611-657.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

Meyers, Jeffrey. "The Politics of *A Passage to India*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 1 (1971): 329-338.

Miller, Andrew H. *Novels Behind Glass: Commodity Culture and Victorian Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

---. "Subjectivity Ltd.: The Discourse of Liability in the Joint Stock Companies Act of 1856 and Gaskell's *Cranford*." *ELH* 61.1 (1994): 139-157.

Milnes, Richard Monckton. “Personal Narratives of the Siege of Lucknow.” *The Quarterly Review* 103.206 (1858): 505-526.

Monserrat, Ann. *An Uneasy Victorian: Thackerary the Man, 1811-1863*. London: Casell, 1980.

Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Kipling and “Orientalism.”* London: Croom Helm, 1986.

---. “Introduction.” *Writing India 1757-1990: The Literature of British India*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Muggeridge, Malcolm. “Introduction.” *Burmese Days*. New York: Time, 1962. xi-xv.

Mulvihill, James. “Economies of Living in Mrs. Gaskell’s *Cranford*.” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 50.3 (1995): 337-356.

Nagai, Kaori. “The Writing on the Wall: The Commemoration of the Indian Mutiny in the Delhi Durbar and Rudyard Kipling’s “The Little House at Arrah”.” i*nterventions* 7.1 (2005): 84-96.

Nechtman, Tillman W. *Nabobs: Empire and Identity in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Nicora, Flaminia. “The Crack in the Cornerstone: Victorian Identity Conflicts and the Representation of the Sepoy Mutiny in Metropolitan and Anglo-Indian Novels.” *Cahiers Victoriens et Édouardiens* 66 (2007): 255-272.

Norton, Sandy Morey. “The Ex-Collector of Boggley-Wallah: Colonization in the Empire of *Vanity Fair*. *Narrative* 1.2 (1993): 124-137.

O’Leary, John. “‘Out Here to be Pleasant’: *Mister Johnson* and the Rhetoric of Niceness.” *Kunapipi: Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 26.2 (2004): 82-90.

Orwell, George. *Burmese Days*. 1934. New York: Time, 1962.

---. “Rudyard Kipling.” *Horizon* (Feb 1942). *George Orwell: Essays*. Ed. John Carey. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002. 397-410.

---. “Rudyard Kipling.” *New English Weekly* (23 Jan 1936). *George Orwell: Essays*. Ed. John Carey. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002. 38-39.

“Our Indian Empire.” *The Quarterly Review* 103. 205 (1858): 253-278.

Paffard, Mark. *Kipling’s Indian Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Page, David. "Introduction." *Letters of Marque*. 2007. *The New Readers' Guide to the Works of Rudyard Kipling*. Ed. John Radcliff. www.kipling.org.uk.

Parry, Benita. *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies in India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*. London: Allen Lane, 1972.

Payne, David S. *Myth and Modern Man in Sherlock Holmes: Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and the Uses of Nostalgia*. Bloomington: Gaslight, 1992.

Peck, John. "Middle-Class Life in *Vanity Fair*." *English: The Journal of the English Association* 43.175 (1994): 1-16.

Perkin, J. Russell. "Thackeray and Orientalism: *Cornhill to Cairo* and *The Newcomes*." *English Studies in Canada* 26.3(1990): 279-313.

Peters, Catherine. *Thackeray's Universe: Shifting Worlds of Imagination and Reality*. London: Faber and Faber, 1987.

---. *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*. Vol. 1 1872-1889. Houndsmills: Macmillan, 1990.

Pinney, Thomas. Ed. *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*. Vol. 2 1890-1899. Houndsmills: Macmillan, 1990.

Pittock, Malcolm. "*Cranford* and Cruelty: An Interpretation." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 38.2 (2009): 95-119.

Randall, Don. "Post-Mutiny Allegories of Empire in Rudyard Kipling's Jungle-Books." *Texas Studies in Literatures and Language* 41.1 (1999): 97-120.

Rappaport, Jill. "Conservation and Sympathy in *Cranford*." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 36 (2008): 95-110.

Ray, Gordon N. *The Buried Life: A Study of the Relation between Thackeray's Fiction and his Personal History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

---. "The Newcomes." *Thackeray: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Alexander Walsh. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. 147-160.

---. *Thackeray*: *The Uses of Adversity*. Volume 1. New York: McGraw, 1955.

Reeves, Margaret. "Textual, Contextual, and Ideological Contradictions in Elizabeth Gaskell's *Cranford*." *English Studies in Canada* 23.4 (1997): 389-407.

Renford, Raymond K. *The Non-Official in India in 1920*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Rosenthal, Rae. "Gaskell's Feminist Utopia: The Cranfordians and the Reign of Goodwill." *Utopian Science Fiction by Women: Worlds of Difference*. Jane L. Donawerth and Carol A Kolmarten. Eds. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 1993.

---. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Seeley, John Robert. *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures*. 1883. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1905.

Sharpe, Jenny. Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Shuman, Cathy. *Pedagogical Economies: The Examination of the Victorian Literary Man*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Siddiqi, Yumna. *Anxieties of Empire and the Fiction of Intrigue*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

"The Siege of Lucknow." *The Quarterly Review* 103.206 (1858): 505-526.

Singh, Bhupal. *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Stuart, Laura Kathryn. "The Medical Profession as Seen by William Makepeace Thackeray." *Medical Libraries: Devoted to the Interests of Medical Libraries Bibliography and Letters*. Ed. C. D. Spivak. 1.8-9(1898): 49-53.

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Sullivan, Zoreh T. *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Tennyson. "The Defence of Lucknow." 1880. *Empire Writing: An Anthology of Colonial Literature 1870*-1918. Ed. Elleke Boehmer. 59-63.

Thackeray, William Makepeace. *The Newcomes*: *Memoirs of a Most Respectable Family*. 1855. London: J.M. Dent, 1994.

---. *Vanity Fair: A Novel without a Hero.* 1848. New York: Penguin, 2004.

---. *The Four Georges*. *Works of Wm. M. Thackeray: Roundabout Papers to which is added The Second Funeral of Napoleon, Critical Reviews, The Four Georges, The English Humorists of the Eighteenth Century, Sketches and Travels in London*. New York: Wm. L. Allison, 189-.

Thomas, Ronald R. "The Fingerprint of the Foreigner: Colonizing the Criminal Body in 1890s Detective Fiction and Criminal Anthropology." *ELH* 61.3 (1994): 655-683.

Thompson, Jon. *Fiction, Crime, and Empire: Clues to Modernity and Postmodernism*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.

Tickell, Alex. "Cawnpore, Kipling, and *Charivari*: 1857 and the Politics of Commemoration." *Literature and History* 18.2 (2009): 1-19.

Trevelyan, George Otto. *The Competition Wallah*. 1864. 1866. 2nd edition. New Delhi: Indus, 1992.

Uglow, Jenny. *Elizabeth Gaskell: A Habit of Stories*. London: Faber and Faber, 1993.

Warhol, Robyn. "Neonarrative; or How to Render the Unnarratable in Realist Fiction and Contemporary Film." *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Eds. James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz. Malden: Blackwell, 2005. 220-231.

Watt, Donald. "E.M. Forster's Quarrel with the God-State." *Philological Quarterly* 60.4 (1981): 523-537.

Weiss, Barbara. "Elizabeth Gaskell: The Telling of Feminine Tales." *Studies in the Novel* 16.3 (1984): 274-287.

Wheatley, James H. *Patterns in Thackeray's Fiction*. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1969.

Williams, Patrick. "*Kim* and Orientalism." *Kipling Considered*. Ed. Phillip Mallett. New York: St. Martin's, 1999. 33-55.

Wiltse, Ed. "The 'Shout of the Beef-Eating British': Nation and Genre in *Vanity Fair*." *CEA Critic: An Official Journal of the College English Association* 67.3 (2005): 41-64.

Woolf, Leonard. *Growing: An Autobiography of the Years 1904-1911*. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.

Zoli, Corri. "'Black Holes' of Calcutta and London: Internal Colonies in *Vanity Fair*." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 35(2007): 417-449.