

Tribhuvan University

Ambivalence in Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*: A Postcolonial Interpretation

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of

Masters of Arts in English

Universal College

Maitidevi, Kathmandu

By

Arun Kumar Mandal

Year of Admission 2008/09

May 2013

Tribhuvan University
Department of English
Universal College

Letter of Recommendation

Mr. Arun Kumar Mandal has completed his thesis entitled “Ambivalence in Paul Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown: A Postcolonial Interpretation*” under my supervision. He carried out his research from May 2012 to June 2013. I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted to viva voce.

.....
Mr. Baburam Timsina
Supervisor

Tribhuvan University
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

This thesis entitled “Ambivalence in Paul Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown: A Postcolonial Interpretation*” submitted to Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu by Mr. Arun Kumar Mandal, has been approved by the undersigned members to the research committee.

Members of the Research Committee

.....
..... **Internal Examiner**

.....
..... **External Examiner**

.....
..... **Head,**
Department of English
Universal College
Date:

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to register my gratitude to Mr. Baburam Timsina, the Head of Department of English, for his shrewd supervision, advice, and guidance from the very preliminary stage of my research and for being an inspiring and sincere mentor of mine throughout the project. His continuous encouragement and cordial support with scholarly ease is unarguably praiseworthy. I similarly owe to Mr. Badri Acharya for his kind and scholarly guidance in order to identify the area of research and develop the understanding of the subject.

It is an honor for me to extend my gratitude to my teachers: Prof. Dr. Padma Prasad Devkota, Mr. Khagendra Bhattarai, Mr. Shuv Raj Ranabhat, Mr. Deewakar Upadhyay, Mr. Jawahar Lal Maharjan, Mr. Laxman Gautam, Mr. Shrijon Chhetri, Mr. Madan Lamichhane, Mr. Mahesh Paudel, and Mr. Rajendra Panthee for their support.

Likewise, my sincere gratitude goes to my parents, Mr. Ram Sharan Mandal and Mrs. Inar Devi Mandal, my spouse, Mrs. Yamuna K.C., brother, Mr. Ashok Kumar Mandal, sister, Mrs. Archana Mandal, and my lovely son, Ayush Kumar Mandal who always prompted and inspired me and have been ever present in my all ups and downs of life.

Finally, I also take the opportunity to remember all involved and ask for an apology for not being able to mention personally the names of those helping hands in my study.

Arun Kumar Mandal

Abstract

Upon the close and thorough inspection of Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), it is revealed that the postcolonial scholarship does not merely include the study of the colonized countries after its independence. It makes the sober interpretation of the impact of the colonialism on the native life from the very beginning of the colonial enterprise. The paper affirms the colonial relationship between the colonized and the colonizer to be in continuous fluctuation as they are never in complete opposition. This ambivalence has invoked various notions of the critics. It, for some, de-centers the authority of the colonialist in the long run whereas its impact is still debatable for many postcolonial thinkers.

Colonialism begets nationalism which promises the emancipation of the majority of natives but ends in frustrating eliticism rooted in Western Universalism. This campaign of the representation of the national consciousness in the native literature is still incomplete. Therefore, to ensure the true independence of the colonies of Europe, the postcolonial critics and writers must attempt to retrieve the subaltern consciousness and identity in their work. As soon as this proletariat's contribution gets prominence in the nationalist literature instead of native elites who very strategically align with the colonialist, the recovery of the missing nationalist spirit starts and hence the real nationalism.

Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1
Research overview	1- 8
Paul Scott: A Brief Introduction	2 - 4
Overview of <i>The Jewel in the Crown</i> (1966)	5 - 6
Ambivalence as Frame of Interpretation	6 - 9
Chapter II: Ambivalence: Origin, Debate, and Context	10
Defference : Criss-crossing Personal and the National	14 - 19
Ambivalence in Postcolonial Debate	19 - 24
Hybridity and Naitonalism: Responses to Ambivalence	24 - 37
Chapter III: Ambivalence in <i>The Jewel in the Crown</i> (1966)	38
Racial Discrimination	40 - 44
Torn Subjects: Ambivalence	44 -50
Negotiating with Past and Present: Hybrid Subjects	51 - 56
Desire of Independence: Nationalism	56 - 63
Chapter IV: Ambivalence: A Source of Utter Confusion	64 – 68
Works Cited	69 - 69

Chapter I. Introduction

Research Overview

This project focuses on Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), a story of the dying days of the British Raj, and the Indian independence movement in India in 1940's, especially during the World War II. In particular, it explores the 'ambivalent attitude' of the writer through his European, Eurasian and Asian characters towards the British rule in India. The paper hypothesizes that Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* shows the ambivalent attitude towards British colonialism. It therefore offers the postcolonial interpretation of the text based upon the prominent postcolonial theories. The study has made the sober examination of the text based upon the postcolonial issues like hybridity, ambivalence, nationalism, racism, and Orientalism, the pioneer theory to analyze colonial discourse.

The project aims at exploring the ways of the representation of the characters in the novel so as to assess its literary framework. It aims to discover the ideological assumptions that lie at the heart of the text. The novel has been thoroughly examined with the spectacle postcolonial theories in order to identify the literary model on which the text is based. The literary strategies employed by the writer have been laid bare so as to decide its underlying literary aim. The project has not left any stone unturned to find out the elements of 'ambivalence' in the text.

To serve the very purpose, the theorists have been brought in conversation so that the study can validate its interpretation. The norms and values underlying the narrative technique of the writer have been brought to the surface in order to work out the attitude of the writer. The text's assumptions about the natives and the colonizers are the prime area of study. The presentation of the colonial relationship between the colonizer and the colonized is highly contributive to the research.

The protagonist, Hari Kumar, his beloved Daphne Manners, and his ambitious father Duleep Kumar who are the major characters of the novel are portrayed as the ones who suffer the ‘cultural hybridity’ and show the ‘ambivalent’ mentality towards the British rule in India, that is, they are torn between two cultures and suffer the alienation, the crisis of identity, and ‘in-betweenness’ of the culture throughout the novel. Hari Kumar, a British educated Indian boy, is lost when he is compelled to hark back to his homeland after his father’s fatal bankruptcy in England. He belongs in no man’s land, neither in India which sees him as a fake Indian nor in Britain which sees him as a jumped-up native. In his view, he has neither present nor future, only past with which he can cling. He is accused of Daphne’s rape by British Colonial agent Ronal Merrick despite the lack of sufficient evidence and her refusal as punishment for his inter-racial love affair with her. Moreover, Old Kumar, Hari’s father also believes in “the intellectual superiority of the English. He thinks the British ruled India not with the physical strength” (Scott 238). The novel shows the covert affinity towards the British colonization albeit the author’s resistance to it on the surface. Daphne Manners cries out and tells Lily to send away when Raju and Bhalu who are Indian servants at Macgregor house approach her – “I cried out because they were black.” (Scott 472).

Paul Scott: A Brief Introduction

Paul Scott, born on March 25, 1920 in Palmers Green, North London, his parents, Tom and Francis Scott were both commercial artists. They were ordinary middle class folk who wanted Paul to become an Accountant. He went to the Winchmore Hill Collegiate School. With the outbreak of the war, however, the young Scott joined the army as an N.C.O., having been rejected as a potential officer because he had told the recruiting officer that he wanted to become a poet. Paul Scott served in

the British and the Indian armies in the United Kingdom, India and Malaya during the year's stay in this country; Scott travelled widely and acquired first-hand experience of life in British-India during crucial forties.

Paul Scott is now an officer, therefore a *sahib*, but he did not feel at home in Anglo-Indian club life. Paul Scott married Nancy Elizabeth Avery; the romantic novelist in 1941 and had two children. Throughout the 1950s, he continued to write novels. His first novel, *Johnnie Sahib* was published in 1952 after seventeen rejections. However, *Johnnie Sahib* and *The Alien Sky* were both successfully dramatized, they failed to bring him the recognition he craved. In 1963 he was the winner of the Yorkshire Post Fiction Award for the third volume of the Raj Quartet, *The Tower of Silence*. He also worked as Agent at David Higham Associates, London.

In 1960, Paul Scott resigned his directorship with the agency in order to concentrate on his own at David Higham to write full time. It was an act of great faith for after the little success of his first novel, *Johnnie Sahib* (1952) none of his intervening novels had made much money or received high recognition. Scott had been superb agent: shrewd, encouraging and critical in a constructive way. After his two experimental novels, *The Bender* and *The Corrida at San Feliu* Scott made his faithful return visit to India in 1964.

Apart from his novels, he was a regular reviewer for *Country Life* and contributor to *The Times*. In 1972, he undertook a lecture tour of India for the British Council International Book Year. Something extraordinary happened to Paul Scott when he visited India in 1964. He returned a changed and wounded man. No one knew precisely what the experience was that he underwent. On his return, from the time he started *The Jewel in the Crown* in 1964, Scott's dedication to his work became complete.

Scott admitted to his drinking problem and this combined with his wife left him at the age of 62, shortly before their thirty sixth wedding anniversary. The ten years of the composition of the Raj Quartet, now being shown on ITV as *The Jewel in the Crown* cost him his marriage and, arguably, his life.

About 20 years ago, Paul Scott set out on his most ambitious project – his four self-contained but interlinked novels on the Raj. The first of these, *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), followed by *The Day of the Scorpion* (1968), *The Tower of Silence* (1971) and *A Division of the Spoils* (1975). Taken as whole, the Quartet – gives us a panoramic view of India from the Quit India movement to partition and independence. Scott paints India on large canvas; large enough to do justice to the great subject he has chosen. In the mean time, like any miniature artist, he presents every detail of the complex love-hate relationship between Indians and Englishmen. The four parts sold steadily until the sequence was complete in 1975 made Scott enough money to live on with generous help from his publishers, Heinemann. When he fell ill soon afterwards, the doctors in London ascribed it to his drinking and the American doctor diagnosed him to be cancerous.

Fame came to him only when his last book, *Staying On*, an epilogue to the Raj Quartet won him the coveted Booker Prize for fiction in 1977 when Scott was dying of cancer. This last novel takes Anglo-Indian experience through to the present day by exploring the lives of British expatriates who remained in India after independence. “I have finished with India”, he said, after its publication. Scott died soon after the publication of this valedictory novel on India on March 1, 1978. He was on his death bed in hospital when the Booker Prize was announced.

Overview of *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966)

Daphne Manners, who has lost her immediate family in England, comes to India to live with her only remaining near kinsman, Lady Manners. Lady Manners sends her to Mayapore to stay with her Indian friend, Lady Chatterjee.

While staying with Lady Chatterjee, whom she calls 'Aunt Lili,' Daphne meets Hari Kumar. He is an Indian who was brought up in England and educated at Chillingborough, a public school that Daphne's own brother attended. But his father's financial collapse and suicide obliged Hari to return to India. Daphne learns to despise the attitudes of the English in India and also grows to love Hari.

Meanwhile, the local police superintendent, Ronald Merrick, has designed both on Daphne and Hari, making for a potent love triangle. Merrick, of lower-middle-class English origin, is resentful of the privileged English public school class and contemptuous of Indians. Hari thus represents everything that Merrick hates.

After Daphne and Hari make love in a public park, the Bibighar Garden, they are attacked by a mob of rioters who by chance witness their lovemaking. Hari is beaten and Daphne is raped repeatedly. Knowing that Hari will be implicated in her rape, Daphne swears him to silence regarding his presence at the scene. But she does not count on the instincts of Ronald Merrick, who, upon learning of the rape, immediately takes Hari into custody and engages in a lengthy and sadistic interrogation which includes sexual humiliation. Merrick also arrests a group of educated young Indians, including some of Hari's colleagues at the *Mayapore Gazette*.

Daphne steadfastly refuses to support the prosecution of Hari and the others for rape. She insists that her attackers are peasants and includes at least one Muslim (although she was blindfolded, she could tell he was circumcised) and could not be

young, educated Hindus like Hari and his acquaintances who have been taken into custody. The inquest is frustrated when Daphne threatens to testify that, for all she knows her attackers could have been Englishmen.

Hari puzzles the authorities by refusing to say anything, even in his own defense (he has been sworn to secrecy by Daphne, and he honors that pledge to the letter). Because the authorities cannot successfully prosecute him for rape, they instead imprison him under a wartime law as a suspected revolutionary. And Daphne's refusal to aid a prosecution for rape leads to her being reviled and ostracized by the English community of Mayapore and of British India as a whole, where her case has become a 'cause célèbre'.

Unbeknownst to Hari, Daphne has conceived a child; its paternity is impossible to determine, but she considers the child to be Hari's. She returns to her aunt, Lady Manners, to give birth, but a pre-existing medical condition results in her death. Lady Manners takes the child, Parvati, to Kashmir. Parvati's physical resemblance to Hari satisfies Lady Manners and Lady Chatterjee that Hari was her biological father.

Ambivalence as Frame of Interpretation

This section presents the model of interpretation of the issues of the novel raised in it. The pattern of the literary analysis is largely based on the notion of 'ambivalence' as postcolonial theorists have debated. *The Jewel in the Crown*, a mixed story of love, history, and mystery, portrays the dying days of the British India where both the British and the Indian were in love-hate relationship with each other. The British colonization of India in 1858, the year after the failure of the East India Company, forced both the Indian and the English culture to be affected with each other. The paper contends that the English came to India on a so-called civilizing

mission with an implicit aim of exploitation of its resources. The racist attitude of both colonizer and colonized was in operation against each other. However, over the time, both the British and the Indian developed a mutual relationship which was fluctuating between love and hatred. They were torn between two oppositionalities of self and otherness. Both the colonizer and the colonized internalized each other's socio-cultural values and language, either by volition, or by obligation as per their requirement. The interpretation holds that the relationship between the British and the Indian is that of power and varying degree of domination.

The postcolonial theories and arguments are at the heart of this entire interpretative discussion. The study of 'abrogation' and 'appropriation' of the foreign culture by the Indian is significant part of the analysis. It has taken into account both the strength and weakness of the nationalist ideology and tried to assess its rationality in postcolonial context. The sober attention to the possible association of racism with nationalist representation has been paid so as to validate theoretical analysis.

To be more explicit, the theoretical overview has been divided into four different chapters; Chapter I. Introduction, Chapter II. Ambivalence: Origin, Debate, and Context, Chapter III. Textual Analysis, and Chapter IV. Conclusion. The first chapter presents what the project is about, a brief introduction of the author, Paul Scott, and the brief discussion of model of interpretation. The second chapter offers the entire theoretical framework of the study with sober discussion of postcolonial issues like ambivalence, racism, Orientalism, nationalism, and hybridity. The third chapter analyses the text with the prescribed theoretical framework and insight. The final chapter is the conclusive idea which is the learning outcome of the study.

In the main, theoretical boundary of the research has been drawn with Bhabha's notion of ambivalence and hybridity, ideas about Orientalism, views on

racism, nationalist opinions against the postcolonial backdrop. Bhabha opines that the colonial relation is always in fluctuation as they never oppose each other completely. He challenges the Said's colonial authority with an argument that colonial representation decenters the authority as soon as the colonizers are hybridized. However, Ashcroft, Gareth, Tiffin argue on this proposition of Bhabha's "decentering authority" as the proposition sees the seed of destruction inherent in the colonial discourse which is a far-fetched idea. If it were true, there would be no more blood bath and bullet demanded by nationalist movement in every colonized country.

Edward Said talks about how the Orient is orientalized by the Orientalist. He claims that the West knows about the East only through the stereotypes created through Orientalist representation in their text. The West always represents the East as irrational, exotic, gullible, lethargic, and primitive and so on. He further claims that Orientalist ideology is instrumental and hence it is always successful in its aim of domination of the Orient which was questioned by the idea by Bhabha.

The discussion of nationalism begins with the historical demand of it by the colonized countries after the World War II to address the problems of the colonies. Benedict Anderson's idea of imagined community with deep, horizontal, comradeship has developed the discussion further. His idea is soon challenged by the idea of divided loyalty of the African people who were forced to migrate to different European Countries during slavery. This problem of nationality was addressed by the Negritude movement which, Aime Cesaire and Leopold Snghor designate, is a celebration of 'blackness'. But it lost its popularity as it accepted and reversed many of the binaries rather than challenging them. Frantz Fanon criticizes the idea of 'pan-national' because the historical circumstances, he thought, of African people in different parts of the globe couldnot be so readily unified. Instead Fanon urged the

intellectuals and writers to forge the national consciousness based upon national culture in their work as part of the struggle for independence.

Etienne Balibar awares people of the implicit racist idea in nationalism and divides this racism into two kinds; external and internal racism. Balibar posits that nationalism always has reciprocal relation with racism. External racism is a kind of xenophobia and the internal one is directed at those who donot belong to the imagined community.

By the same token, Ranjit Guha also criticizes Indian nationalist movement for excluding the Indian subaltern and insists that elite consciousness dominated the subaltern consciousness in nationalist representation of Indian literature. In the like manner, C.L. Innes unfolds the problematic aspect of ‘patriarchal structure’ of the nationalism. She views that nation is often identified with the mother figure in nationalist literature. The mother (nation) has to depend upon her sons (natives) for her freedom from the domination. Thus she points out the nationalist representation to be inclined towards the form of male chauvinism.

The interpretation gets conclusion in Robert Young’s suggestion of more ‘english’ than English. So far, this has been left as only strategy to interrogate European colonialist discourse and investigate the means by which Europe imposed and maintained its codes in its colonial discourse. Alternatively, Bhabha’s notion of ‘how-aspect’ rather than ‘what aspect’ is equally relevant in this regard. He suggests that the nationalist writers should always focus on the ‘how-aspect’ of the literature rather than ‘what-aspect’. Despite various contradictions, nationalist movement is undeniably necessary to rid the colonized countries of tyrannical domination.

Chapter II. Ambivalence: Origin, Debate, and Context

This chapter offers the underlying theoretical framework of the entire study. The insight with which the study examines the text is basically based on the notion of the ambivalence as developed and debated in post-colonial theory. The paper contends that Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*, a story of the crumbling British Raj in India explores the relationship between the Indians as colonized and the British as colonizer. The novel has brought two different civilizations in contact which provides an opportunity for the cross-cultural study, that is, English and Indian in terms of their attitude towards each other. When British and Indian blocs came in contact with the taking over of the jewel India by the British crown after the failure of The East India Company in 1857, both the British and Indian exhibited their racist attitude towards each other. Both saw each other as a racial and cultural contestant. Both civilizations did leave a remarkable impact on each other's culture.

Not only would the British have a profound effect on India's history, but the 'crown jewel of the British Empire' would also affect Western Civilization. This is reflected in such English words as 'bungalow', 'verandah', 'punch', 'dungarees', and 'pajamas', such customs as smoking 'cigars', playing 'polo', and taking 'showers', as well as more profound influences in the realms of religion and philosophy. The English racial contempt for the Indian was overt since they were powerful and therefore they were obliged to conceal their racist attitude. But the Indians' racial contempt was very covert since they were comparatively weak and forced to conceal their racial attitude. The British racial practice was evident in unfair treatment of Indians through Anglo-centric administration, economic exploitation and colonial government of India. A wide gap between the higher ranking British and lower ranking Indians existed in colonial administrative service.

The development and exploitation of India began together after the British Queen Victoria declared herself the Empress and took a direct control over India in 1858. British rule, on the one hand, had developed the infrastructures of India with railroads, telegraphs, schools, colleges and universities; yet it, on the other hand, disrupted the traditional culture and economy relegating Indians to the lower status. Despite the intelligence and efficiency, Indians were never allowed to hold the dignified posts in administrative services. Likewise, Indians who used to go overseas, and stay for some time there, they were supposed to be unclean by traditional Hindu standard for crossing the black water. And, to purify them, they were persuaded to consume the five products of cow which include cow's dung, urine, milk, curd, and ghee. The Indians were contemptuous of beef eating tradition of the white. Indians have deep respect and reverence in the cow in the body of which, by Hindu religion, resides the Goddess Laxmi. But this kind of hatred of Indians to Europeans was not explicitly expressed because they were dominated by the English. They saw Europeans with the racist spectacle. However, they could not express violently upon the English.

Furthermore, *Orientalism*(1978), the most influential work of Edward Said also provides critical perspective and insight to examine the Anglo-Indian relation during the British Raj. The English, Edward Said posits, have stereotyped image of the East and always perceive them with the same image. The West has developed a discourse which is like a corporate institution to deal with the orient. Paul Scott has represented the Indian characters as aberrant, supine, exotic and ripe for the possession. This English scholar's version has been the canonical and so the Europe knows the East only in the texts. The West thinks that the East cannot represent itself, it must be represented. A clash between the Indian and the English civilization existed

with the beginning of the colonial enterprise of England in India in 1858. The Orientals are portrayed as “gullible, devoid of energy, and inactive” in the European texts (Said 38). More clearly, the representations of the Indian characters are “lethargic, suspicious, householder and everything that oppose the clarity, directness and nobility of the Anglo-Saxon race” (Said 39). Said holds that though virulent concept of Orientalism had started since Greko-roman time, it came as a form of academic discipline at the end of eighteenth century. He dates back the beginning of the Orientalist practices to very distant historical time:

Taking the late eighteenth century as a very roughly defined starting point Orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient—dealing with it by making statements ..., settling it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (Said 2)

Orientalism is not only an imaginative fantasy of the West but also a wily body of theory and practice to inculcate myths of orient in their future generation who would consider Orientalism as a touchstone to understand the East. Orientalism brings light into geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philosophical text. It is blatant undermining of the West over the East. Colonial period was the great invasion of the Orient by Europe but it later shifted to America.

After the colonial rule began in India, the Indian and the British culture came into interaction creating a profound impact on each other. Naturally, the British and the Indians both tried to appropriate each other’s language, culture and value system up to the extent of their requirement. In the mean time, they couldnot help resisting

the alien culture and life style out of racism. The Indians intended to appropriate English language due to its administrative and economic value in British India. By the same token, the British were culturally obliged to appropriate some Indian expressions and language to fulfill their day to day purpose and to perpetuate the colonial administration. They needed to maintain the communication with the local princes (*nabobs*) and landlords to collect the revenue and tax. The Missionary teachers came to teach the Indian children and hence they were forced to receive Indian words and expressions to interact with the Indian children. Consequently, they were torn between the two cultures, nationalities, and belief systems. They subconsciously developed a culture in-between Indianness and Englishness. Gradually with the development of their social and cultural practice within colonial affair, they underwent a split in their personality developing a love-hate relationship between each other.

This ambivalent situation gave rise to two different issues; nationalism and hybridity. Nationalism here is indigenization and hybridity is an adoption of some of the good and useful things from the West with the preservation of the uniqueness of the indigenous culture. The national uprising arose in two forms; pure nationalism seeking cultural purity and uprising with adoption of the useful western culture. In the context of Indian history, Subhas Chandra Bose represents the leader of pure Indian nationalism who broke with the Gandhian commitment of civil disobedience based on the principle of non-cooperation and non-violence and formed a forward bloc, a pressure group within the congress for immediate action against the Raj. He stood as the fundamentalist who believed that the British would never leave India peacefully. He fled India to collaborate with a foreign power hostile to the British. He, towards the end of his life, formed Indian National Army in Japan, attacked British rule but he

had to escape when the force surrendered to the British. However, India won its independence two years after the assumed death of Bose in 1945. On the other hand, Gandhian bloc was of the premise that Indian uprising should exploit even English culture and education. He made an amalgamated strategy to drive out the British from India and end the colonial rule. Gandhi led Indian National Congress practiced the strategy of negotiation leading to newness.

Difference: Criss-crossing the Personal and the National

In the first volume of the Raj quartet, the issues of racism and the racial theory are so intricately interwoven with the equally prominent issues of Orientalism, nationalism, and hybridity that it, for researchers, prepares enough background for postcolonial debate to discuss about the emerging issue of ambivalence. Close inspection of the text presents several intersections and overlapping of the interest of the author deciphered from the autobiographical reading and the national interests in the text.

Scott as the author, in the main, is found to be identified with the Black and resentful of the colonial ideology. However, he subconsciously maintains his Anglo-Saxon failing of his self-denial. His vision of India is ambivalent. He loved Indians but honored and valued the works British did there too. His racial tendency at the subconscious level of his mind and his love for India make him stand in-between two nationalities. His divided loyalty emerges from his fluctuating relationship with India and England. 'Race,' a term for the classification of human beings into physically, biologically and genetically distinct groups, is particularly relevant to the rise of the colonialism because the division of human society in this way is inextricable from the need of colonialist powers to establish dominance over subject peoples and hence justify the imperial enterprise. The notion of race assumes, firstly, that humanity is

divided into unchanging natural types, recognizable by physical features that are transmitted 'through the blood' and permit distinctions to be made between 'pure' and 'mixed' races. However 'racism' is not so much a product of the concept of race as the very reason for its existence.

But with the rise of European imperialism and the growth of Orientalism in the nineteenth century, the need to establish such distinction between superior and inferior finds its most 'scientific' confirmation in the dubious analysis and taxonomy of racial characteristics. Orientalism, Edward Said's masterpiece, which, he defines, is a western style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the 'Orient' and (most of the time) the 'Occident' provides the insight to examine the text keeping in mind the author's way of representation of the Indian characters. The paper emphasizes on the latent Orientalist attitude of the author which has forced his loyalty 'in-between' two countries.

Race is particularly pertinent to the rise of colonialism, because the division of human society in this way is implicitly interwoven with the colonialist enterprises of the domination over the weak countries. Race thinking and colonialism are imbued with the same impetus to draw a binary distinction between 'civilized' and 'primitive' and the same necessity for the hierarchization of human types. By translating the fact of colonial oppression into a justifying theory, however spurious, European race thinking initiated a hierarchy of human variation that has been difficult to dislodge. Although race is not specifically an invention of imperialism, it quickly became one of imperialism's most supportive ideas, because the idea of superiority that generated the emergence of race as a concept adapted easily to both impulses of the imperial mission; domination and enlightenment. Racism can be defined as: a way of thinking that considers a group's unchangeable physical characteristics to be linked in a direct,

causal way to psychological or intellectual characteristics, and which on this basis distinguishes between two racial groups - 'superior' and 'inferior'. Physical differences did not always represent an inferiority of culture or even a radical difference in shared human characteristics. The concept of racial improvement concurred with the 'civilizing mission' of imperial ideology, which encouraged colonial powers to take up the 'white man's burden' and raise up the condition of the inferior races who were idealized as childlike and malleable. The assumption of superiority thus supported by scientific racial theory could pursue its project of world domination with impunity. Chinua Achebe claims that colonialists always seek out the ways to demean and relegate the colonized to the inferior position. He brings into light their tactic of their claim of the knowledge of the natives which justify two things at a time; one the simplicity of the native and they are controllable another. He further writes:

Meanwhile a new situation was slowly developing as a handful of natives began to acquire European education and then to challenge Europe's presence...with the intellectual weapons of Europe itself. To deal with this phenomenal presumption the colonialist devised two contradictory arguments. He created the "man of the two world" theory to prove that no matter how much the native was exposed to European influences he could never truly absorb them; like Prester John ...and reveal his true face. (1192)

The above statements by Chinua Achebe, a Nigerian racial critic clarify the fact of inability of the native to absorb the colonizer's culture no matter how they are exposed to the European influences. He also unfolds the fact that indicates towards the gap between two cultures of the native and the colonizer and hence the

ambivalence. The 'man of the two world' theory created by the West asserts the fact that appropriation of the foreign culture by the native is never complete. It means this incompleteness gives rise to the ambivalent attitude towards the foreign rule. In the early decades of the twentieth century, 'race' continued to acquire a legitimacy through the 'scientific' study of racial variation, but the horror of the Second World War and the slaughter of millions of Jews, Slavs, Poles and gypsies on racial grounds led to the 1951 Unesco *Statement of the Nature of Race and Racial Difference* which pointed out that race, even from a strict biological standpoint, could at most refer to a group with certain distinctive genetic concentrations. The statement asserts that mental characteristics should never be included in such classifications and that environment is far more important than inherited genetic factors in shaping behavior.

The Orientalist representation of the orient and the Orientals in the western literature has tacit purpose to colonize the mind of the natives so as to persuade them to internalize the foreign culture and ideology. John McLeod, in this regard, designates:

Colonialism is perpetuated in part by justifying to those in the colonizing nation the idea that it is right and proper to rule over other peoples, and by getting colonized people to accept their lower ranking in the colonial order of things – a process we can call 'colonizing the mind'. It operates by persuading people to internalize its logic ... and represent the world. (18)

Therefore John McLeod maintains that decolonization of the native land doesnot require only the handing back of the land to the dispossessed natives and returning the power to those who once ruled by the empire. To overturn the colonialism is the process of the changing the dominant ways of seeing the world and representing the

reality which does not replicate the values of the colonialist. The natives' mind needs change and resist the colonizer's value system. They should resist the dominant language, culture and entire value system of the colonizers that have divided into master and slave, ruler and ruled and colonized and colonizer for lasting and progressive change is to be achieved. Denis Porter argues that the Orientalist texts also show the fluctuating relationship between the east and the west:

In "*Orientalism* and its problems", Dennis Porter argues that even the most seemingly Orientalist text can include within itself moments when Orientalist assumptions come up against alternative views that throw their authority into question. Texts rarely embody just one view. ... An example Porter gives is T.E. Lawrence's *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* (1922). (qtd in McLeod 51)

Bhabha also argues that the colonized subject, in colonial discourse, is always in motion, sliding ambivalently between polarities of similarity and difference. Bhabha thus points out the contradiction in Orientalist theory which conforms to the Porter's argument. He questions the Orientalist ideology which claims authority over the colonized. The Orientalist representation of the Orient, in itself, is contradictory:

Any attempt to subdue the radical otherness of the colonized is perpetually offset by the alarming fantasies that are projected onto them. This indicates how, in the discourse of colonialism, colonized subjects are split between contrary positions. They are domesticated, harmless, knowable; but also at the same time wild, harmful, mysterious. (qtd in McLeod 54)

Bhabha emphasizes that the colonized subject can never stand still; he or she is always in motion. Because of this slippery motion, stereotypes are deployed as a

means to arrest the ambivalence of the colonized subject by describing him or her in static terms. Thus the colonial relation gets problematized due to this fluctuating representation in the Orientalist text. The space for ambivalence is created out the double standard of the Orientalist representation.

Racism and Orientalism both hold significant position in postcolonial debate. Even after the formal independence of the nation, the racial and Orientalist practices persist. Race is pertinent to the rise of colonialism because the racial discrimination has intricate relation with the colonialist need to claim the authority over subject peoples and validate their imperial mission. The concept of racial improvement concurred with the 'civilizing mission' of imperial ideology, which encouraged colonial powers to take up the 'white man's burden' and raise up the condition of the inferior races who were idealized as childlike and malleable. Racial theory and Orientalist theory both include the contrariness and slipperiness between two polarities wherefrom emerges the ambivalent attitude.

Ambivalence in Postcolonial Debate

Ambivalence is one of the significant features of the postcolonial text and one of the prominent issues of the postcolonial theory. It is one of the most debatable issues in postcolonial scholarship. It is a term first developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite. The colonial relation is always ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer. Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Homi K. Bhabha, it describes the mixed thought of attraction and repulsion that relates colonizer with colonized. Alternatively, it also refers to a simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action.

Rather than assuming that some colonized subjects are complicit and some resistant, ambivalence suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating relation within the colonial subject. Ambivalence also characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject, for it may be both exploitative and nurturing, or represent itself as nurturing, at the same time. Ambivalence, writes Bhabha in *Nation and Narration* (1990), “haunts the idea of the nation and the language of those who write of it and the lives of those who live it” (1). The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values, that is, ‘mimic’ the colonizer. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never very far from mockery. Ambivalence describes this fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery of the colonizer’s culture and language. It is fundamentally unsettling to colonial dominance. In this respect, it does not disempower the colonial subject. But this is not a simple reversal of a binary, for Bhabha *The Location of Culture* (1994) shows that both colonizing and colonized subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse:

It is from this area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming, civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double that my instances of colonial imitation come. What all they share is a discursive process by which the access of slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry (almost the same but not quite) does not merely rapture the discourse, but... which fixes the colonial subject as a ‘partial’ presence. (86)

The effect of this ambivalence, Bhabha suggests, is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse. For instance, Bhabha, in *Location of Culture*

(1994) gives the example of Charles Grant, who, in 1792, desired to inculcate the Christian religion in Indians, but worried that this might make them “turbulent for liberty” (87). Grant’s solution was to mix Christian doctrines with divisive caste practices to produce a ‘partial reform’ that would induce an empty imitation of English manners. He sheds light on the implicit problem in the colonialist literary model stereotyping the Orient as irrational, exotic, and primitive. The problematic area of the colonial discourse came into light for the first time with Bhabha’s theory of ambivalence. Bhabha exploited a psychoanalytical term, ‘ambivalence’ in order to analyze the colonial relation. His *The Location of culture* refutes the colonialist claim of their authority over the colonized:

The *menace* of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority. And it is a vision that is a result of what I’ve described as the partial representation/recognition of the colonial object. (88)

Discovering the generalizing aspect of Said’s argument, he quickly criticized that Said assumed too readily that an unequivocal intention on the part of the West was always realized through its discursive productions. Bhabha focused on Said’s claim that Orientalist knowledge was instrumental and always worked successfully when put into practice. Here, Bhabha has taken a departure from the Said’s notion of Orientalism which asserts the everlasting emergence of the colonial stereotypes that represent the colonized people in various derogatory ways. Bhabha clarifies it is because the colonial discourse does not function according to the plan, it’s pulling in two contrary directions. John McLeod also cites Bhabha who claims that colonial discourse can never fulfill its aim “to construct the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin” (52). He has discovered the

psychological aspect of Said's analysis of Colonial discourse. He has added the psychoanalytic concept to Said's Foucauldian analysis. Bhabha points out the possibility of Orientalism working two conflicting levels; manifest orientalism and latent orientalism. Bhabha emphasizes the extent to which the two levels fused and were, in operation, inseparable. He has claimed the colonial discourse of any kind operated not only as an instrumental construction of knowledge but also according to "the ambivalent protocols of fantasy and desire" (qtd in Young 153).

Robert Young, in his famous *Colonial Desire* (1995), aligns his argument with the Bhabha's while refuting the Said's claim of instrumental successfulness of the Orientalist knowledge. He agrees to the Bhabha's notion that the colonial discourse in its attempt to produce 'mimic' men produces the ambivalent subject.

He has exhibited through a series of analyses the ways in which European colonial discourse ... is effectively decentered from its position of power and authority. ... Bhabha shows that ... very often through the exploitation by the colonized themselves of its evident equivocations and contradictions that are all too apparent in the more hostile and challenging criteria of surroundings. (Young 152-153)

Most importantly, ambivalence therefore gives rise to a controversial proposition in Bhabha's theory which suggests that, since the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. Bhabha posits that this demonstrates the conflict within imperialism itself that will inevitably cause its own downfall: it is compelled to create an ambivalent situation that will disrupt its assumption of monolithic power. It is controversial that imperialist representation causes its destruction because the natives have to revolt against the colonizer to get their land back. The national independence has, colonial history witnesses, not been

possible without bullet and bloodshed. Every independence war in the colonized countries has demanded the sufficient blood and sacrifice of the natives to free their nation from the colonialism. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin probelematize the Bhabha's argument of imperialist discourse which decenters the authority:

This is controversial because it implies that the colonial relationship is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonized. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replicas of the colonizers – this would be too threatening. (12-14)

Moreover, Ashish Nandy asserts that ambivalence is not always associated with the diasporic phenomenon. Unlike Bhabha, he claims that liminality can develop in the ideology of the natives as well. He points out that hybrid mode of Gandhian philosophy is the secret of his popularity. 'Hindutva' as an ideology can be taken to be flexible and hybrid in its construction. Mahatma Gandhi, comment Nandy, not only achieved the active and vigorous support of the Indian Hindu elite but also of the vast majority of the Indian peasantry. Gandhian political style owes to various religious ideas particularly from Christianity, Buddhism and more strategically from Islam. Nandy emphasizes on Gandhian argument that his ideas never formed any system. His way of thinking was always anti-systematic which was based on the concept of cultural hybridity. His acceptance and denouncement of western modernity bears the witness to his cultural eclecticism. The liminality, views Ashis Nandi, "is not only the state of being of the diasporic postcolonial migrant but also amounts to be the authentic state of Indianness" (qtd in Young 346).

Yet, the Bhabha's essay, claims John McLeod, remains problematic. First, it is not entirely clear where the agency for counter-narrative of the nation exists. Does the agency for resistance derive from the acts of representation by those from the nation's margins, or is it found mystically within nationalism itself? Second, his essay includes the tendency to universalize his model of the ambivalence of nationalist representations despite the fact that he claims to be making "no general theory" (McLeod 120).

To conclude, the notion of ambivalence in postcolonial debate is one of the crucial issues because it is very natural feature of the colonial relationship.

Ambivalence is problematic of both the colonialist and nationalist representations.

Both the colonizer and the colonized are unable to oppose completely each other. The issue of ambivalence has problematized the nationalist discourses since it represents the nation in its more illiberal guises resulting into the frustration of the nationalist aim due to the necessity of the 'performative' which renders the nation ambivalent.

This argument is of immense value to pursue for the marginalized the nation.

Bhabha's assertion of impossibility of single nationalist narrative to capture the entire nation and its people has been addressed by McLeod with the view that English as a national language is never free from the problems in all once-colonized countries.

Postcolonial literary texts in English cannot offer the representation or typical

illustrations of the nation as a whole. The concept of ambivalence in Postcolonial studies, though problematic, has many questions unanswered which will invite the new ideas in its further response.

Hybridity and Nationalism: Responses to Ambivalence

The term, 'hybrid' is the offspring of human parents of different races and alternatively defined as 'a mongrel or mule; an animal or plant, produced from the

mixture of two species'. Its first recorded use to denote the crossing of peoples of different races dates back to 1861. However, Robert Young in his *Colonial Desire* (1994) mentions up Prichard as the person who had already used the term 'hybrid' in the context of the question of human fertility in 1813. It is the most contested term that is widely discussed in the postcolonial debate to refer to the transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization. It is the state of cross-cultural exchange between two different racial and cultural communities.

After the colonial expansion of Britain and many other European countries like France, Germany in Renaissance period, many Asian and African countries experienced the colonial rule which made them intermix with the language and culture of the colonizer. As a result, the natives, by volition or forcefully, internalize the foreign cultural values and political ideology and hence hybridity. Therefore hybridity has various forms; linguistic, cultural, political, and racial. Most recently, the term has got the association with the work of Homi K. Bhabha who contends that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls 'Third Space of Enunciation' which has postcolonial origin. The use of the term in postcolonial writing has earned a wide criticism as it negates the imbalance and power relation it references. Robert Young views that the criticism of the Bhabha's notion stems from the perception that theories that stress mutuality necessarily downplay oppositionality and increase continuing post-colonial dependence.

After the Second World War, the colonized countries felt the necessity of the national uprising to abolish the brutal colonialism which fails to address the problems of the colonies worldwide. Nation became one of the most important models of social and political organization in the modern world. Benedict Anderson defines nation in his influential book, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of*

Nationalism as “an imagined community” (qtd in McLeod 68). He maintains that individuals in the nation share “deep, horizontal comradeship” (qtd in McLeod 69). So central to the ideas of the nation are collectivity and belonging, a mutual sense of community a group of individuals share. These feelings of community are the emotive foundation for the organization, administration and membership of the nation-state. It is pointed out that a sense of mutual, national belonging is manufactured by the performance of various narratives, rituals and symbols which stimulate an individual’s sense of being a member of a selected group.

Since 1950’s till the date, various theories have been developed to address the problems of the colonized people. A number of scholars have made remarkable contribution to the Postcolonial theories to seek the academic literary model to decolonize the native and their mind in true sense. Nation and Nationalism both are the terms which developed as an alternative to the empire and imperialism. These words mark the breakup of the imperial history. In antiquity, the words like empire, kingdom and confederation existed. Nationalism is, basically a movement which arose as a product of the World War II after the colonial rule failed to address the socio-political problems of the natives in colonized societies. The end of the World War II brought the demand for national political independence in order to solve the problem of the colonies. However, this movement was soon found to be unrealistic and deficient to address the problem of the colonies when it resulted into the disintegration of the nation after formal independence.

In the discussion of the hybridity from the past, various positions prevail that are taken up. First is the “Polygenist species argument” which is a denial that any product of the people of different races is infertile (Young 16). Even they intermingle physically; they retain their own racial differences. Second is the “amalgamation

thesis” which is a claim that all humans can interbreed prolifically and in an unlimited way (Young 17). And this mixing of people generates a new race. Third is the “decomposition thesis” that which is an admission that some amalgamations between two people resulting into mixed breed either die out quickly or revert to one or another of the permanent parent types (Young 17). Fourth, sequence of the third argument, is the argument that hybridity varies between proximity and distant species: unions between allied races are fertile, those between distant either are infertile or tend to degeneration. This claim remained the dominant view from the 1850s to the 1930s. Fifth is the negative version of the amalgamation thesis which is an idea that miscegenation produces a mongrel group that makes up a ‘raceless chaos’, degenerate, degraded, threatening to subvert the vigor and virtue of the pure races with which they come into contact.

Mikhail Bakhtin adapted the concept of hybridity in his linguistic theory and defined the hybridization as “a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor” (Qtd in Young 16). He further clarifies the hybrid construction of the language in any contact zone produced by colonization:

What we are calling a hybrid construction is an utterance that belongs, by its grammatical [syntactic] and compositional markers, to a single speaker, but that actually contains mixed ...systems. We repeat there is no formal-compositional and syntactic boundary between these utterances, styles, languages, belief systems; the division of voices and languages takes place within the limits of a single syntactic whole, often within the limits of a single sentence. (qtd in Young 19)

Bakhtin takes hybrid utterances as the utterance mixed within two utterances and two speech manners, two styles and two languages. He clarifies that in hybridized language sometimes a single word may belong to two different languages at a time. Thus two linguistic belief systems intersect each other resulting into two accents of language. His assertion of two contradictory meanings in a single word reinforces the Bhabha's idea that the colonial relation is in continuous fluctuation.

According to Robert Young, Bakhtin articulates the Bhabha's notion of the potentiality of the hybridity to reverse the structures of domination in the colonial situation. For Bhabha, cites Young, hybrid situation is problematic of the colonial representation. This hybridity causes the reversal of colonial structure. Bhabha has taken the concept of 'intentional hybrid' and has suggested for using this in an active moment of challenge and resistance of colonial rule.

Bhabha defines hybridity as 'a problematic of colonial representation...that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other "denied" knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority'. The hybridity of colonial discourse thus reverses the structures of domination in the colonial situation. (qtd in Young 21-22)

Young further points out that "Bakhtin's hybridity is politicized, made contestory, so that it embraces the subversion and challenge of division and separation" (Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 119-121). Young takes a departure from the indiscriminate use of the term 'hybridity' as conceived by Bhabha and Bakhtin. He suggests for the deconstruction of the essentialist notions of the race in connection with hybridity:

Young does, however, warn of the unconscious process of repetition involved in the contemporary use of the term. According to him, when

talking about hybridity, contemporary cultural discourse cannot escape the connection with the racial categories of the past in which hybridity had such a clear racial meaning. Therefore 'deconstructing such essentialist notions of race today we may rather be repeating... (qtd in Aschroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 119-121)

In calling for national liberation from colonialism, much anti-colonial nationalists were working with the map of the world drawn by the colonizers. This proved a potential source of problems in the post-independence period. One of the most important results of Empire was the movement of peoples across the globe. This movement during slavery problematized their loyalty. Which nation do they belong to? Which country was truly theirs?

To respond to the problems of nationality, two theories basically emerged in postcolonial scholarship; Negritude and Frantz Fanon's notion of national consciousness. Negritude is, most often associated with the works of two theorists Aime Cesaire and Leopold Senghor. Negritude celebrates the 'blackness' which is a colonial stereotype created for colonial domination. According to Cesaire and Singhor, it is a project to return a sense of dignity and value to back peoples and their cultures:

Negritude is the awareness, defense and development of African cultural values. Negritude is a myth, I agree. And I agree that there are false myths, myths which breed division and hatred. Negritude as a true myth is the opposite of these. It is the awareness by a particular social group of people of its own situation in the world, and the expression of it by means of the concrete image. (qtd in McLeod 78)

Although Negritude provides an inspiring ideal to forge unity among oppressed peoples, and offered a different way of conceiving of African history and culture which refuses colonial representations, it has lost popularity as it has accepted many of the binaries of colonial discourse, reversing rather than challenging them. As Negritude could not enable the black people to celebrate a mythic past which was free of ill of the present, Frantz Fanon, highly influenced by Marxist writing and sympathetic to the project of Negritude, rejects the notions of 'native intellectuals' and 'pan-national'. It is because the historical circumstances of African peoples in different parts of the globe cannot be so readily unified. He asserts that the 'native intellectuals' are often educated under the auspices of the colonizing power. Therefore they are in danger of identifying more with the middle-class bourgeoisie of the colonizing nation rather than with the indigenous masses:

Negro-ism therefore finds its first limitation in the phenomena which take account of the formation of the historical character of men. Negro and African-Negro culture broke up into different entities because the men who wished to incarnate these cultures realized that every culture is first and foremost national, and that the problems which kept ... (qtd in McLeod 85)

Fanon therefore stresses the urgent responsibility of writers and intellectuals to forge national consciousness based upon national culture in their work as part of the struggle for independence. Crucial to his understanding of national culture, then, is his rendering of culture as dynamic and responsive to historical circumstances. There can be no return to idealized notion of culture, as in Negritude, not do the nation's masses take their cue from Western-educated native intellectuals. Native intellectuals must be attuned to the day-to-day struggle of the indigenous people in order to forge the

national consciousness. He suggests that the national culture is created through three phases. In the first, the native intellectuals attempt to copy the dominant trends in the literature of the colonizing power. In the second phase is, Fanon calls, 'just-before-the-battle' when the native intellectuals turn backwards and champion all indigenous things by reflecting upon the past of the people. Third phase is 'fighting phase' when the writers and intellectuals involve directly in the struggle against colonial rule with the native peoples.

By contrast, Bhabha's views reveal nationalist representations as highly unstable and fragile constructions which cannot ever produce the unity. They become split by similar kinds of ambivalence to those that threaten the coherence of colonial discourses. In making this argument, Bhabha might make us think about the worrying similarities between colonial discourses and nationalist representations. Nationalist discourses aim to create a homogeneous community out of difference, to convert the 'many' into 'one'. In so doing, Bhabha argues, nationalist discourses enshrine two contradictory modes of representation. He calls those two representations as 'pedagogic' and 'performative'. Deriving idea from Bhabha, McLeod, the postcolonial theorist in his claims "if nationalism is derived from the West, then attempts to construct a unifying myth of the nation can exacerbate existing conflicts between different 'races' and 'ethnicities' in some once-colonized nations"(McLeod 112). He cites another scholar, Partha Chatterjee, who, in his influential book *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World*, explains about the Western provenance of the concept Nationalism:

The origin of the nation in the West has much to do with the pursuit of a set of human ideals often identified as the European 'Enlightenment'.

From this perspective, Western forms of nationalism are part of the

same historical process which saw the rise of industrialism and democracy' and 'nationalism represents the attempt to actualize in political terms the universal urge for liberty and progress'. (qtd in McLeod 104-105)

Partha Chatterjee in above statement points out that a conflict lies right at the heart of nationalism which he calls the "liberal dilemma". It promises liberty and universal suffrage, but is complicit in undemocratic forms of government and domination. Western concept of the nation, on the one hand, firmly commits to a project of modernization with hope of progress and civilization and becomes all quickly a way of legitimating colonial expansion in moral terms. He problematizes the nationalist discourses when he brings into light its beautiful façade camouflaging the ugly interior lined with the imperialist domination. Chatterjee argues that they couldnot avoid also perpetuating nationalism's 'illiberal' and colonial aspects too:

Nationalism sought to demonstrate the falsity of the colonial claim that the backward peoples were...modern world. Nationalism denied the alleged inferiority of the colonized; it also challenged the colonial claim to political domination. It also affirms that colonized... testimonial. However it accepted the very intellectual premises of 'modernity' on which the colonial ideology was based. (qtd in McLeod 105)

Not only that, he accused the concept of modern nation when he writes in his influential essay "Nationalism as a Problem" that "Historically, the political community of the nation superseded the preceding 'cultural systems' of religious community and dynastic realm"(qtd in Ashcroft, Griffiths, Tiffin 164).

Moreover, Rosemary Marangoly George also highlights 'illiberal aims' of nationalism in her book *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction* with a thoughtful remark that "ways of manufacturing national unity are based upon ideas of racial, ethnic or religious exclusivity"(qtd in McLeod 110-112). This racist criterion has privileged some with the trapping of power, others have found themselves restricted from positions of authority and condemned as second-class citizens. Furthermore, in the context of nationalism, race and ethnicity have been used to further certain illiberal aims.

Etienne Balibar explores the ways in which nationalism can become complicit with racism by privileging one racialized group above another as the nations' most legitimate or 'true' people. The perception of 'race' can function as a primary strategy in constructing myths of national unity and in deciding who may or may not belong to the rightful people. As part of his argument Balibar makes a useful distinction between external and internal racism. 'External racism' is sort of xenophobia and 'Internal racism' is directed at those who live within the nation but are not deemed to belong to the imagined community of the national people due to their perceived race. Balibar posits that nationalism always has a reciprocal relation with racism where one is found, the other is also nearby, not far away when he points out:

Racism always tends to operate in an inverted fashion ...the racial cultural identity of 'true nationals' remains invisible, but it can be inferred (and in ensured) a *contrario* by the alleged, quasi-hallucinatory visibility of 'false nationals': the Jews, 'wogs', immigrants, 'Pakis', natives, Blacks. (qtd in McLeod 112)

He affirms the fact that the process of decolonization has reproduced, expanded and re-activated the illiberal racist tendencies. That is why it is claimed that decolonizing

peoples are in danger of perpetuating a concept which tends to support divisive processes of racialization. He discovered the underlying racist tendency of the nationalist representation inviting other scholars with the proper notion to address the failings of nationalism. Many critics have explored the ways in which the nationalist representation of India excludes the role of Indian subaltern. Ranajit Guha explains about Indian nationalist movement:

Representations of Indian nationalism are locked inside a certain way of thinking about nationalism that privileges consciousness over subaltern consciousness. Indian anti-colonial nationalism tends to place the subaltern classes as subject to the whims of the elite. (qtd in McLeod 108-109)

Last but not least, many critics have derived the metaphorical association between woman, mother and nation in nationalist discourses, as C.L. Innes suggests in her essay “Forging the Conscience of Their Race”: Nationalist Writers’. The nation has frequently been depicted iconically as female. Therefore Innes claims that “Nationalism is very frequently a gendered discourse; it traffics in representations of men and women which serve to reinforce patriarchal inequalities between them” (Innes 114). Several feminist critics have pointed out an inclination towards male chauvinism in many forms of nationalism. Nationalist representations reinforce images of the inert female who relies on active males to maintain her honor. Thus the nationalist representations have been in danger of perpetuating disempowering representations of women.

Nationalism, on the whole, has made significant contribution to challenge the colonial representation based on several binaries like colonizer versus colonized, rational versus irrational, civilized versus primitive despite its implicit racist,

patriarchal, and universalizing tendency along with the problem of ambivalence embedded in it. It has challenged the colonial ideology and representation in literature up to a large extent. Though unable to render the true independence to the natives, it has helped the natives of once-colonized countries to be free from the political and economic exploitation. Its major failing, the scholars have experienced so far is inability to restore the pre-colonial cultural identity and freedom because the colonial mindset does not evaporate on the very first day of the political independence. It takes time to restore the real independence of the nation through the establishment of the social-cultural identity and value system of the native which will be able to challenge the colonial interference in any subtle aspect of the nation.

To conclude the theoretical discussion, postcolonial literature received its name in abrogation of the colonial received English which speaks from the center dividing the world between colonizers and colonized, master and slave, ruler and ruled. These literatures are, instead of universal humanist representation, politically radical and locally situated. These literatures are actively involved in decolonizing the mind of the native people who generally misunderstand the formal independence of the country as true independence. It takes several years to restore the true independence of the country which is much helped by the postcolonial literatures. The new 'english' of colonized place is irredeemably different from the language of the colonial center because the postcolonial writers surpass its limits by breaking syntax and value system. Postcolonialism may well aim to oppose colonial representation and values, but whether it fulfills these aims remains a hotly debated issue in the field. So it is never free from the problems and shortcomings.

As Robert Young concludes his postcolonial discussion in "More english than English", the demand for an entirely new or wholly recovered precolonial 'reality'

cannot be fulfilled because “postcolonial culture is inevitably a hybridized phenomenon involving a dialectical relationship between the ‘grafted’ European cultural systems and an indigenous ontology, with its impulse to create or recreate an independent local identity” (Young 220). He opines that it is not possible to return to or rediscover an absolute pre-colonial purity, nor is it possible to create national or regional formations entirely independent of their historical implication in the European colonial enterprise. His suggestion of more ‘english’ than English seems to be only strategy to interrogate European discourse and its discursive strategies and to investigate the means by which Europe imposed and maintained its codes in its colonial domination of so much of the rest of the world. This remedial literary model to the problems in postcolonial theory and writing seems to win a wide range of adherence of the postcolonial writers who seek to challenge the colonial ideology and representation.

Bhabha also asserts in his essay that “there can never be any one, coherent, common narrative through which a nation and its people can be adequately capture” (Bhabha 120). He also proposes for the rereading and rewriting the literature focusing on the how-aspect rather than what-aspect of the literature.

The entire theoretical framework encompasses the ideas of different postcolonial theorists, critics and scholars with critical assessment. The discussion basically has been based upon Edward Said’s *Orientalism*, Chinua Achebe’s *Colonial Criticism*, Homi K. Bhabha’s *The Location of Culuture and Nation and Narration*, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin’s *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, John McLeod’s *Beginning Colonialism*, Robert Young’s *Colonial Desire*, Frantz Fanon’s “On National Culuture” and “The Pitfalls of National Consciousness” , Ranjit Guha’s “On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India” , Partha Chatterjee’s

Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World, and many other literary critics. The theoretical argument presented above is, in the main, an assessment of varying issues and concepts that developed and further criticized in the postcolonial debate. The discussion asserts that the ambivalence, hybridity, racism, colonial representation, Negritude, nationalist representation and national culture, subaltern consciousness etc. are the salient issues raised in postcolonial discussion which will invite many other issues and notions in the further development of the postcolonial theory. A number of literary models and theoretical concepts have been suggested by the above mentioned scholars which are both capable of resisting the colonial ideology and representation and incapable of eliminating them from the minds of the native. These models, on the one hand, helped the colonized countries achieve political independence and remained unsuccessful in decolonizing the native mind without which the true independence can never be established on the other. So ultimately the discussion of the postcolonial theory rests upon the negotiated reality. The natives are left to face the socio-cultural remains of the colonizers and be influenced with it. However, they can maintain the priority of their own culture over the foreign one. Thus the mixed cultural practices determine the natives' post-independence life.

Chapter III. Ambivalence in *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966)

The struggles with the identities and constraints imposed on the characters by their societies form the core of the novel, *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966). This conflict between 'ego' and 'self' of the characters is undercurrent of the novel. The novel, configured around this idea of psychological fluctuation of the characters between their consciousness and unconsciousness, embodies the central argument of the project. Scott's first volume of the Raj Quartet, which is set in British India of 1940s, is vivid portrayal of the love-hate relationship between the English and the Indian. Scott asserts that the British and the Indian could never become friends as long as India was under the British colonial rule. Scott's vision of India is also ambivalent. He loves India and Indians but also values and honors what British and their colonial government did there. This artistic detail of the complex love-hate relationship between the native and British Indians Scott presents in the novel has established him the writer out of the literary fashion of his time. He does not only offer two over-simplified versions of the British Raj, he rather presents the viewpoints, impressions and attitudes of the innumerable characters he creates so as to depict the subtle nuances of the British-Indian relationship.

Miss Crane's mixed feelings about the painting; *The Jewel in the Crown*, her confused psyche, and her hatred for Mahatma Gandhi whom she respected before are portents of her ambivalent attitude. Hari Kumar, the protagonist of the novel is torn between his upbringing and his new belonging by the indelible marks the Westernized education enforced by Duleep has left on him – a British sense of alienation from the country, an upper-class British accent, and a public-school-air of superiority. Duleep's raj-conditioned fallacy is shown in its devastating consequences in Indian surroundings, where Hari's perfect command of the language proves no gain, but a

factor which isolates him; the social situation determined by the colonizers fails to accommodate him. His father, Duleep's conception of the power as the magical combination of knowledge, manner, and race proves to be highly fatal for his son, Hari Kumar and himself. Daphne Manner who is a victim of British colonial rule leads a life oscillating between her inner desire for Hari and racial constraint of inter-racial affair. In particular, Hari Kumar and his father Duleep Kumar both who are in continuous fluctuation between Indianness and Englishness throughout the novel is reinforcement of Bhabha's notion that the colonial subjects are always in motion. Thus the colonial scenario pervasive throughout the novel consisting of the torn characters and fluctuating relationship between them is ambivalent.

This chapter provides the textual evidence in support of 'ambivalence' as a core idea of the novel in four sub-chapters; namely, Racial Discrimination, Torn Subjects: Ambivalence, Negotiating with the Past and the Present: Hybrid Subjects, and Desire of Independence: Nationalism. First sub-chapter offers the textual evidence of the racial values, culture, and practices in British India. Second is exploration of the torn subjects between two poles of ideas due to their divided psyche. Third presents the hybridity as a response to the ambivalent situation created by the British colonization. Final sub-chapter deals with the pure nationalism as a second response to ambivalence.

Racial Discrimination

The racial discrimination which is an integral part of Anglo-Indian relationship has reaches its apex in Bibighar case. Daphne Manners, the heroine of the novel is brutally and frequently raped by a group of unknown Indian hoodlums in the Bibighar garden. While in loving embrace with her lover Hari, she is assaulted by the unidentified ruffians because their love making was inter-racial. In British India,

the Indians were not allowed to be in love-affair with the white girls. It is against the racial code of the Indians. They watch the Indian making love to the white girl. Being aware of the possible punishment for Hari, if falsely implicated in the rape, she swears him to silence. She forces Hari to admit that they have not seen each other. Daphne's shrewd precautionary step against the future trial of Hari highlights the fact how pervasive racism was in India of that time, from which she strives to save him.

The racial practice was at the heart of the colonialism and the nationalism. The unknown gangster donot only attack on the girl, even on Hari. Whether the assailants were the English or Indian, whoever they were, they have attacked on them out of their inter-racial contempt. When they see them in love making posture on the mosaic platform of Bibighar garden, they find it against their social taboo grounded on racism. Daphne Manner herself admits her rape as the result of racism, "They assaulted me because they had watched an Indian making love to me. The taboo was broken for them" (470).

The English women in India resent Daphne Manners for carrying the womb of the Indians. At the Gulab Singh's pharmacy, they comment that they would do the public abortion outside the bloody temple of the Hindus and throw the filthy muck to the pi-dogs if they were pregnant like Daphne Manners. The European women call Daphne's child the 'filthy mock'. The women were contemptuous to the Hindu temple which expresses their deep hatred for the Indians. Racial attitude deep rooted in the British Indian society surfaces in the Bibighar affair and its transformation into cause célèbre.

Likewise, the fact that the British had discriminatory attitude towards the Indians was in sober realization of Duleep as a youth. He, while on the visit to the sub-division officers with his father, notices the snobbery of the English towards his

father. The English sub-division officer's young son insults Kumar's father by keeping him waiting on the verandah. Though English boy is immature chicken doing his first year in covenanted civil service, he could snub the mature and adult Indians. Indians of black skin were always relegated to the inferior position by the British:

There were many Kumars, but as a youth Duleep began to notice that no matter how much they were looked up to by people whose skin was the same color as their own, the callowest white-skinned boy doing his first year in the covenanted civil service could snub them by keeping them waiting on the verandah of the sacred little bungalow from whose punkah-cooled rooms was wafted an air of effortless superiority. (223)

It is this racism on the ground which the entire colonialist had ruled over India. They could validate their colonizing enterprise only with this racial degeneracy of Indians in their colonial discourse. This racism was the tool of the British to dominate the vast population of India. Native Indians were equally scornful of the British racial practices. When the young Kumar returns from England after failure pursuit of much desired carrier of lawyer, he is regarded as impure by the Hindu standards for he has crossed the black water. Hindus of Native India are very resentful of the British culture. As soon an Indian went to Europe, s/he was thought to be contaminated due to the European contact. Indians are equally contemptuous to the beef eating tradition of the White which is evident in Duleep's saying:

I returned as a half-man – unclean by traditional Hindu standards and custom because I had crossed the black water. But I had crossed for no obvious advantage. To purify myself I was persuaded to consume the five products of the cow. Which includes the cow's dung and urine. Although not, of course, its flesh. (240)

Duleep, in above statements, is reporting to his son, Hari Kumar what happened when he came back from England as a failure. He very clearly unfolds the racial attitude of the Indian towards the English. The Indian expressed their racist attitude in rather self-coercive way as they could not coerce the British.

It demands the political treatment of Indians by the British to assess their attitude to the Indians. For the first time, in the true sense of the word, the Indians had been reduced to the position of a subject people. Scott says, "... to site for the exams of the Indian Civil Service, which in those days was the only place where the examinations could be taken: a rule which effectively restricted the number of Indians able to compete" (228). During one hundred fifty years of British rule in India, no Indian had been appointed to the Governorship of any province. Indians were ineligible for commissions in the army; they couldnot be enrolled as volunteers. In order to qualify for the civil service of their own country, they have to travel six thousand miles to take the chance of succeeding once in a while. The sons of India who gained the rank of the officials, are only servants of the British. The Indians alone were forbidden to carry arms except by special permission of their masters. Another major incident of racial practice is seen in the case of Indian nationalist prisoners who are forced to eat beef into the jail. They are arrested under the so-called Defense Rules of India. The British government, with the help of this rule, prevents their mass gathering aimed at agitation and rioting. They are afraid of the possible civil disturbance that can be incited by the young nationalist leaders in the Indian streets of town and village.

Half an hour later some food was brought in. They were hungry and tired and frightened. They began to eat. After a few mouthfuls also they vomited. The 'mutton' in the curry was beef. The two Muslim

jailors who were standing watching them laughed and told them that now they were outcastes and even God had turned his face from them.

(Scott 398)

The forceful attempt by the English employed Muslim jailor to feed the Hindu prisoners is portent of the racial prejudice in the English and Muslim. The racial discrimination could be realized by the dominating English only exercising their power over the opponent race. The young Hindus in the prison during civil disturbance in 1942 are made feel their racial inferiority. The racist ideology is strategically intertwined with the colonial ideology to justify and validate the imperial rule over India.

Thus the racial contempt of the Indians to the English was of self-coercive because they were unable to coerce the English. When people cannot coerce others, they become self-coercive of themselves. The racial arrogance of the Englishmen and their rude behavior to the natives were no less galling to the Indians than the openly declared policy of British Imperialism to keep India in perpetual slavery.

Torn Subjects: Ambivalence

Ambivalence is a prominent theme of the novel *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966) where the characters are inescapably trapped in between two cultural poles; that is, Indian and British cultures. They are obliged to lead their lives in fluctuation. They can neither reject nor accept other's culture completely. Consequently, they find the way in partial acceptance and partial rejection and hence the ambivalence. The relationship between the British and the Indian was always dynamic in British India. They had formed the love-hate relationship between each other. The Indians contempt the British and their culture but wish to adopt the English language.

The protagonist of the novel, Hari Kumar is torn between his upbringing and his new belonging Westernized education rendered him. He belongs to English culturally and linguistically but not to India socially. He is horrified by Indian life, its stench, heat, corruption, violence and abject living conditions. His father persuades him to suppress his Indian heritage by anglicization of his name, that is, Hary Coomer. The English proficiency which had guaranteed his access to middle class-culture in England now excludes him from exactly the group in India he is allotted to. This split of his personality is prepared by his handling of his main proof of identity - his name. Hari's case is a strong example of the ambivalent dynamism which characterizes the colonial relation. He has inextricably combined English and Indian within him. He bitterly criticizes the English for their policy of 'Divide and Rule' as a political strategy to rule India:

But I wonder about the outcome. I think there's no doubt that in the last twenty years – whether intentionally or not- the English have succeeded in dividing and ruling, and the kind of conversation I hear at these social functions I attend – Guides recruitment, Jumble Sales, ...English now seem to depend upon the divisions in Indian Political opinion perpetuating their own rule at least...beyond it. (293)

Hari overtly condemns the political strategy, 'divide and rule' the British employed to rule over India. He is not oblivious of the fact that India has been inhumanly exploited by the British colonizers. They, in the guise of trader and missionary, sucked the blood of Indians and forced them to lead their life in misery, poverty, ignorance, and the colonial slavery. The perpetuation of the British Raj was dependent upon this policy of division among Indians. They preferred Muslims over Hindus because of more affinity between God and Allah than God and Brahma. Hari very minutely

analyses the political tactic through which the British gained success in perpetuating their colonial rule in India. He makes an irony of the British political struggle for *Magna Carta* when they were in arms against the feudal status quo in England. He satirizes the dualist policy of the British who were in arms once for their own sake, are against now in India.

By stark contrast, Hari laments for his English background in England. His nostalgia for his educational background at Chillingborough Public School contradicts with his opinion about English political tactic of 'divide and rule'. His nostalgic feeling of Chillingborough English surfaces when he sees the family condition of his aunt Shalini. All the family members in her family are ignorant about English and the future related to it. He wishes they would know English at least little so that they could help him get scholarship and grant for further study.

Aunt Shalini doesn't know any because she doesn't have any social life. This is a tight, closed, pseudo-orthodox Hindu society. I'm beginning to see just what it was that my father rebelled against. My five years at Chillingborough can't mean nothing, and there must be all kinds of scholarship and grants I could be put on to ... Romesh Chanda says I'll be useful to him in his business. (258)

The above statements are indicative of the fact that Hari Kumar doesnot like the Indian family structure. He even feels sorry for his Aunt Shalini for she does not have any social life. He hates the regressive family structure in India which is an obstacle to the progress of the socio-economic life of the family members. The indifference to English, he feels, is an ignorance of his family members. Hari sympathizes with Aunt Shalini for her deprivation of education and social exposure. She, Hari perceives, has a coercive life forced by the domestic tyranny from which his father Duleep had once

decided to free her. His uncle, Romesh Chanda Gupta Sen who is a business man, he criticizes, is unwilling to know about the prospect of English language and English background.

He thus possesses the fluctuating attitude towards the English culture. Indianness and Englishness are the two poles between which he is sliding after his return to India from England. This ambivalence has been a part of his personality. He cannot eschew this trap. What happens to Hari, on the wider level, is befalling all Indians. It has been fate of Indians.

By the same token, this uncertainty of the ambivalence was equally true of the English colonizers. They were not sure of their relationship with the Indians. They were in continuous motion which disabled them to stick to their own cultural pole. They tried to reject the alien cultural values but they soon found their resistance is hindered by their affinity towards the opposite culture. The colonizers, Bhabha argues, claim their authority over the colonized but soon de-centered by the colonial margin after the colonizers are hybridized. The English missionary teacher, Miss Edwina Crane is a profound example in this regard.

She was Superintendent of the District's Protestant Mission Schools. The Painting, *The Jewel in Her Crown* is a picture about which Miss Crane has very mixed feelings. She finds it useful when teaching the English language to a class of Muslim and Hindu children. The painting which shows the Old Queen surrounded by the representative figures of her Indian empire: princes, landowners, merchants, money-lenders, sepoys, farmers, servants, children, mothers, and remarkably clean and tidy beggars, is emphatic of the Englishness. The Queen is sitting on a golden throne, under a crimson canopy, attended by her temporal and spiritual aides: soldiers, statesmen, and clergy. The canopied throne is apparently in the open air because there

are palm trees and a sky showing a radiant sun bursting out of bulgy clouds such as, in India, heralds the wet monsoon. Above the clouds fly the prayerful figures of the angles who are the benevolent spectators of the scene below. Miss Crane replaces the portrait of Mahatma Gandhi with the painting depicting India as a British empire. She uses this as a teaching material to teach English to the Islamic and Hindu children.

She tells her students the sentences like ‘this is the Queen’, ‘the sky there is blue’, ‘there are clouds in the sky’, and ‘the uniform of the standing sahib is scarlet’ and helps the children internalize the English structure. She is valorizing the British colonial value with the help of its use as a means of teaching. She is inculcating the Indian children the English supremacy over Indian inferiority through the depiction of Queen Victoria resplendent on her throne with an Indian prince approaching the throne bearing a velvet cushion on which he offered a large sparkling gem. She very dutifully pays her homage to her Queen as she is a colonial agent in the guise of missionary school teacher.

On the other hand, her respect to the English Crown contrasts with her critical view of this painting. She criticizes the painting for not taking notice of: “poverty, disease, misery, ignorance and injustice” (24). The picture, she blames, is representative of the English indifference toward the pervasive poverty and misery of India. She, in a sense, accuses the colonizers of being biased and exploitative to the Indians. Her sympathy to the Indians shows her adoption of Englishness and Indianness within her. Her vision of India is ambivalent. She valorizes the British crown respected by the colonial representatives on the one hand and sympathizes with the Indians for being ignored and prejudiced by the British Crown on the other. She argues that the painting takes no account the miserable condition of India.

Not only that, she is tired of her divided personality which forces her to perform the ambivalent role. Miss Crane, a tired missionary teacher, turns hopeless and nervous when she has to face the real ordeal of her life – “After all, it’s me they want, she said. Not you. So that’s it. If this is where it ends for me, let it end” (63).

It was early spring. While driving from Kotali to Dibrapur during civil disturbance, she sees a rioter at a distance on the road. She has been accompanied by Mr Chaudhuri, a school teacher at Dibrapur. Mr Chaudhuri had dissuaded her from going during the trouble in the country. She, against his wish and with his reluctant advice, has set for Dibrapur. She could neither drive over the mob nor could she stay silence inside Ford to evade the mob. To their unluck, Mr Chaudhuri is dragged outside of Ford and beaten to death. Miss Crane is in fluctuating psyche and therefore she delays her decision and ultimately caught by the young rebels. She is attacked by five or six men; they hit her across the face and push her down three feet down embankment where she lies unconscious until she recovers her senses and strength to bemoan the death of Mr Chaudhuri.

Once she shares her view with a Clancy, a young British army that Indian independence is inevitable: “India must be independent. When the war’s over, we’ve got to give her up” (26). The Indian uprising, Crane believes, is irresistible. It cannot be dominated but she also fears such an uprising. Once she wakes up in the night and lies sleepless in fear and anxiety of the possible uprising which will probably sweep away the British colonizers. She is much disturbed with the ideas of civil disturbance that had spread all over India. Her anxious feeling reflects her latent desire of sabotaging the Indian movement. She is sub-consciously against the Indian independence:

Sometimes Miss Crane woke up in the night and lay sleepless, listening to the rain, and was alarmed, conscious of dangers that were growing and which people were preparing to face but not to understand, so that virtually they were not facing them at all. We only understand, she said, the way to meet them, or, sometimes, the way to avert them. (41)

The aforementioned statements are connotative of the fact that Miss Crane is very uncomfortable and disturbed with the outbreak of uprising. What may cause her to be such stressful? It could be her own subtle defiance of the national movement and hatred to the Indians at sub-conscious level. If not so, there is no more other reason. She must be defying the civil movement inwardly that invites nightmare. Her mentality in a sense turns imbalanced because of her ambivalent thought. She has been unable to decide to whether she should be on the side of India or British.

Her dilemma of loyalty not only makes her night sleepless but also makes her commit suicide. She burns herself to death in a shed in the compound of her building due to her imbalanced mentality. She dresses up herself in white sari, enters the shed, and sets a fire to suicide. This act is symbolic of her committing suttee. She probably might have felt the India she knew had died, so like a faithful widow, she made a funeral pyre and committed suicide. Her suicide is confirmed by the note obtained from Miss Crane's servant in an inquest held in Mayapore.

Negotiating with Past and Present: Hybrid Subjects

Hybrid subjects are the byproducts of ambivalent situation created by the colonialism. It is a key issue for cultural debate. Hybridity is an indispensable part of the colonized society. First the subjects are ambivalent and then get hybridized. The relationship between the colonized the colonizer is never completely opposite. They

love and hate each other simultaneously. One is dependent upon another. That's why their happiness and sorrow are subject to one other.

This section substantiates the issue of hybridity as a key feature of the colonial situation. The first evidence of the hybridity in the protagonist of the novel, Hari Kumar is apparent when "he began consciously to be critical of his father who spoke English with that appalling sing-song accent, spelled the family name Coomer, and told people to call him David" (22).

He starts to point out the mimicry of his father because which he is now forced back to India. His conscious analysis of his father's bankruptcy and his suicidal death makes him discover his father's pomposity and mimicry of Englishness. He grows critical of his own father for his futile mimicry to appropriate the English culture. His father had named his only son Hari which was diminutive of Saxon Harold, who had been King of the English before the Norman came. He tells people to call him David because his name 'Duleep' was so mouthful. Hari begins to trace the path which led his father to the bankruptcy and suicide. Upon wakeful contemplation, he identifies the mimicry of English culture and language as a major cause to his damnation. From that point onwards, he hates English culture which causes him to leave a profound career and life.

Hari Kumar was born in India and attended the public school of England oscillates between Indianess and Englishness. He belongs in no man's land, neither in India which sees him as a fake Indian nor in Britain which sees him as a jumped-up native. The split in his personality is well realized by him, yet he cannot escape this trap of hybridity. In his view, he has neither present nor future, only past with which he can cling. Jacqueline Banerjee, a critic asserts that "it is appalling as well as

ridiculous that a personable and young man like Hari should lose all value for the British as soon as he arrives in India, simply because of his color” (61)

Likewise, his pidgin Hindi is a result of the simultaneous influence of the English and the Indian cultures on him. After having invited by Mrs Prakash Gupta Sen for the dinner at her house, Daphne Manners goes to her house with Hari Kumar. While going on the way, he speaks in the typical pidgin Hindi to the tonga driver, “Dahne ki taraf aur ek dam sidhe ki rasta” (429). The Hindi he speaks to the tonga driver is of muddling type. It’s very much broken Hindi out of the standard Hindi grammar. He had appropriated English grammar and accent so heartily that he cannot speak Hindi properly. His Hindi utterances are hindered by his English accent and tongue. It’s as broken as Daphne Manner who is his English beloved. These pidgin utterances are the part of his hybrid personality.

In the like manner, his hybridization is evident in his two sided attitude towards English colonizers. He writes in a letter to his friend, Colin Lindsey that the English rulers seem to depend upon divisions in Indian political opinion. The policy ‘Divide and Rule’, he claims, has been the strategy for the perpetuation of their colonial rule. He accuses the British rulers of suppressing the nationalist movement and points out the irony in British rulers who were once in arms against the feudal status quo. Ironically, Hari who makes such a meticulous assessment of British tyranny is unable to appreciate his own native town, culture, and heritage. He distresses the fact that he is invisible to his white people and friend in India rather. It doesn’t strike him that he is not liked by Indians. The white people, Hari remarks, homogenize the Indians in a crowd:

I am invisible, Kumar said, not only to white people because they are white and I am black but invisible to my white friend because he can

no longer distinguish me in a crowd. He thinks – yes, this is what Lindsey thinks: ‘they all look alike.’ He makes me disappear. I am nothing. It is not his fault. He is right. I am nothing, nothing. I am the son of my father whose own father left home with a begging bowl in his hand and a cloth round his loins, having blessed his children and committed their mother to their care. (300)

Hari is conscious of the homogenizing tendency of the white people and not caring the individuality of the Indians. He is against the colonial domination but also critical of Hindu Concept of four stages of human life – ‘Bramahcharya’, ‘Grihastha’, ‘Vanaprastha’, and ‘Sanyas’. This love-hate relation of Hari with the English and the Indian emerges from the fact that he had combined the English and the Indian within him. The Indian inside him hates the English domination with the political tactic of ‘divide and rule’ whereas the English inside him hates the Hindu religious ideas of four stages of human life. Hari criticizes the Hindu belief in ‘Sanyas’ as a third prominent stage in human life. He criticizes the English colonial strategy of oppressing the population of India and his house and living in India simultaneously. He describes his living room Number 12 at Chillianwallah Bagh very uncomfortable and Indian as alien country. He has to “beat at the mosquitoes, fist his ears against the sawing frogs and chopping squawk of the lizards in heat on the walls and ceiling” (252). He expresses his repugnance for everything alien country offered. His sleep in India is a nightmare. This love-hate relationship embodies his hybrid self that colonial rule forms in him.

By the same token, his father, Duleep Kumar is another significant example of the hybrid subject produced by the British Raj in India. Duleep has carried both Indian and British within him. He doesnot like the racial prejudice meted out to the

Indians by the English rulers but he takes a liking to the English language. The racial barrier, he believes, can be overcome with the linguistic competence of English. To put another way, this command of language is also the means to beat the color blindness. His strong desire for English culture and English education for himself and later for his son show his respectful attitude towards the British whereas his “awareness of racial discrimination” of the British rulers indicates his anglophile tendency. (223) Duleep’s personality is divided between the English and the Indian culture. His ambition of attaining English education, he tells his son, was predetermined to be failure from the start. On the one hand, he has passion for English language and English education and he falls in love with Kamala at his first glance on the other. This love for his wife, an Indian girl reinforces his Indianness:

‘The fact that I fell in love with your mother’, he told Hari, ‘proved one thing’, which in itself proved many others. It proved my Indianness. It wasn’t just a case of there being here opportunity for a young man to satisfy his sexuality in the terms you would understand it. ... I became husband and house holder. (239)

His personal realization that he had started a project that his heart had not set on proves his life as a lie. His split into heart and mind is the hybridity inside him. His fluctuating desire and passion for two contradictory cultural poles establishes him as a torn subject.

Scott’s *The Jewel in the Crown* writes basically about the twilight of the British Raj, during and after the second world war. The roles of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in Indian nationalist movement are very much like that of the hybrid subjects. They had deep understanding of the cultural hybridization in colonial context. The concept of cultural purity, they knew, was impossible in the course of

national movement. “Gandhian political style, Ashish Nandy recognizes, like his Hinduism, consisted in the showman’s touch of mixing incompatible genres, cultures, castes and classes. Thus performative, hybrid mode was the secret of his popularity” (Young 346). Gandhian political theory to drive out the British and to end their colonial rule was an amalgamation of several ideologies, and philosophical beliefs. His ideology of ‘Hindutva’ is found inclusive and hybrid in its construction of its notions of authentic Indianness.

Despite his denouncement of the western modernity, of derivative discourses, he freely accepted the ideas from the western thinkers like Henry David Thoreau and Ruskin. Gandhi theorized his diasporic experiences to other ideas and cultural forms as a combination of rootedness and openness. Based on the ancient heritage of native Hinduism, he was open to the spiritual inheritance of all the great religions of the world. He used to welcome the noble thoughts from worldwide irrespective of their religious, cultural, and spiritual origins. He had borrowed the noble ideas from Henry David Thoreau, Boer War. His effective measure, ‘Civil Disobedience’ against the British government is largely an idea of Henry David Thoreau. Similarly his ‘passive resistance’ is an inspiration from the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy. Gandhian methods worked because he was able to exploit the liberal dimensions of British colonial government. Gandhi was the first anti-colonial activist to use the contemporary media as a forum to stage his non- violent tactic of resistance; using high technology to facilitate the communicative power of their media representation, despite his distrust of technology, wherever he could Gandhi used media technology to the full. He revolts against the western modernity on the one hand and makes the use of western technology to the full in anti-colonial politics.

Similarly, Scott writes of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru as the leader whose basic political stand was of hybrid type. He was counted by the British as the one who believed that the cultural purity would be a far-fetched idea. Scott, drawing upon the memoir of a high rank colonial agent, A.V. Reid, describes Nehru as a sensible and middle-of-the-way fellow:

Mr. Nehru, who was the actual leader of the Congress, had for some time been considered by us as a more sensible middle-of-the-way fellow who knew the international language of politicians and could possibly be counted on to see sense. (324)

The above description of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, the actual leader of Indian National Congress given by the Brigadier of British Indian army depicts Nehru as the native activist who wanted to take the middle path between British domination and complete indigenization. He believed in negotiating reality between the past and present. He was of the opinion that postcolonial culture is inevitably a hybridized phenomenon. Postcolonial scholars view that it is not possible to return to or discover the pre-colonial cultural purity through abrogation. It is only through the negotiating between the pure pre-colonial past and the present colonial cultural impact the future of newly independent nation can be determined.

Desire of Independence: Nationalism

Nationalism emerged as a reaction against colonialism. If it were not so, colonial tyranny would be perpetual in the history. The wretched colonized would have been in the hell of colonialism forever. They would irredeemably be doomed. Colonial domination and tyranny is just like the painful pregnancy for the child birth of the nationalism. It is natural and social phenomenon. The human history witnesses varieties of nationalist movements on varying scale in the colonized countries for the

freedom, peace and prosperity of the native. When the imperialist prosecution reaches its apex, it calls on the nationalist uprising inviting its own downfall.

After more than 20 years and so of futile agitation of Indian National Congress for concession and redress of grievance, the Indians had received the stones instead of bread. The moderates (the early forerunners of Congress from 1885 to 1905) failed to acquire any roots among the common people and even those who joined the Congress with high hopes, were feeling more and more disillusioned. The politics of the 'moderates' started to be described as 'halting and half-hearted'. Their methods were termed as mendicancy or beggary through prayers and petitions. The British had begun calling Congress as 'industry of sedition' and Congressmen as disappointed candidates for office and discontented lawyers who represented no one but themselves.

In the context of Indian National Movement, Subhas Chandra Bose, popularly known as 'Netaji', holds the significant best position among the Indian nationalists who sought to bring British rule to an end in order to establish pure cultural identity in India. He was one of them who thought that the true independence can be realized in the formation of indigenous culture. He didnot believe in the mimicry as the tool to overcome the colonial rule. For him, the indigenization is the best response to the ambivalence produced by the colonialism. He joined the Indian nationalist movement after he resigned from the Indian Civil Service in 1920. From his early years, he passionately hated the British Raj in India. Bose, in 1921, met Mohandas Karamchanda Gandhi, the founder leader of the Indian National Congress which was the first Indian political party demanding the self-government. After becoming a general secretary of the Indian National Congress, he pressed Gandhi to more quickly and forcefully for complete Indian independence. Some of his volunteers under him

formed an underground revolutionary group called the Bengal Volunteers. His secret association with the underground group marked him to the British rulers as a dangerous man. His “ties with them and their acts of violence also troubled Gandhi, whose commitment to nonviolent methods was unswerving” (Gordon, Leonard).

In 1938, with Gandhi’s blessing, Bose was elected president of the Indian National Congress. He decided to run for the Congress president again the next year, against the wishes of Gandhi. He narrowly defeated Gandhi’s candidate with the backing of the leftist. But he soon found it difficult to run Congress without Gandhi’s support. So he resigned his presidency and constituted the Forward Block, a pressure group within the Congress working for immediate direct action against the Raj. His passion and major concern was the complete self government without negotiating with the British rulers.

As per his belief that the British would never leave India peacefully, Bose decided to flee India and collaborated with a foreign power hostile to the British. He, in 1941, walked into Afghanistan and then travelled to Berlin with the help of Italy, Russia, and Germany. Setting up Free Indian Center in Berlin, he initiated a propaganda operation which made radio broadcasts to India. He also formed a small fighting force recruited from Indian prisoners of war taken in North Africa. Scott talks about the contribution of such hardcore revolutionary group led by Subhas Chandra Bose in the liberation movement of India. Disturbed by Adolf Hitler’s tyranny, he was forced to travel to Japan where he established the Indian National Army with the support of Japanese Prime Minister, Tojo Hideki.

When the Japanese invaded Burma and defeated the English we felt that at last our freedom was in sight. Neither I nor my friends were afraid of Japanese. We knew that we would be able to make trouble for

the Japanese also they invaded India and treated us badly like the British. Many of our soldiers who were left behind by their British officers and captured in Burma and Malaya were given their freedom by the Japanese and formed 'Indian National Army' under Subhas Chandra Bose. (Scott 388)

S V Vidyasagar, one of the young nationalists under Bose, hopes the Indian liberation in complete form. He is sure about the Indian liberation movement as he knows that the Japanese attack on Burma and defeat of British army in it, would hammer on the morale of the British army forcing them to leave India. Vidyasagar's confidence lies in the fact that Japanese could be troubled by the Indian National Army formed by the hardcore nationalist, Subhas Chandra Bose. Vidyasagar's enthusiasm for the national freedom, though shaken in the times of torture by the British police, is typical of the young nationalists who believe that Indian independence demands the complete cultural freedom. The middle-way-man like Jawaharlal Nehru, they thought, was delaying the liberation process of India. They were against the independence based on the negotiated reality. The nationalists belonging to this line of political promise were radical. Unlike the mainstream nationalist leaders, these freedom fighters full of youth and enthusiasm for the nation were ready to sacrifice of any sort.

With strong sense of patriotism, they did not believe in the ramblings and wandering of the mainstream leaders:

In those days, we were knowing that only young men who were ready to give life and take life could ever make India a 'great power'. We did not understand the ramblings and wanderings of our leaders. Unfortunately it was difficult for us to form anything but small groups. (Scott 388-389)

Vidyasagar runs a secret hand press in a prostitute's house to evade the gaze of the British officers and disseminate the ideas against the prosecution, exploitation, and tyranny of the colonial government to unite the all India. At the young age of 18, he chances to work with two local magazines, *Mayapore Gazette* and *Mayapore Hindu*. He and his fellow donot want to miss any oppportunity which will bring the day of liberation nearer. Though very poor, he has dedicated his life to printing sediton literature. He, along with his rebellious fellows, are arrested by the police, interrogated to disclose their accomplices and tortured heavily for not doing so. After the arrest of Moti Lal, he takes over a secret press in a prostitute's house and spread the account of governmental suppression on the Indians during the civil disturbance in Mayapore city in August of 1942. They are persuaded to disclose the names and whereabouts of their accomplices very strategically but none of them admit to do so. All of them are prosecuted and humiliated in the jail by Ronald Merrick, the superintendent of police by beating with a cane and exposing their private parts of the body. While being in a prison, one day, the police tell him of the death of her mother. He cries and begs for the forgiveness from the God for the suffering he has caused her mother:

They told me one day that my mother was dead. I wept and begged of God to be forgiven for the suffering I had caused her, in this freedom-work I had felt I had to do. I didnot resent any of my punishment because I was all the 'crimes' I was punished for. I did not think of them as being crimes and therefore my punishment was not punishment but a part of the sacrifice I was called upon to make. (Scott 394)

On a close reading of above statements, it is not difficult to predict that the nationalist youths of India like Vidyasagar were pregnant with zeal, sacrifice, and devotion for the mother land. Though they were regretful occasionally for their loss on the physical and social level, they never surrendered to the British government and stepped back as a coward. Vidyasagar, after released from the jail, finds oneself homeless and orphan and of low weight – 97 pounds. All the young rebels of India have to undergo a series of prosecution, trial, and tribulation in the process of struggle to free their motherland.

Moti Lal and Mr. Laxminarayan, the novel depicts, are also leading nationalists of Indian movement against the British rule. Their active and selfless involvement in the movement cost them the loss of their house, family and health. They, without caring material pursuit, fight for the unworldly reasons of autonomy of their land. They pay every possible price for the freedom of their native land. They give up all the earthly possession for the sake of birth land.

Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* presents the Anglo-Indian relation as ambivalent caused by the instability of their loyalty and divided personality. Their duty and desire frequently intersect each other. The lack of consistency in their cultural adherence keep them sliding between two poles of British and Indian cultures. The English mission teacher, Miss Edwina Crane has a mixed feelings about the painting *The Jewel in Her Crown*; one highlights the English Empress and another criticizes the English Empress indifferent towards the Indian poverty and famine. Duleep Kumar, a native Indian, is unable to stick to his own cultural value and belief and hence ambivalence. He wants to buy English education, English language, and English culture for his son despite his awareness of English racist attitude and political tactic of division in Indian opinions. British ruled India on the ground of racial inferiority and where as the Indian formed their 'unified community' on the

same ground of racism. Racism thus is an integral part of Indo-British relation. The Indian and the British both get hybridized in their colonial exercise resulting into ambivalent subjects. Both mimic each other's language and culture except the native block which never compromised English rule with their own pure native culture. They are of the opinion that indigenization (the complete rejection) is the best way to free native land from the colonial tyranny. Subhas Chandra Bosh and his young Indian supporters like SV Vidyasagar, Moti Lal, Mr Laxminarayan, Hari Kumar are symbolic of that revolutionary block which believe in complete indigenization to ensure the true independence of the country.

The novel tells the rape story of an English girl, Daphne Manners against the backdrop the crumbling British Raj which fails to address the growing socio-economic problems of India. Alternatively, the novel gives the panoramic view of India from the Quit-India Movement to partition and its independence. Scott, as a miniature artist, presents every detail of love-hate relation between the Indian as the colonized and the British as the colonizer. The theme of the novel flows like the undercurrent that English and Indian could never become friends in India as long as the British continued to rule over India. This truth has got more poignancy through Hari Kumar who is India-born but has lived in England and has had the best public school education. Both the Indian as well as English characters have more life. We are able to look at the prime event of the rape in Bibighar garden through different points of view. The various views have been laid bare through dishonest Superintendent of Police Ronald Merrick, anti-Indian Brigadier Reid, liberal and humanistic Deputy Collector Robin White as well as the kind and somewhat confused school teacher Edwina Crane. We are able to observe the situation of massive turbulence in India from the perspective of not only the nationalist journalist Vidyasagar but also from

that of English educated, pro-British Hari Kumar. The neutral and detached standpoint of the intriguing but courageous non-British social worker Sister Ludmila is openly set forth. The action begins in Mayapore with the launching of the Quit India Movement in August, 1942. Following the Bibighar rape on August 9, the massive riot and upheaval rises to the full which goes beyond the British military and economic power. They are further weakened by the Japanese advance to India and attack of Indian National Army organized by Subhas Chandra Bose on the British army.

Chapter IV. Ambivalence: A Source of Utter Confusion in Transition

As the postcolonial reading of the text theoretically demands the observation of the mode of representation, this section attempts to analyze the literary frame employed by Paul Scott to offer the relationship between the colonizer and the nationalist. The novel has depicted the British and the Indian interrelated with each other in ambivalent motion. The love-hate relation between the invader and the native, which is in continuous fluctuation, is the undercurrent of the novel.

Scott has employed the literary tools, 'abrogation' of the Standard English and 'appropriation' of the native language up to the large extent. Some of the abrogation he has made includes "a few annas for daily expenditure" (384), "doolie procession" (236), "a great guru as Mrs Besant" (64), "piping hot chapattis" (57), "sanyasi" (84), "burra- Sahib" (230), 'baniyas', "Gymkhana" (197), "tablas" (517), "maidan" (303), "doliya la ao re more babul ke kaharwa chali hoo sajan ba ki des" (236), "Rakhi Bandhan" (243), "Khadi"(246), and "gyarah baje" (430). Likewise, the deviation and distortion of English Grammar is massively used in the text – "my five years at Chillingborough can't mean nothing" (258). The text is not merely the adoptions of European models. It has made, by and large, the subversion of the binaries adopted by the literary canon of the West. Instead of totalizing generalization, Scott has tried to incorporate the natives from various social class involved in the nationalism movement of India.

However, in a strict sense, the novel fails to serve the representation of the vast population of Indian peasantry involved in the process of national uprising. The leaders of the nationalist movement Scott represents are from the upper middle class of Indian society. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mohandas Karamchanda Gandhi, Subhas Chandra Bose, and Hari Kumar are the bourgeois elites of British India. Their role

and contribution in the liberation struggle has been described as historical and significant. The novel seems to be dominated by the consciousness of Indian elites rather than the Indian peasants. S V Vidyasagar, a young journalist too is of lower middle class who finds difficult to feed his family after the death of his father. Moti Lal and Laxminarayan who serve the Indian movement through their journalist power also belong to middle class family of India. It is the Indian elites who share the credit of the success of Indian uprising in Scott's text. The mention of Indian working class and their contribution is very nominal in the text. The elites' contribution gets the prominent representation in the text. The pain and suffering of Indian bourgeois has received much of the pages in novel:

When I was released from prison, my own home was no longer available. I had frequently to report to the police. My old employer Mr Laxminarayan found lodging for me and together. I was in poor health and weighed only 97 pounds and was much troubled with coughing.

(394)

The text, unlike western nationalist literatures, has failed to focus on the blind-spots, silences and anxieties of the peasants of India to uncover their myths, cults, ideologies and revolutionary desire. The novel implicitly has been written in the line of conventional historiography. The present day postcolonial critics denounce such works because of their collusion with the western master narratives which reject the subaltern's autonomous consciousness. Brilliantly deconstructive though, such readings are of the colonial-nationalist archives. The aim of such writings is not to unmask dominant discourses of the colonialist and nationalist elites but to explore their fault-lines in order to provide different accounts, to describe histories revealed in the cracks of the colonial archeology of knowledge. This criticism emerges from the

fact that most of these kinds of literature are being written in the first-world academy where the power of hegemonic discourses about India is so palpable. However, this is not to say that these discourses do not extend beyond metropolitan centers; but outside the first world, in India itself, the power of western discourses operates through its authorization and deployment by the nation-state – the ideologies of modernization and instrumentalist science are so deeply sediment in the national body politic that they neither manifest themselves nor function exclusively as forms of imperial power.

The historiography of India commenced with the enterprises of British colonialism in the mid 1800's. This simultaneous birth of history and colonialism in India stripped of it the meaningful past. It historicized India as history-less at the age of history. Colonial history is replete with the instances where India forced their agency to themselves within the context of modern institutions and sometimes on the behalf of the modernizing project of nationalism. This is the double bind through which the subject of 'Indian' history expresses itself. Gyan Prakash, a scholar of history of the modern India asserts the fact that the recent postcolonial criticism consists of the writing from the subaltern perspective which challenges the elite perspective:

A prominent example of recent postcolonial criticism consists of the writings in several volumes of Subaltern Studies ... which challenge existing historiography as elitist and advance in its place a subaltern perspective. A collective of historians writing from India, Britain, and Australia, the Subaltern Studies scholars use the perspective of the subaltern to fiercely combat the persistence of colonialist knowledge in nationalist and mode-of-production narratives. (Prakash 8-9)

Gyan Prakash, in above statements, insists that the postcolonial literature writing needs to be based model of subaltern consciousness. The postcolonial writings that represent the national elites are implicitly framed on the Western Universalist representation. The criticism which intends to retrieve the Indian peasants' identity must combat the persisting archeology of Eurocentric knowledge. Ranjit Guha's *Elementary Aspects of Peasants Insurgency* (1983), he complements, "is a powerful example of this scholarship which seeks to recover the peasant from elite projects and positivist historiography" (qtd in Prakash 9). The persistence of the eliticism in conventional history which represents Europe as a sovereign theoretical subject can be challenged by emphasizing the Subaltern's autonomous consciousness. The concept of a subaltern history, derived from its simultaneous possibility and impossibility in discourses of domination, exemplifies the ambivalence of postcolonial criticism: formed in history, it reinscribes and displaces the record of that history by reading its archives differently from its constitution.

Dipesh Chakrabarty, a postcolonial critic, problematizes the idea of 'indians' representing themselves in 'history'. He argues that the all national histories are the variation on a master narrative that could be called the history of Europe. In this sense, 'Indian history itself is in a position of subalterneity. He posits, the transition narrative like Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966) will always remain "grievously incomplete" (Chakrabarty 384). The only mode of self-representation that Indian can adopt here is what Homi Bhabha has justly called 'mimetic'. Chakrabarty claims that so long as one operates within the discourse of 'history' produced at the institutional site of the university, it is not possible simply to walk out of the deep collusion between 'history' and the modernizing narratives of the West. He convinces the readers to ponder on the reason of inclusion of history as a compulsion in modern

education in every country. The reason, he discloses, is nothing but the perpetuation of the universalization of the nation-state as the most desirable form of the political community. This concept of nation-state is implicated in the problematic master narrative of the West. While saying so, he clarifies the fact that nations are potential to enforce their truth games and are the part of fuel of the institutions involved in the process of universalism. His problematization of the self-representation seems to be perpetual and irredeemable unless and until the new critical perspective of Subaltern Consciousness is theorized: "...a third-world historian is condemned to knowing 'Europe' as the original home of the 'modern' ..." (Chakrabarty 385).

In *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), the paternity of Parvati, the product of inter-racial love between Daphne Manners and Hari Kumar is unidentified. Her mother scares of her color and language she will have in British India. Although Scott is optimistic about the future of the new generation who is born out of the inter-racial affair between the British and Indian, he is not sure of the cultural pole he should stick to. Though Subhas Chandra Bose, the pure Indian nationalist fights his level best against British colonial rule and believes in complete indeginization of the Indian culture, most of the nationalists like Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru follow the middle path of nationalism. They are in-between the contrary cultural practices. Hari Kumar, the protagonist of the novel disappears on obscurity after he is released from the prison at the end of the novel. Similarly, many young nationalists like SV Vidyasagar, Laxminarayan, and Moti Lal are also indeterminate and confused about the future of the Indian nationalist movement and Indians. Miss Crane is a victim of the colonial ambivalence which obliges her to commit suicide. Thus, the confusion and indeterminacy of the ambivalence caused by the British colonialism is the undercurrent of the novel.

Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua, "Colonial Criticism". *Critical Theory since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1971. 1191-1192.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History". *Postcolonial Studies Reader*. Eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. London: Blackwell, 1995. 384-388
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- . *The Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Bhabha, Homi. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994.
- McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester Press, 2000.
- Prakash, Gyan. "Postcolonial Criticism and Indian Historiography." *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 8-19.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon, 1978.
- Scott, Paul. *The Jewel in the Crown*. London: Arrow Books, 2005.
- Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- . *Postcolonialism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2001.
- Gordon, Leonard. "Subhas Chandra Bose." Microsoft® Encarta® 2009 [DVD]. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.