Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*: Power, Liminality, and the Moral Continuum

A Thesis submitted
to the Graduate School
Valdosta State University

in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in English

in the Department of English
of the College of Arts & Sciences

July 2011

Stephanie Flores-Bradshaw

BA, Valdosta State University, 2009

© Copyright 2011 Stephanie Flores-Bradshaw

All Rights Reserved

FAIR USE

This dissertation is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, revised in 1976). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of the material for financial gain without the author's expressed written permission is not allowed.

DUPLICATION

I authorize the Head of Interlibrary Loan or the Head of Archives at the Odum Library at Valdosta State University to arrange for duplication of this dissertation for educational or scholarly purposes when so requested by a library user. This duplication shall be at the user's expense.

Signature ____

I refuse permission for this dissertation to be duplicated in whole or in part.

Signature ____

ABSTRACT

This thesis suggests that ethical behavior is contingent not only on temporal and spatial dimensions, but also on the power relations that inhabit human interactions. This theory emerges within the (post)colonial context of Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*, where the narrative constructs a moral continuum in distinctly liminal spaces. This paper accesses this continuum, drawing on the Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope and Michel Foucault's theory on power. The first chapter surveys the theory that informs the postcolonial narrative and reviews the critical responses to Scott's text. Chapter 2 discusses authorial intention through Bakhtin's chronotope of the fool and directly counters the criticisms that label Scott as an imperialist sympathizer; this chapter also highlights the text's call for ethics and humanism. The third chapter examines the text's reassessment of power. Particularly, this chapter explores *Jewel*'s deconstruction of imperial power and illustrates how the chronotope of road functions as both a place of meeting and of transformation. Chapter 4 explores the text's treatment of hybridity; I propose that the chronotope of the hybrid avidly defines postcoloniality in its move to bridge cultural differences. Underscoring each analysis is Scott's call for humanism, for within each interaction rests the opportunity for human compassion and dignity. This study emphasizes that ethical considerations, as displayed in *Jewel*, emerge from the interconnectedness of time, space, and power.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction: Postcoloniality and the Moral Continuum……………………………....1

II. Toward Ethics and Humanism……………………………….............………...12

III. Deconstructing Imperial Power……………………………………………………...24

IV. Hybridity……………………………………………………………………………..36

V. Conclusion……………………………………………………………………………55

Works Cited ……………………………………………………………………………..58

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would not have successfully completed my thesis without the guidance of my committee members and the encouragement of my family and friends. Specifically, I express my sincere appreciation to my committee chair, Dr. Theresa Thompson. Thank you for acknowledging the merit of my work and for pressing me to realize its potential. I must also thank my dear Flores family in Belize. Despite the physical distance between us, your warm affection sustained me during many stressful hours. Finally, I express my deepest gratitude to my husband, Chris, whose devotion and support carried me these past months. I love you.

Chapter I

POSTCOLONIALITY AND THE MORAL CONTINUUM

> [W]e, too, peoples of Europe, we are being decolonized: meaning the colonist inside every one of us is surgically extracted in a bloody operation. Let's take a good look at ourselves, if we have the courage, and let's see what has become of us … the striptease of our humanism … nothing but a dishonest ideology.
>
> —Jean-Paul Sartre

Paul Scott's *The Jewel in the Crown*[1] establishes a moral continuum within the narrative's (post)colonial context. In spite of its ostensibly fatalistic inclinations, *Jewel* drives its protagonists toward an epiphany or change, that is, a historical transformation. This moment of deliverance hinges on the text's pervasive trope of "the moral continuum of human affairs," a recurring idea that advocates an elemental humanism grounded in morality (Scott 3). Morality, within this narrative framework, operates within a continuum and is necessarily informed by time and space. As such, this thesis explores *Jewel*'s temporal and spatial dimensions, drawing on M. Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope, which literally means time-space. In addition to the text's time-space representation, I posit that power relations play a fundamental role in shaping the text's meaning. Accordingly, this thesis also employs Foucault's theory on power to examine the narrative's power structures. This chapter surveys applicable literary and postcolonial theory, reviews Scott's critics, and situates *Jewel* within the postcolonial genre. Amidst

[1] *Jewel* forms book one of the tetralogy, *The Raj Quartet*, which includes *The Jewel in the Crown* (1966), *The Day of the Scorpion* (1968), *The Towers of Silence* (1971), and *A Division of the Spoils* (1975).

its treatment of history, imperialism, culture, power and identity, *Jewel* ultimately calls for a reinstatement of human compassion and dignity.

Why study postcolonial theory and literature? English, as a discipline and universal language, denotes Great Britain's colonial history. As Richter notes, imperialism has existed since "the dawn of human history" (1754), and the British Empire spanned extensively across the earth's surface in the late-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. Richter records that "around 1900, the British Empire, with possessions nearly everywhere, counted over 400 million subjects of the Crown living on about 25 percent of the earth's landmass, compared with the 35 million inhabitants of the British Isles who lived on less than 0.2 percent" (1755). British colonialism accounts for the influence of English language and culture across nations, whether the peoples impacted by English tradition originate from a purposeful, privileged place, or an enslaved, displaced one. Postcolonial studies, then, materialize from a variety of important movements, specifically, colonization—the social condition under imperial rule; revolution—the search and/or fight for independence; and decolonization—the repercussions of colonialism after independence. Potent postcolonial questions include: how do or, rather, how can formerly colonized nations and peoples secure an autonomous identity? Is decolonization even possible? Postcoloniality raises elemental theoretical questions across disciplines, particularly in relation to history, culture, power and language.

Jewel is set in a pivotal time within British imperial history, at the brink of their loss of Empire. The text emanates from a particular hegemonized period in the year 1942, five years before India's independence. Moreover, Scott writes in the postcolonial era,

which enhances the text's applicability and relevance. This thesis does not overly emphasize the narrative's temporal elements but underscores that each event functions within this (post)colonial time. According to Bakhtin, in history, "the chronotope, function as the primary means for materializing time in space, emerges as a center for concretizing representation, as a force giving body to the entire novel" (250). Likewise, "the time of human life, of historical time … occurs within well-delineated spatial areas" (250). Accordingly, this study primarily analyzes *Jewel*'s spatial components within its imperial framework. The narrative takes place within the city of Mayapore, a fictional but realistic Indian city; within this larger colonized space subsists important pockets of human affairs, which demonstrate the text's moral continuum.

Morality operates on a continuum, a continuous reconstruction of ethical judgment based on time, space and, as discussed later in this study, power relations. Bakhtin's treatise on the chronotope provides a sound theoretical basis to access *Jewel*'s ethical considerations. Bakhtin regards time and space as significant elements in the novel: "They are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel" (250). Chronotopes "open" the narrative to reveal meaning; they represent "the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied" (250). More than a narrative construction, Bakhtin maintains that one's perception of the world stems from temporal and spatial factors. In retrospect, the moral codes of another, particularly in the distant past, appear flawed and lacking. Therefore, context remains extremely important when determining meaning. As the character Daphne Manners notes, "you can't isolate the good and happy things from the bad and unhappy ones" (*Jewel* 390). Any event or action

must be analyzed within its particular context—the time and place in which it takes place. Context shapes meaning and, by extension, shapes one's morality or perception thereof.

History and the representation and interpretation thereof are implicit components of the postcolonial text. Action and events always occur within a chronotopic framework, within a particular context. Bakhtin describes what he calls "historical inversion," where elements of the present or future are transferred into the past: "en route it has become weightier, more authentic and persuasive" (147). Because history and the perception thereof are intrinsic to postcoloniality, any theoretical discussion must begin with language. Poststructuralist theory on language justly challenges our perception of history because we can only access history through language, that is, through textual representation. Fredric Jameson states, "History is inaccessible to us except in textual form" (*Political Unconscious* 80). Histories, then, ought to be analyzed in terms of literary formations and rhetorical strategies. According to White, "the historical narrative does not *reproduce* the events it describes; it tells us in what direction to think about the event and charges our thought about the events with different emotional valences. The historical narrative does not *image* the things it indicates; it *calls to mind* images of the things it indicates, in the same way a metaphor does" (1391). The suggestion upsets one's concrete understanding of the past, for it forces a reexamination of what is often considered fact or truth. Even so, the term "history" has heretofore been employed casually, suggesting that there exists some concrete, real, and established truth of the past. Drawing from poststructuralist reasoning, any textual representation is just that, a representation of the real—not the real. The debate concerns the mode of documentation, the truth of textual accounts, the subjectivity of the narrator, and the interpretation of the

audience. History, with all of its involvedness, complicates the reading of a postcolonial, historically based fiction such as Scott's *Jewel*.

In Scott's text, interpretation of any action or event must be considered contextually—within its temporal and spatial dimensions. *Jewel* emphasizes the importance of approaching meaning both diachronically—the event's historical development—and synchronically—the event's immediate factors. The narrator expresses this notion on the first page of the narrative. While the text states that "[t]his is the story of a rape," it immediately qualifies that localized incident and underscores the importance of context: "[and] of the events that led up to it and followed it and of the place in which it happened. There are the action, the people, and the place; all of which are interrelated but in the totality incommunicable in isolation from the moral continuum of human affairs" (3). The premise of a synchronic and diachronic approach to meaning grounds Scott's text in several manners, particularly in its treatment of power. What the text underlines is that no one lens properly identifies "truth." Both diachronic and synchronic approaches are necessary to find meaning.

For Bakhtin, "every entry into the sphere of meaning is accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope" (258). He treats time and space as "forms of the most immediate reality" (85). Based on this, our understanding of space and time necessarily informs our perception of reality and of identity: "Out of the actual chronotopes of our world emerge the reflected and *created* chronotopes of the world represented in the work" (Bakhtin 253). Therefore, *Jewel*'s constructions of time and space and power extend beyond its narrative boundaries and to our world. Outside of its narrative context, Scott's text calls for a moral consciousness that values human dignity

across time, place, and especially within power relations because, as Foucault asserts, power relations inhabit all human interactions.[2] Therefore, each character in *Jewel* participates in the moral continuum, for the “image of man is always intrinsically chronotopic” (Bakhtin 85). In other words, power operates within each human interaction, interactions that occur along the moral continuum shaped by time and space.

Because of the relativity associated with ethical judgment, Scott’s treatment of Anglo-India resists any stereotypical formulation of power. In *Jewel*, the colonizer is not necessarily evil; the colonized is not inherently good. Unsurprisingly, Scott’s departure from political correctness has garnered negative criticisms from several scholars. Critics such as Salman Rushdie have questioned the eligibility of Scott’s position as a postcolonial, Anglo-Indian writer, trivializing his intentions and claiming his work reasserts imperial power. Predictably, the primary contention relates to race, color, and culture. What authority or authenticity does Scott, a white Englishman, have to write about brown colonized Indians? Of course, one may pose a similar question to any historical-fiction writer, any writer that conceptualizes a reality other than his/her own. Even so, can any author properly represent reality? Because of language’s inherent arbitrariness, any representation draws uncertainty.

While academe largely neglected the *Quartet* for around two decades after its publication, the upsurge of interest in the Raj during the late 1980s and early 1990s brought renewed interest to Scott’s works. In particular, scholars examine Scott’s historical representations of Anglo-India but often question authorial intent. *Jewel*’s unorthodox power structures aggravate many within the postcolonial movements, especially those labeled anti-imperialists. Salman Rushdie famously and severely derides

[2] Chapter 3 discusses *Jewel*’s Foucaultian elements as it relates to power.

Scott's ostensible *mis*representation of history. Rushdie interprets *Jewel*'s gang rape of an Englishwoman by Indians as "evocative to conjure up white society's fear of darkie, of big brown cocks" (89). Following Rushdie's lead, other critics accuse Scott of implicit racism, for he reportedly ignores the Indian condition and romanticizes the colonizer's privileged position. For example, Blair Mahoney furthers Rushdie's accusations and refers to *Jewel* as "no classic" and "an interesting document" that will "likely to be compared *not* with the linguistic pyrotechnics of a Rushdie or a Roy, but instead with the long, realist accounts of a Seth or a Mistry" (261-62). Another deriding allegation accuses the author of plagiarizing E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (Hitchens 122). Among those who purport an essentialist, anti-imperialist stance, the overriding consensus maintains that Scott's *Quartet* "is not so much about India as it is about the British" (Hitchens 127). I respectfully disagree. As this thesis illustrates, *Jewel*'s temporal and spatial dimensions and its treatment of power evidence its distinct endorsement of humanism. The advent of morality inhabits all human relations, regardless of color, creed or status.

Not every critic ignores Scott's merit, however. Recent critics largely defend Scott against Rushdie's disapproval. Haswell argues that each development of corrosion in the *Quartet* reverts back to the opening image of the fleeing girl, an image of the fleeing white colonialist. The rape, she argues, acts as metaphor for Scott's condemnation of racism and deconstruction of English identity. Haswell's reading raises a primary consideration among the *Quartet*'s scholarship: how authentic are Scott's representations of history? Scott himself claims that "the action [in his works] grows both out of the characters and the pressure of history" (qtd. in Boyer 64). Some critics lament the

disparity between "historical" works and "actual" historical events (Mezey, Childs). Jason Mezey criticizes Scott's assessment of the Raj through the rape of a white woman, which he calls "a tired and even objectionable trope of colonial interaction and anxiety" (327). Childs attempts to reconcile the *Quartet* within its historical and social context. Other critics like Boyer defend the *Quartet*'s historical accuracy. Boyer writes, "[the *Quartet*] is not merely a historical novel, in which momentous events form a backdrop for the characters' private interaction. It is a historical essay, an exploration and interpretation of history, in novel form" (64). I agree, for the moral continuum exists outside of the narrative's framework. Read with an awareness of our chronotopes, the interpretation of history resists essentialism. Context thwarts one-dimensional readings of the historical narrative as Scott's text demonstrates.

While most critics consider the narrative's commentary on imperialism, another wave of criticism investigates Scott's pristine character development to uncover social, cultural, and humanistic implications: "*The Raj Quartet* is about human relationships under imperialism . . . To complete itself, Britain must find a way to recover Hari Kumar" (Boyer 67, 80). Jacqueline Banerjee broadens the scope of Scott's ideas to include present-day concerns regarding multiculturalism: "It is time now to see [the *Quartet*] not simply as a major work about the end of empire, but also, and more importantly, as an exploration of the greatest problem we face today—how best to live our lives in a multicultural world" (83). Francine Weinbaum agrees and further likens Scott's narrative to the author's core humanism: "Scott's ideal is broadly humanist as well as historical . . . [and] is a metaphor for an author's view of life . . ." (105). Likewise, John Derbyshire commends Scott for his "insights into history and human

nature . . . [and] what it has to tell us about race and 'diversity,' matters that are going to occupy us mightily in the decades to come" (14). Mezey refers to a prominent trope in *Jewel*—what Ralph Crane refers to as Scott's "reassessment of whiteness" (19). Peter Childs addresses this reassessment of whiteness and draws from Scott's biography as a tool for interpretation.

Most critics consider Scott's apparent subversion of the power hierarchy in pre-independent India. Scott insistently positions Indians against white characters. Critics ask: is he employing Anglo-India as a device to (re)empower the colonizer? As this thesis argues, Scott's narrative does approach sovereign power unconventionally. *Jewel* reexamines theoretical questions that inform postcolonialism, particularly as it relates to power and identity. Gorra writes that "Scott demands that we see history in moral terms—that we allow our consciences to pass judgment on the human costs of impersonal historical forces rather than merely shrugging our shoulders over their inevitability" (31). This thesis extends this sentiment, positing that Scott's message transcends its historical framework. *Jewel*'s treatment of history emphasizes the need to return to basic humanism.

Structurally, this study examines three important, empowered female characters: Sister Ludmila, Miss Crane, and Daphne Manners. From their status as European nationals within India, each of the three possesses the rights of the colonizer. However, as *Jewel* demonstrates, they operate within Scott's moral continuum, forced to make significant ethical judgments. I examine the spaces in which these characters move and the people they encounter within those spaces. Chapter 2 considers Sister Ludmila, the mysterious nun who traverses spaces in search of untouchables. This chapter directly

counters the criticisms that claim Scott sympathizes with the imperialist. Using Bakhtin's chronotope of the fool, I posit that the nun functions as Scott's voice in the narrative. Chapter 3 charts the story of Miss Crane's historical transformation. I suggest that *Jewel* deconstructs the purported white man's burden and exposes its fallacies. In spite of tragedy, Miss Crane gains deliverance, shedding the myth of her racist education. Chapter 4 investigates the text's chronotopic hybrid characters, focusing particularly on the relationship between Daphne Manners and Hari Kumar. I argue that the hybrid successfully creates the entity of oneness, for which Scott advocates. Within each analysis rests Scott's call for humanism.

Scott's text contributes to postcolonial studies in that it extends the ideas of anti-imperialists such as DuBois and Fanon. *Jewel* proposes a reassessment of the essentialist systems in place, rather than adhering to a dualistic perspective, one that purports a binary of the evil colonizer versus the innocent subaltern. The text illustrates the in-depth factors at work in a colonized setting but addresses issues of the postcolonial world from which Scott writes. The text comments on power relations and cultural identity. Drawing ideas from theorists such as Foucault, Bakhtin, and Bhabha, this thesis illustrates how *Jewel* reassesses imperial power structures and destabilizes popular conceptions of race, nationality, and culture. Scott's *Jewel* problematizes "truths." It questions autonomous identity. It reveals the arbitrariness of language. It asks: What is Englishness? What is Indianness? Like Appiah posits, "we are all already contaminated by each other" (354). Does an unadulterated cultural and/or national identity exist? Scott's text undermines essentialism and argues for a reassessment of our conception of power and identity.

Principally, *Jewel* points its readers toward certain ethical considerations regarding the human condition in its construction of the “moral continuum of human affairs.”

Chapter II

TOWARD ETHICS AND HUMANISM

> [W]hen the world has done its worst for a man, and a man his worst for the world, let him savour dignity then. Let him go out in cleanliness and such peace as cleanliness and comfort can give him. Which is little enough.
>
> —Paul Scott

This chapter responds specifically to the criticism that Scott endorses imperialism. By analyzing *Jewel*'s mysterious character Sister Ludmila and the chronotopic dimensions of her story, I seek to unearth Scott's authorial intention.[3] More so, I suggest that Ludmila functions as Scott's voice in the novel, his intrusion into the text. According to Bakhtin, "The novelist stands in need of some essential form and generic mask that could serve to define the position from which he views life, as well as the position from which he makes that life public" (161). Sister Ludmila embodies Bakhtin's chronotopic "rogue, clown and fool" trope, which points to the "positioning of the author himself within the novel, as well as the author's point of view" (Bakhtin 160). Sister Ludmila's position and actions contribute to Scott's construction of the moral continuum; the strange nun's human compassion speaks to the author's commentary on ethics.

Bakhtin posits that "[t]he rogue, the clown and the fool create around themselves their own special little world, their own chronotope" (159). Accordingly, Ludmila's "origins were obscure" (*Jewel* 117). Stories of her origin are wild and fantastical, including that she is a peasant, a spy, and a runaway. One observer refers to her as "the

[3] Within this context of this chapter, I decidedly ignore both Barthes and Foucault's argument that the "author is dead," meaning the author's intention is not relevant; only the text speaks meaning.

mad Russian woman who collects dead bodies and isn't a nun at all, but just dresses like one" (*Jewel* 392). Everything about Ludmila is shrouded in mystery; no one knows her age or her source of income. She speaks English but with a heavy accent (415) and walks the city streets wearing a nun's habit "like one of those Sisters of Mercy with huge white fly-away linen caps" (392), which earns her the title of "Sister." Others maintain that she escaped from a convent and "wore the nunnish clothing in the hope of being forgiven" (415). However, Ludmila holds no affiliation with any Church. Her religious garb functions as a mask. Bakhtin notes that "[fools] are life's maskers; their being coincides with their role and outside this role they simply do not exist" (159). Sister Ludmila does not exist outside of her masked persona; she exemplifies human devotion and does not exist outside of this character.

Sister Ludmila's ambiguity exudes a certain horror. Lili Chatterjee admits, "she makes me shiver, basking off collecting people she finds dying" (*Jewel* 392). Ludmila's strangeness aligns her with the mythological Psychopomp, a spirit that conducts souls across worlds, guiding them from the living to the dead. Ludmila crosses boundaries, like the Psychopomp, and escorts the dead (or the dying) to safety. The old nun's mystique cements her otherness and social isolation. However, as Daphne maintains, "there was no tale about her that was true. Only her charity was true. … In herself she was all the explanation I felt she needed. … To be explained by yourself, by what you are and what you do, and not by what you've done, or were, or by what people think you might be or might become" (*Jewel* 415). Ludmila's charitable spirit and actions underscore *Jewel*'s move toward ethics. While her presence as a white European in 1942 India necessarily expose her privileged position as colonizer, Ludmila's benevolence emphasizes Scott's

construction of the moral continuum. Her work illustrates the ethical choices and charitable opportunities present in hegemonized spaces.

More important than her attire or history is Sister Ludmila's charity, her service. She "defied the curfew and went out every night with Mr. de Souza and her stretcher bearer" (*Jewel* 441). Sister Ludmila scours the streets searching for the "untouchables," the disregarded lowest of the lowly in India. With hired help, Ludmila carries them back to The Sanctuary, the shelter she provides for this very purpose, a "cluster of buildings where she fed the hungry, ministered to the sick, and cleansed and comforted those who for want of her nightly scavenging would have died in the street" (117). The Sanctuary stands along "the waste ground near the river where the poorest untouchables live in horrible squalid huts" (414). Ludmila's compound is enclosed by walls, and the "place looks derelict and you can smell the river most of the time. But inside the buildings everything is clean and neat, scrubbed and whitewashed" (414). She offers the discarded members of society "a clean bed, a hand to hold, a word through layers of unconsciousness to reach and warm the cold diminishing centre of the departing soul" (129). This is how she meets Hari. He had "collapsed in a ditch" unconscious due to drunkenness, and Ludmila collects him (408).

Ludmila's position as European colonizer authorizes her to cross worlds; she holds the power to traverse spaces, to cross boundaries like the Psychopomp. However, her power promotes human dignity instead of tyranny. She attends to the "dying instead of the living" (*Jewel* 149). She transports those most in need from the slums to her created haven, walking along the public square in the city "in front of a boy who was armed with a stick, holding a leather bag that she kept chained to the belt round her

waist" (392). As she walks in the city, her presence demands attention, and she becomes a public spectacle. Hari informs Daphne that Ludmila kept "very much to herself and was only really interested in people who were dying and had no bed to die in, although she also ran an evening clinic that people could go to who couldn't afford to take time off from work to go to the daytime clinics, and she doled out free rice on certain days of the week, to children and mothers mostly" (395). Ludmila says that her work "is only for people who have nothing else to offer" (396). But what motivates Ludmila to tend to the untouchables? The text does not answer explicitly, but Ludmila keeps both a dancing Shiva and a framed bible verse in her office. The verse reads, "He that soweth little shall reap little, and he that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously. Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart, not grudging, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver" (395). At their last meeting, Ludmila gifts the text to Daphne (396). Her garb, spiritual emblems, and title Sister do not underline religious motives, however. Instead, Ludmila often mirrors the role of a religious or savior figure. She even describes herself as a "mother-confessor" (254). What is important is her human compassion, her devotion to humanity. Her service and dedication to, using a Fanonian term, lumpen-proletariats underscore Scott's own call for charity.

Fanon's musings offer some clarity. While I am mindful of Trinh's warning against generalizing statements about "the masses," Fanon makes clear distinctions among the groups within the masses. The proletariats are not, in fact, on the lowest tier in social hierarchies. The proletariats and rebels ultimately project the desire of the national bourgeoisie. According to Fanon, the faction with which we are to be concerned is actually the lumpen-proletariats, the dissenting group that remains uncontaminated by

power. The lumpen-proletariats, unlike the individualized subjects caught in a panoptic system, remain community-minded: “The individual steps aside in favor of the community” (Fanon 67). Their communality makes them extremely dangerous. Fanon describes the lumpen-proletariats as “a phenomenon which is governed by its own logic, and neither the overzealousness of the missionaries nor decrees from the central authorities can check its growth. However hard it is kicked or stoned it continues to gnaw at the roots of the tree like a pack of rats” (81). Admittedly, Fanon’s projections are somewhat fantastical and flawed—typical of certain elements in Marxist criticisms. However, the underlying premise reasons that the untouchables demand attention, whether in fear of volatile unrest or from a simply ethical stance. Scott’s text further underlines that while the nationalists and the imperialists fought for power, they successfully ignored the starving, depraved people. Both sides claimed to have good intentions, but their actions proved otherwise, highlighting their desire for power and control. Untouchables remained untouched. Ludmila ponders, “Is not our capacity to laugh and cry the measure of our humanity?” (*Jewel* 121). Amidst the political conflict for control of India, a seemingly insignificant nun attends to the colonized nation’s critical victims.

Within the spaces that Ludmila traverses, *Jewel* illustrates the regrettable effects of a falling empire. Hari Kumar writes an article for the *Gazette* about Ludmila’s Sanctuary, but his editor rejects the piece because of its “implication that the British were responsible for letting people die in the streets (*Jewel* 395). Hari alters the article “to show that *nobody* cared, not even the people who were dying, nobody except Sister Ludmila” (395). The editor again rejects the piece. This act of silencing recurs throughout

the text as a means of power—a concealing truth to enact power or to hide guilt. Still, *Jewel* does not ignore the element of power within Ludmila's venerable actions. Her presence confirms the colonizer's presence in India. Ludmila's actions also indirectly facilitate Merrick's first assault on Hari: "It was stupid of me. It was the price I paid for devoting myself to the interests of the dying instead of the living. … If I had not been stupid then we might have escaped from the cycle of inevitability" (149). She seeks out Daphne to unburden her "blame" and "guilt" (155). Her guilt is a typical "imperial" guilt, another trope replicated throughout the text and discussed in later chapters. Essentially, the colonizer, after undergoing a moral epiphany, lives in regret for the sins committed against a people. What *Jewel* illustrates is that even within these hegemonized spaces, the choice to reciprocate basic human dignity and charity exists. Power does not absolve one's moral obligations; instead, power reinforces one's ethical responsibilities.

To reiterate, the colonizer holds the opportunity to serve the people, as Ludmila demonstrates. This service differs from the notion of the white man's burden, which is deconstructed in the next chapter. Ethical judgments emerge in every human interaction; power complicates these interactions, blurring the lines of morality. Ronald Merrick, for instance, another colonizer character and the antithesis of Sister Ludmila, never chooses charity. While certain colonizers feel a sense of obligation for the colonized, Merrick feels entitlement. He assaults Hari, hitting him in the face, punching and kicking him after he is seized "for not answering 'smartly'" (*Jewel* 408). Sister Ludmila notes, Merrick "was a man unable to love. [But] he was able to punish" (155). In the colonized world and in accordance with the stereotypical colonizers, the native represents "the enemy of values" (Fanon 6). To protect the empire, these "others" require discipline.

Fanon notes, “A world compartmentalized, Manichaean and petrified, a world of statues…That is the colonial world” (15). In colonial India, race and class demarcate space. *Jewel*’s Anglo-India resists such Manichaean forms of identity, for it endorses cultural hybridization.[4] For as Fanon points out, “the colonized” constitute tiered groups—the people in the countryside versus those from urban areas, an internal replication of an imperialistic relationship.

In essence, imperialism rebirths within the colony, with nationalists imitating the political system of the colonizers. This neocolonialism is jarring, of course. Nationalists purport a strong resistance against the imperialists; they fight for national independence; they incite mobs to defend freedom. However, in retrospect, these grand schemes of resistance ultimately mirror the imperial model: “We will see, unfortunately, that the national bourgeoisie often turns away from this heroic and positive path, which is both productive and just, and unabashedly opts for the antinational . . . They mobilize the people with the slogan of independence, and anything else is left to the future” (Fanon 99). The former imperial state perpetuates the same notions the nationalists supposedly resisted, camouflaging itself “behind the mask of neocolonialism” (101). Daphne alludes to this occurrence in her journal: “I liked the *fun* of the English before it became self-conscious and vulgar and violent, and I liked the simple almost childish fun of the Indians, and their seriousness, before it became prissy and prickly and imitative of European sulks” (*Jewel* 398). Responding to Hari’s rudeness toward an Indian servant, she ponders, “I began to wonder whether the Indians had got this habit from the English, or the English from the Indians, or whether the whole thing dated back to some time when servants were treated like dirt everywhere and the habit had only been kept up in

[4] Chapter 4 discusses cultural hybridity in detail.

the Empire by Sahibs and Memsahibs and modern Indians wanting to be smart" (403). While the colonized Indians berate the British colonizers' inhumanity, the Indians' caste system enforces similarly dehumanizing tactics (407). In other words, aspirations to political or social superiority belonged to the Indians as much as the British.

We should view the rioters in Scott's *Jewel* with this context in mind. Yes, they fight under the "slogan of independence," but how authentic is this fight? While *Jewel* presents the actions of the rioters, the actual governance behind the strikes surfaces in subsequent books of the tetralogy. In *Scorpion*, book two, an important, extensive dialogue transpires between the English Governor and the Indian Congressman Kasim, who has been arrested for inciting the strikes. Kasim defends his party's motives to build a nation completely severed from the manipulations of the British. With Gandhi, the nationalist leaders stirred laborers into rebellion. The Governor argues that India has been essentially independent since the Parliament consented to bicameral assemblies under the Government of India Act, 1935, and to the ensuing national elections in 1937. Arguably, the British remained in control of India. The quarrel, then, was among the opposing religious factions (Muslims and Hindus) and not with the British, despite the nationalists' claims, which made Partition inevitable. The Governor says to Kasim,

> The old battle was for Indian independence and although you may not think so now, Indian independence became a foregone conclusion in 1937 when men like you became provincial ministers. Getting rid of us was still part of your programme but getting rid of us was no longer the battle. *The battle was to maintain and extend the area of your party's power … You're fighting for political power over what has been conceded. It's logical. It's essential. It's an*

> *inescapable human condition.* When you all resigned the power you got, in the belief that you were striking another blow for India's independence, you weren't striking a blow for that at all. You were striking a blow at your own existing and potential political power. (emphasis mine, 15)

While the rioters in *Jewel* come across as the united "masses" against the colonizer's reign, in truth, the proletariats were manipulated tools for and by the national bourgeoisie. Trinh in *Woman, Native, Other* warns of the dangers in the "massification" of the Third World under the guise of defending freedom. She writes, "Do the masses become masses by themselves? Or are they the result of a theoretical and practical operation of 'massification'? From where onward can one say of a 'free' work of art that it is written for the infinite numbers which constitute the masses and not merely for a definite public stratum of society?" (12). She continues,

> Like all stereotypical notions, the notion of the masses has both an upgrading connotation and a degrading one. One often speaks of the masses as one speaks of the people, magnifying thereby their number, their strength, their mission. One invokes them and pretends to write on their behalf when one wishes to give weight to one's undertaking or to justify it … Yet to oppose the masses to the elite is already to imply that those forming the masses are regarded as an aggregate of average persons condemned by their lack of personality or by their dim individualities. (12-13)

The fact remains that Indian officials like Kasim live in luxury, the untouchables remain neglected in the drains and alleys, left to the mercy of a humanist such as Sister Ludmila.

The nationalists idealize the construction of autonomous Indianness, while, as Lady Chatterjee admits, they have willingly become English. She frankly notes,

> I have a feeling that when it was written into our constitution that we should be a secular state we finally put the lid on our Indianness, and admitted the *legality* of our long years of living in sin with the English. Our so-called independence *was* rather like a shotgun wedding. The only Indians who don't realize that we are now really westerners are our peasants. (*Jewel* 71-72)

The colonized people have already been infected by western ideology. Fanon writes, "If we want to transform Africa into a new Europe, America into a new Europe, then let us entrust the destinies of our countries to the Europeans. They will do a better job than the best of us" (Fanon 99). Where is the logic in resisting a system of dominance or hegemony only to reaffirm its likeness after independence under the banner of democracy? Fanon contends,

> But if we want humanity to take one step forward, if we want to take it to another level than the one where Europe has placed it, then we must innovate, we must be pioneers. If we want to respond to the expectations of our peoples, we must look elsewhere besides Europe. (99)

Fanon's sentiments underscore an underlying premise in Scott's text, which calls for a reassessment of power relations.[5] Essentially, without trivializing the role of the colonizer, the text implicates the unequal power relations outside of the colonizer-colonized dichotomy.

Decolonization poses these disquieting questions on the true independence of formerly colonized nations and the emergence of an internal, second colonization. The

[5] Power considerations are further discussed in Chapter 3.

condition of the so-called Third World demonstrates the outcome of decolonization. Rather than displaying forward-thinking policies as originally projected, the Third World exists in a constantly developing mode. As Richter writes,

> political independence marks the end of colonial status. For most former colonies, independence may be only the beginning of the end, since colonial structures, political, economic, and cultural, usually continue long after the European viceroy closes down his office and departs. To perpetuate these structures is to perpetuate one's subaltern status, but to tear them down before others have been readied is to invite chaos. (1756)

Scott's text dares to defy the anti-imperialist sentiment—not in the sense of siding with imperialists but in recognizing the flawed politics under the guise of independence. As Fanon contends, "if we want to respond to the expectations of the Europeans we must not send them back a reflection, however ideal, of their society and their thought that periodically sickens even them" (99). Scott's text essentially exposes the corruption beneath certain nationalistic politics, a system of governance that mirrors imperialism.

Of course, grand projections on politics and power tend to survive mostly within the realms of academia and scholarly debate. I return to this chapter's analysis of the "rogue," Sister Ludmila, the purported voice of Scott. One obvious comment in *Jewel* is that while the imperialists and nationalists battled for control of India, they forgot or ignored the sick and dying natives, the ones that suffer most in times of conflict. Political conflict grew out of the desire for power and not necessarily for the betterment of the people. The text also calls for action, an action portrayed in the image of the girl running in the darkness. Sister Ludmila notes that Daphne "was attempting always at wholeness.

When there is wholeness there are no causes. Only there is living. The contribution of the whole of one's life, the whole of one's resources, to the world at large. This, like the courage to leap, is a wholeness I never had" (*Jewel* 143). The concept of "wholeness" reemerges throughout the text as in the image of the dancing Siva that graces Sister Ludmila's wall: "The dance of creation, preservation and destruction. A complete cycle. A wholeness" (143). This wholeness is echoed in the limnal spaces of the novel. Ludmila labels the MacGregor House and Bibighar Gardens as "the place of the white and the place of the black" (142), that is, liminal spaces. Crossing "the dark currents of a human conflict . . . a current whose direction might be traced by following the route taken by the girl running in darkness from one to the other" (141-42), offers the hope of wholeness. Sister Ludmila asserts, "life is not just a business of standing on dry land and occasionally getting your feet wet. It is merely an illusion that some of us stand like we are not living at all, but dreaming. So jump, jump in, and let the shock wake us up. Even if we drown, at least for a moment or two before we die we shall be awake and alive" (142). Ludmila informs the narrator, "India is a place where men died, still die, in the open, for want of succor, for want of shelter, for want of respect for the dignity of death" (128). She calls us to action geared toward human dignity and compassion.

Chapter III

Deconstructing Imperial Power

> Modern thought and experience have taught us to be sensitive to what is involved in representation, in studying the Other, in racial thinking, in unthinking and uncritical acceptance of authority and authoritative ideas, in the sociopolitical role of intellectuals, in the great value of a skeptical critical consciousness. Perhaps if we remember that the study of human experience usually has an ethical, to say nothing of a political, consequence in either the best or the worst sense, we will not be indifferent to what we do as scholars.
>
> —Edward Said

Jewel opens with the story of Miss Edwina Crane. Though the narrator informs readers that the narrative revolves around Miss Manners' rape (3), the text commits a significant amount of time and space to Miss Crane, signaling this character's importance. Miss Crane typifies the British who have lived in India for an extensive period; however, her experience in India impacts her perspective on imperial power. Particularly, the narrative exposes through Miss Crane the mindset of the British regarding their supposed responsibility for colonized people—"the white man's burden." Drawing from Miss Crane's story, this chapter examines *Jewel*'s deconstruction of imperial power, especially in its treatment of the white man's burden (post)colonial trope. The narrative demonstrates an obvious movement toward transformation as Miss Crane approaches a place where she recognizes equality in humanity, a place where racial superiority dissipates. As Miss Crane journeys toward her moral epiphany, I draw on the chronotope of the road, which in its imperial framework invites violence. In addition to its spatial and temporal implications, this chapter also underlines *Jewel*'s premise on the

pluralistic nature of power as demonstrated in Miss Crane's differing roles as colonizer and woman.

Scott's *Jewel* reconceptualizes power within an imperial space. Foucault contends, "In reality power means relations, a more-or-less organized, hierarchical, coordinated cluster of relations" (*Power/Knowledge* 198). Power operates within every relation. Foucault continues, "power is not an institution, a structure, or a certain force with which certain people are endowed; it is the name given to a complex strategic relationship in a given society" (236). Likewise, power inhabits "the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization … it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another" (*History of Sexuality* 92-93). In essence, "Power is everywhere" (93), and even within hegemonized spaces, power does not belong to any one group. Instead, power operates within dispersed relations. Similarly, *Jewel*'s construction of power relations counters parochial definitions of power as coming from the top down. Power does not reside with the colonizer alone but surfaces within various relationships.

Miss Crane, an English missionary school superintendent, has worked among the Indians for thirty-five years (*Jewel* 7). Miss Crane's white skin automatically empowers her within the Indian community as a colonizer. The Indian children view her as an emblem of the mother queen, whose image adorns their walls (19, 21). Miss Crane's empowerment as colonizer is unstable, however. She questions her authority and that of her race (19). Miss Crane's duplicity emerges in several areas of her life, including her faith or lack thereof, though she wears the label of missionary. Miss Crane acknowledges

her disbelief in God but participates in Christian rituals to appease her community (12). Her names—Crane, Miss Crane, and Edwina —demonstrates her compartmentalized self. The almost abrasive sounding Crane indicates her lowered social position; Miss Crane denotes her racial authority; Edwina, which rarely occurs in the text, point toward her guarded but sincere self (10). At one point, she wonders whether the English God views her as Crane, Miss Crane, or Edwina: "If she thought of Him as the Son she would, she presumed, be Edwina, but to God in his Wrath, undoubtedly Crane" (12). Edwina chooses to work with the Indians because her English counterparts treat her as an inferior due to her class and station. She does not feel at home in England and removes herself after a time from English society in India: "she felt isolated from her own people and recognized that the British India was not the real India" (9). Removed from her compatriots, Miss Crane operates within a consistent state of in-betweenness or liminality. Miss Crane's position weakens an essentialist definition of the colonizer as possessing unlimited authority or power. Though her white skin empowers her to some degree, Miss Crane must still submit to the conventions of her society's codes.

Superficially, Miss Crane holds imperial power, but her sense of authority materializes as duty, not tyranny, "a [purported] matriarchal care … [that conveyed] the importance of courageously accepting duties and obligations, not for self-aggrandizement, but in self-denial, in order to promote a wider happiness and well being" (*Jewel* 23). This sense of duty typifies the Victorian mindset regarding empire as detailed in Rudyard Kipling's "White Man's Burden." Essentially, the European colonizer bears the responsibility to mind and civilize its subjects. Miss Crane distrusts Mahatma Gandhi's protests because of his apparent allegiance with the Japanese. She notes, "if he

thought that *they would be better masters* then she could only assume he was out of his senses" (4). The advent of self-governance escapes her. As she sits in front of the Indian schoolchildren for the first time, Miss Crane determines that "the only excuse she or anyone of *her kind* had to be there, alone, sitting on a chair, holding a nosegay, being sung to, the object of the awe of uninstructed children, was if they sat there conscious of a duty to promote the cause of human dignity and happiness" (17). In the earlier moments of her journey, Miss Crane believes in the benevolence of the British. Miss Crane later admits that such an India never existed; that misguided *duty* failed to take account of "poverty, disease, misery, ignorance and injustice" (23). Her interaction with the natives begins to transform her prejudiced views, yet she cannot completely abandon her British education of superiority.

In her relationship with the Nesbitt-Smiths, Miss Crane's former employers, she falls subject to class order and social snobbery: "Her employers felt a duty to accord her a recognition they would have withheld from the highest-born Indian, at the same time a compulsion to place her on one of the lowest rungs of the ladder of their own self-contained society" (*Jewel* 8). Though Miss Crane "stood in a position far superior to that of any native servant," Mrs. Nesbitt-Smith handles her dismissively in the presence of respectable company (10). Miss Crane's position as a woman also subjects her to certain social codes. Her inability to secure a husband—mainly due to her "plain looks" and station—gives her English counterparts reason to ridicule her (9). Even Miss Crane's relationship with God illustrates the pluralistic nature of power. Miss Crane did not view the "English God" as redeemer, for he, Miss Crane notes, was not the god "of the dark-skinned community that struggled for life under the weight of the Punjabi sky but of the

privileged pale-faced community of which she was a marginal member" (12). Is power here vested with the English God's ability to discipline, with Miss Crane's capacity to reject religion, or both? *Jewel* continues to reassess essentialist definitions of power, highlighting power's pluralistic nature.

Miss Crane's relationship with Mr. Chaudhuri, an Indian teacher, represents a pivotal component in *Jewel*'s narrative and in Edwina's transformation. The text further muddles power structures in the interaction between Miss Crane and Mr. Chaudhuri. Superficially, Miss Crane, a white British national, inhabits the role of colonizer, while Mr. Chaudhuri, the brown Indian subject, fulfills the role of the colonized. However, besides race, gender and status also impact their relationship. Mr. Chaudhuri does not typify the stereotypical, impoverished, uneducated Indian. He holds university degrees in arts and science but resigns from a distinguished government post for a humble teaching position. Instead of exploiting his education for personal gain, Mr. Chaudhuri holds "a genuine sympathy for the depressed classes of his own race and a genuine belief that educated men like himself should more often be prepared to sacrifice their private interests in the interest of the country as a whole" (41). He disapproves of teachers who place politics before education. In spite of his commendable humanitarian agenda, his patriarchal role takes precedence at home, where his wife assumes a submissive, lower-status posture. When Miss Crane visits the Chaudhuris' home for dinner, Mrs. Chaudhuri does not join her husband at the table but stands at the doorway "watching her husband for the slightest indication from him that something had been forgotten, or was wrong, or needed to be replenished" (44). Miss Crane herself feels intimidated by Mr. Chaudhuri's patriarchal power and curbs her typically outspoken tongue: "With Mr. Chaudhuri she

found herself reverting to the soft phrase, the cautious sentiment, and then spoiling whatever effect this had had by letting slip words that came more easily to her" (43). These variations of power do not diminish the gravity of imperial power, however. Miss Crane's race sustains her superior rank over Indians, who must treat her respectfully. Of course, though often reified, the colonizer's supremacy is abstract, a social and historical construction; likewise, the Indians' submissiveness is not concrete. Power relations transform across human interactions according to context.

Among the Indians, Miss Crane's bravery earns her respect. She challenges a group of rioters and protects her students (*Jewel* 19). The narrator invites us into Miss Crane's developing transformation as she grapples with conflicting ideologies. Her journey propels toward a new perspective, one where racial and cultural differences pale in comparison to basic humanity. Miss Crane's journey alludes to the recurring trope of movement throughout the text. Her journey also underscores the road chronotope, where her transformation materializes. Despite Miss Crane's movement toward transformation, she struggles to escape the racial prejudices engrained within her. Miss Crane instinctively distrusts the Indians, and though she detests these feelings, she automatically adopts a superior attitude when among them. These feelings shame her, but despite her inclinations, she serves the Indian community admirably. She ventures in and out of both English and Indian spaces, failing to commit solely to either one.

Miss Crane's relationship with Mr. Chaudhuri presents another atypical interaction between colonizer and colonized. Mr. Chaudhuri "was westernized. He wore European clothes at the school . . . ate at a table, seated on hardwood chairs and talked about art and music" (45). Though they work together at the mission school and have

similar interests, Mr. Chaudhuri and Miss Crane initially cannot overcome their prejudices and distrust for each other. Their interaction pushes Miss Crane further along her journey toward a moral epiphany; she now longs to accept Indians as her equals but cannot quite get to that conviction. Mr. Chaudhuri, on the other hand, appreciates British customs but cannot bring himself to trust a white colonialist. The merging worlds of Miss Crane and Mr. Chaudhuri continue toward the climactic moment—their eventual union, which brings tragedy.

Jewel employs the flawed character of Miss Crane to deconstruct the predispositions of the dominant group. In particular, the text strips the moral façade away from the white man's burden, the colonizer's claim of moral obligation to the subject race by pushing Miss Crane toward a transformative event. One white soldier writes of his disgust toward the Indians' ungratefulness: "I felt sickened to realize the extent to which some of these so-called educated young Indians would go to defy and attack the people who had given them the opportunity to make something of themselves" (305). He, like many other of the English, regards his imperial presence as an essential duty to control the Indians. Another soldier's account states,

> the Indians wanted to be free, and that we also wished this, but that they had wanted to be free for just that much longer than we had felt or agreed that they should be . . . Being human, the longer the Indians were denied freedom the more they wanted to be free on their own terms, and the more they wanted to be free on their own terms the more we—also being human—insisted that they must initially acquire freedom on ours. (341-42)

Still, Miss Crane recognizes that the India she "found full of compensations was only the white man's India" (9). Robin White, Deputy Commissioner, echoes this sentiment to the narrator. He explains that the British essentially raped India and took control of its resources without acknowledging the repercussions. He notes a significant but often overlooked factor: "we were *able* to exploit India because the first confrontation … was that of an old, tired civilization that was running down under the Moghuls and a comparatively new energetic civilization that had been on the up-grade ever since the Tudors" (325). In other words, British imperialism in India does not account for the nation's first colonization. While this fact does not erase or minimize the trauma suffered by the people and the land under British rule, power struggles have always existed in India's historical narrative. White also emphasizes the moral dilemma present in Anglo-Indian relations:

> The moral issue is bound to arise even eventually grow, and finally appear to take precedence in any longstanding connection between human beings, especially if their status is unequal. The onus of moral leadership falls naturally on the people who rank as superior. … At almost precisely the same time that the English were developing their theories of the White Man's burden to help them bear the weight of its responsibility, the Hindus and the Muslims were taking a long hard look at *their* religions, not to explain their servitude but to help them to end it. (326)

White reiterates the pervasiveness of power relations across borders and within all human interactions. In the narrative's purported hegemony, imperial power does not represent the sole source of power. Likewise, the advent of morality necessarily emerges from unequal power relations.

In a colonized world, the struggle for territory or space is inherent. Miss Crane's journey leads her to a significant space—a road. Raka Shome labels this territoriality an inevitable "site of violence" (47). On the road, according to Bakhtin,

> the spatial and temporal paths of the most varied people—representatives of all social classes, estates, religions, nationalities, ages—intersect at one spatial and temporal point … On the road the spatial and temporal series defining human fates and lives combine with one another in distinctive ways, even as they become more complex and concrete by the collapse of *social distances* … Time, as it were, fuses together with space and flows in it (forming the road). (243-44)

The chronotope of road functions as the meeting place or the means for movement and transformation for Miss Crane. The space also becomes a necessary site of violence, for here is where colonizer and colonized converge. The connection between Mr. Chaudhuri and Miss Crane climaxes in one pivotal episode—on a road. Driving along the road in Miss Crane's car, Mr. Chaudhuri accompanies Miss Crane to her residence, mindful of the politically charged riots underway at the time (*Jewel* 51-53). On the road, they encounter a violent mob; here, confirming Bakhtin's road chronotope, the spatial and temporal dimensions of the colonizer and the colonized converge. The innate cultural differences or, in Bakhtin's words, the "social distances" (244) between colonizer and colonized collapse. The image of the white woman and the brown man travelling along the road incites the rioters to violence. The Indian demonstrators view Miss Crane as the evil, dominating colonizer; they view Mr. Chaudhuri as a traitor. Miss Crane and Mr. Chaudhuri's purported alliance threatens the nationalists' endeavors; the dissolving barrier between colonized and colonizer destabilizes power structures. According to Miss

Crane, “she was about to go over the hump thirty-five years of effort and willingness had never really got her over; the hump, however high or low it was, which, however hard you tried, still lay in the path of thoughts you sent flowing out to a man or woman whose skin was a different colour from your own” (*Jewel* 55). As they approach the rioters, Miss Crane feels “an unexpected confidence” between them (55). Her regard for Mr. Chaudhuri transforms from the “white man’s burden” to “respect and the kind of affection that came from the confidence one human being could feel in another, however little had been felt before” (55). As they approached the rioters, Mr. Chaudhuri appeals to Miss Crane to drive her car forcefully into the crowd, but Edwina’s transformation prevents her from doing so (56). Human life now means more to her than control and influence over others.

The road, which functions as the meeting place of cultures, becomes a site of violence. The rioters attack and beat the travelers—Miss Crane to unconsciousness, Mr. Chaudhuri to death (*Jewel* 58-59). At this site of violence, the Indian rioters exercise power over their enemy, Miss Crane, and a traitor, Mrs. Chaudhuri. The rioters successfully halt the physical movements of both Mr. Chaudhuri and Miss Crane. Though Mr. Chaudhuri dies, Edwina’s transformation continues to a moral epiphany. In the closing image of this episode, Miss Crane sits down in the mud at the side of the road next to Mr. Chaudhuri’s body and takes his hand. Miss Crane says: “It’s taken me a long time . . . I’m sorry it was too late” (59). The scene concludes with the image of the white woman sitting at the edge of the road clasping the hand of a dead Indian (60). Several characters recall Miss Crane’s heartbreaking lament, “I’m sorry it’s too late,” some twenty years later in interviews with the narrator (446). Miss Crane laments about the

time it took for her to uncover the fallacies of the white man's burden, the injustices of imperial power. Yet Edwina's transformation is unmistakable; she regretfully reflects, "the tragedy is that between us there is this little matter of the colour of the skin, which gets in the way of our seeing through each other's failings and seeing into each other's hearts" (63). In spite of power struggles and conflicts, one's moral obligation to humanity remains intact.

After her attack, Miss Crane surrenders to silence. She receives harsh censure from the British because of her refusal to incriminate her attackers (*Jewel* 81). They "criticized her for being unable to describe the men who murdered the teacher" (155). Lili Chatterjee remembers, "Her silence was of the ominous kind, which is where the idea of harpy came in because nothing was more ominous than the silence of a European harpy" (69). But beyond her resolute silence, Miss Crane's morality radiates. Lili notes,

> She showed courage and that's the most difficult thing in the world for any human being to show and the one I respect most, especially physical courage. I usually suspect cant in all the chat that goes on about moral courage. Moral courage smells of refusal. The physical sort is like an invitation, and I find that open. I find it appealing. And in any case, you know, physical courage is not without morality. We speak of moral courage as if it's on a higher human plane, but physical courage is usually informed by moral courage too, and often couldn't be expressed without it. (72)

In the end, Miss Crane ceremoniously removes the queen's picture from her walls (63, 85). She no longer identifies with the colonizer. Instead, Miss Crane completes her transformation by committing suttee, a Hindu tradition where a widowed wife burns

herself to honor her lost love (75, 446). Miss Crane "dressed for the first time in her life in a white saree, the saree for her adopted country, the whiteness for widowhood and mourning" (113). Thereafter, she "locked herself in and soaked the walls with kerosene and set them alight and died, one hopes, in the few seconds it took for the violently heated air to scorch the breath out of her lungs" (113). Amidst the flames, Miss Crane strips herself of her imperial burdens and metaphorically weds Mr. Chaudhuri, the two becoming one.

Chapter IV

HYBRIDITY

> For there is a sense of disorientation, a disturbance of direction, in the ‘beyond’: an exploratory, restless movement . . . What is theoretically innovative, and politically crucial, is the need to think beyond narratives of originary and initial subjectivities and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. These ‘in-between’ spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity.
>
> —Homi K. Bhabha

Jewel builds its narrative on the image of the fleeing girl as illustrated in its first sentence: “Imagine, then, a flat landscape, dark for the moment, but even so conveying to a girl running in the still deeper shadow cast by the wall of the Bibighar gardens an idea of immensity, of distance” (3). This image grounds the narrative and represents the reoccurring trope of the hybrid, who traverses borders, racial and cultural divides. The image recalls the boundary-crossing abilities of the Psychopomp. In *Jewel*, the chronotopic hybrid Anglo-Indian becomes a physical representation of postcoloniality: “Time becomes, in effect, palpable and visible; the chronotope makes narrative events concrete, makes them take on flesh, causes blood to flow in their vein” (Bakhtin 250). Daphne Manners epitomizes the hybridized character in *Jewel*. She describes her compartmentalized life as one divided into “watertight compartments,” an effect of her duplicitous identity (*Jewel* 397). This chapter explores these “compartments” or spaces, specifically, the Bibighar Gardens and the MacGregor House. More importantly, I

examine the relationships Daphne forges within these spaces, including her ill-fated union with another hybrid, Hari Kumar, and her connection with Lili Chatterjee, her Indian guardian. Like Sister Ludmila and Miss Crane, Daphne Manners operates outside of the stereotypical agenda of the European colonizer in India. Instead, *Jewel* presents a girl desperately in love, unperturbed by her love's ethnicity. Daphne's indifference to color emphasizes the narrative's appeal for humanism.

Scott's text portrays its hybridized characters as Derridean "undecidables," theoretical zombies that occupy a liminal space between the living and the dead, or, in this case, between the colonizer and the colonized, the white European and the black Indian. Hybridity and liminality are critical but often controversial tropes in postcolonial and cultural studies. As discussed previously, hegemonic power relations thrive on a platform of difference, on the polarization of binary oppositions such as colonizer/colonized or white/black. In an imperial world, unequal power relations contribute to a group's fixed sense of identity. The colonizer marks his/her identity in contrast to that of the colonized, an identity based on difference. Ironically, hegemony, the domination of one group over another, triggers hybridity. Groups operating in close proximity inevitably affect and influence each other. As such, hybridity dispels the notion of identity based on strict binaries; it problematizes identity as a concrete entity, for hybrid cultures occupy liminal or ambiguous spaces. Accordingly, this chapter also examines the power-related struggles inherent in hybridized identities and spaces.

Scott situates *Jewel*'s narrative within an Anglo-Indian community. Anglo-Indians may refer to people of Indian-European heritage or to British subjects born and/or living in India. Within the limits of Scott's *Jewel*, the term Anglo-Indian functions within

the trope of hybridity. Alzena MacDonald-D'Costa recounts Anglo-Indians' history and place in India as an almost permanently "othered" place. D'Costa writes, "Anglo-Indian identity is discursively constructed as a pathetic consequence of India's invasion by European colonists" (335). Blending this history with Freud's theory of the uncanny, D'Costa argues that Anglo-Indians represent India's "unheimlich" or the uncanny. As such, Anglo-Indians have become a displaced people, ostracized by European and Indian society, characterized by a double-vision viewpoint. Seemingly "untainted" systems or fixed English and Indian structures deem Anglo-Indians, whether of mixed race or of mixed culture, as Other, undecideables. Hari Kumar arguably embodies *Jewel*'s treatment of the hybrid more than any other character. Superficially, Hari is an Indian man; however, as Daphne describes him, "except for the colour of his skin he wasn't an Indian at all" (*Jewel* 369). Hari lived all his life in England from the age of two (374). He attends a prestigious school, adopts the manners of the upper crust, and largely identifies with English culture. When his father goes bankrupt and dies, Hari returns to India, a homeless and destitute young man. He has no connection to or recollection of India when he is thrust into this unknown space. Hari yields to the kind mercies of his Aunt Shalini, living the isolated, "othered" life of an Anglo-Indian.

Reiterating MacDonald's assertions, Anglo-Indians represent India's uncanny, the repressed Other. The Indian nationalists, in addition to resisting the imperialist, must also reject Anglo-Indians, for they represent, in part, India's subjugation. Likewise, while the imperialists may have manipulated the Anglo-Indian community for their own gain, Anglo-Indians could never be the imperialists' equal. Ostracized by Europeans and Indians, the Anglo-Indians are a displaced people. In *Jewel*, Anglo-Indians include

English characters separated from their privileged status, characters contending with learned racial prejudices, while continually seeking to cross the boundary into native India. The text also features Indian characters grappling with the implications of their English education and sensibilities, while trying to survive in a society that views them as traitors. These characters, despite their distinctive narratives, undergo the experiences and tragedies of the Anglo-Indian. Hari thinks, speaks, and operates as Harry, an Englishman; yet he is "invisible" to white society and forced to live as Hari with the blacks "on the wrong side of the river" (*Jewel* 229). Language barriers compound his meager circumstances. Hari/Harry cannot speak the Indian language; he speaks English more properly than authentic Englishmen. He even portrays "white" prejudices against Indians: "He felt an unexpected resistance to the ideas of an Indian doing an Englishman's work. When he paused to consider this resistance he realized that he had responded as a member of a subject race. The thought alarmed him" (256). In one poignant scene, Colin Lindsey, Harry's white friend, fails to recognize Hari amidst the other brown faces; the incident affects Hari immensely. Harry depends on Lindsey's letters to wane his "diaspora," but Hari receives a rude awakening when Lindsey crosses into the Indian world: "I am invisible," says Hari, "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 makes me disappear. I am nothing" (269). This moment indicates Hari's full realization and acceptance of his status as the invisible Anglo-Indian.

Possibly more than any other motif, the chronotope of the hybrid defines postcoloniality. Colonization necessarily shoved different cultures together, which heightened the need for both sides to maintain autonomous identities—an impossibility.

Daphne and Kumar's relationship rattled any sense of demarcated identities. *Jewel* questions the legitimacy of identity, particularly as it relates to race, culture, and nationality. After a colonized nation gains independence, the search for an identity separate from the colonizer typically ensues. However, an absolute, autonomous identity remains inaccessible. In a telling passage in *Jewel*, the text describes the two nations as "locked in an imperial embrace of such long standing and subtlety it was no longer possible for them to know whether they hated or loved one another, or what it was that held them together and seemed to have confused the image of their separate destinies" (3). This "imperial embrace" thwarts the ostensible difference that marks identities and produces hybridized spaces. As discussed in Chapter 1, even on a linguistic level, the concept of identity is arbitrary and often fluid. What constitutes identity? Certainly, identity involves race, culture, ethnicity, and nationality, but unsurprisingly, these elements present conflict. For example, what role does nationality play in cementing one's identity? According to Benedict Anderson, nationality develops not from material elements but from socially constructed ideologies. He defines nation as

> an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign … it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings. (6-7)

Daphne debunks the purported definitiveness of an English identity, exposing its façade. She moves uninterruptedly within the white-only club behind the mask of conformity:

“Played the game. And again felt how easy it was, how simple. To act at conforming. Because all the time there was nothing to conform with, except an idea, a charade played round a phrase: white superiority” (*Jewel* 411). Daphne writes about the imagined community among the English, describing the obligatory gatherings of the whites as mandatory meetings to assure themselves of their status. Ultimately, she views such interaction as a “forced” companionship or, more accurately, imprisonment (372).

Daphne’s blurred sense of culture underscores the arbitrariness of identity. Recent cultural-studies scholars reject race as a marker of identity. Howard Winant writes, “In the twenty-first century, race will no longer be invoked to legitimate the crucial social structures of inequality, exploitation, and injustice … Law, political and human rights, as well as concepts of equality, fairness, and human difference will therefore increasingly be framed in ‘race-neutral terms’” (39). Likewise, Omi and Winant contend,

> In contrast to the other major distinction of this type, that of gender, there is no biological basis for distinguishing among human groups along the lines of race. Indeed, the categories employed to differentiate among human groups along racial lines reveal themselves, upon serious examination, to be at best imprecise, and at worst completely arbitrary. (55)

While the projection of race as a social construction, a nonentity, has become politically correct, should scholars erase racial considerations from literary criticism while racism continues in practice?

Jewel demonstrates that race played a role in imperial power structures. Within the narrative’s hegemonized spaces, the white race dominates non-whites socially, politically, economically and otherwise. The color of one’s skin indicates to a large

extent a person's influence or authority. Despite political and social validations, color remains a superficial element of identity because the relation between race and identity is arbitrary. Race does not determine Englishness or Indianness. As Michael Gorra writes in *After Empire*, "'Englishness' may be an acquired characteristic, a matter of culture, not color" (2). However, Hari's education and culture, that is, his Englishness, "meant nothing in India, because he lived with his aunt in one of the houses in Chillianwallah Bagh—which was on the wrong side of the river" (*Jewel* 375). Within the colonized *space* of India are other bordered spaces arranged by class and caste. Hari does not speak Hindi well (382). Ludmila recalls, "To hear him speak you might think him Coomer. But to see him, well Coomer was impossible. And the name of course was rightly Kumar" (126). This proper Englishness offends Merrick, for even Hari's English accent is superior to Merrick's (135). In India, Hari does not identify with the Indians, and the British society there does not accept him either. His "Englishness" separates him from the Indians, while his "Indianness" and station segregate him from the English.

Nikos Papastergiadis posits that hybridity responds to identity as constructed through "a negotiation of difference . . . [hybridity acknowledges] that the presence of fissures, gaps and contradictions [in the making of identity] is not necessarily a sign of failure" (258). Cultural hybrids destabilize the fixed sense of identity on the part of the colonizer and colonized. Werbner identifies this threat as "the transgressive power of symbolic hybrids to subvert categorical oppositions and hence to create the conditions for cultural reflexivity and change" (1). While some critics hold that "all cultures are hybrid"—a "historically negotiated creation of more or less coherent symbolic and social worlds" (Werbner 15)—generally, groups cling to that aforementioned "imagined"

community or belongingness to legitimize their identity or sameness. Stemming from India's own caste system, the Indian elites often adopt white European culture, aligning themselves with an English identity, creating the space for cultural hybridity. In spite of the racial divides and the hegemonic domination of the white colonizers, as the narrative progresses, it further complicates identity by hybridizing English and Indian culture. The narrator asks about Hari's doubleness: "Where does one draw the line under the story of Hari Kumar, Harry Coomer: the story of him prior to Bibighar?" (*Jewel* 242). Hari "hung on to his Englishness as if it were some kind of protective armour" (233). Colin's letters were "proof" that "his English experience had not been imagined" (242). However, he quickly realizes that they no longer speak the same (figurative) language due to the stark contrast between the spaces they now occupy (254). Instead, his Englishness guarantees his misfortunes. In his mind, he becomes invisible to the English (242), for "[i]n India an Indian and an Englishman could never meet on equal terms" (248).

The hybrid identity as an unknown or non-fixed entity instills fear among the purportedly fixed and resolute identities. Gloria Anzaldúa captures this negotiation between cultures in her treatise on the "mestiza consciousness" (77). She writes,

> In a constant state of mental nepantilism, an Aztec word meaning torn between ways, *la mestiza* is a product of the transfer of the cultural and spiritual values of one group to another. Being tricultural, monolingual, bilingual, or multilingual, speaking a patois, and in a state of perpetual transition, the *mestiza* faces the dilemma of the mixed breed: which collectivity does the daughter of a darkskinned mother listen to? (78)

In her journal, Daphne describes the hybridized life as something "[t]o be rejected … you have to come *right out* with something they see as directly and forcefully opposed to what they think they believe in. To be accepted you have to be seen and heard to appear to stand for what they think they believe in. To be neither one thing nor the other is probably unforgiveable" (397). Racial or cultural difference such as black and white instinctively draws border lines, almost mechanically demarcates spaces. However, the hybrid resides on neither sides of the border. The hybrid, like the Psychopomp, traverses spaces and crosses borders. The hybrid exists in perpetual liminality, in a state of in-betweenness.

In his seminal text *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha notes that the "social articulation of difference, from the minority perspective, is a complex, on-going negotiation that seeks to authorize cultural hybridities that emerge in moments of historical transformation" (3). Bhabha treats hybridity as an empowering response to hegemony, arguing that

> liminal space, in-between the designations of identity, becomes the process of symbolic interaction, the connective tissue that constructs the difference between upper and lower, black and white … the temporal movement and passage that it allows, prevents identities at either end of it from settling into primordial polarities. This interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy. (5)

Bhabha celebrates the possibilities of cultural hybridity, advocating a multicultural shift in formerly colonized spaces. His vision of globalized hybridity appears hopeful but,

arguably, romanticized as it ignores the continued advent of cultural domination and neo-imperialism. In other words, the power capacity for globalized hybridity seems exponential, and in some respects, it is. Fluid identities and multicultural communities appear inevitable in the era of globalization; a multicultural reality obviously threatens dominating power structures. However, the theory ignores the power capacity of organized factions. Power and the struggle to attain or maintain control remain at the forefront of most human, social, and political interactions.

In *Jewel*, Lili Chatterjee likewise problematizes the definition of "Indian" because of her status. She holds a privileged position and title among polite society and frequently entertains English officials and respectable Indians in her home, the MacGregor House. The MacGregor House, Lili's residence, represents a place of "trust, compromise, something fundamentally exploratory and noncommittal, as if the people in it were trying to *learn*, instead of teach—and so forgive rather than accuse" (*Jewel* 444). Here, Lili strives to foster a hybridized space. Indeed, both English and Indian gather in this space, but the division remains palpable. Lili's leeway is also restricted. Lili cannot enter the white club (371) or the white-section of the hospital (80), for instance. Like every other character, Chatterjee faces a challenging moral dilemma. While she assumes guardianship over Daphne, the niece of her British colleagues, she unavoidably carries the weight of her people. As Daphne points out, "well-off privileged Indians like Lili have a sort of deep-rooted guilt that they bury under layers of what looks like indifference, because there's so little they can individually do to lessen the horror and the poverty. They subscribe to charities and do voluntary work, but must feel it's like trying to dam up a river with a handful of twigs" (392-93). Lili straddles the line between her

Indian heritage and her respectability (72). Of course, her strictly identified respectability plays a role in only certain spaces. Like Sister Ludmila, Lili lives in regret. Lili wishes she had intervened somehow in the distressed lives of people she has encountered: “I often wish I could have that time all over again, but knowing what I know now,” she tells the stranger. “Not just for Daphne’s sake, but for Miss Crane’s sake. I think I could have stopped Miss Crane from becoming sannyasi in that especially horrible way” (84). Despite Lili’s prejudices, the narrative propels its characters toward a moral transformation, toward a place of primary humanism.

Daphne’s journey seems to start where Miss Crane’s journey ends. At the proverbial and literal “end of the road,” Miss Crane recognizes the misgivings in her moral outlook as it relates to Indians. Daphne moves past that realization and seeks to quell the differences that separate English and Indian identities. Her mother often derided India, while her father adored the colony. The juxtaposition drives Daphne to form her own perceptions of India: “I grew to feel sorry for it, and then to love it and want it for its own sake” (*Jewel* 377). Her moment of epiphany climaxes with her love affair with Hari. But before the affair, Daphne views Mayapore as compartmentalized spaces: “just the house, the road to the cantonment bazaar, the road to the hospital, the maidan, the club” (390). Her life is torn among the various roles she fulfills in these chronotopic spaces: snobbery at the club among the English, insincere racial integration at the MacGregor House during Lili’s parties. Each space demonstrates particular temporal and spatial dimensions of strained Anglo-Indian relations. But at Bibighar with Hari, Daphne becomes whole. Daphne characterizes the three spaces: “At the club you stood on *loud*, committed ground. At the MacGregor House it was silent and determinedly neutral. With

Hari I began to feel that here at last was ground wholly personal to me, where I might learn to talk in my own tone of voice" (390). At the turning point, Daphne recognizes the arbitrariness of her compartmentalized life, and her view of India extends to "the other side of the river and, because of that, in all directions" (390). Twenty years later in an interview with the narrator, Ludmila reflects on Daphne's "wholeness," a virtue Ludmila admits she never possessed (143).

The hybrid also becomes a public spectacle, operating in a seemingly panoptic model. Foucault claims that "the Panopticon must not be understood as a dream building: it is the diagram of a mechanism of power reduced to its ideal form . . . it is in fact a figure of political technology" (205). Major social institutions such as schools and hospitals adopted the panoptic mechanism of power as a means of imposing order. The contemporary panopticon, as evident in Scott's Anglo-India, becomes "a faceless gaze that transformed the whole social body into a field of perception . . . a long hierarchized network . . . this unceasing observation" (214). In effect, the colonized subjects regulate themselves in accordance with the panoptic system, "a real subjection is born mechanically from a fictitious relation" (202). Though Harry claims to be invisible to white people (*Jewel* 152), the text portrays him as consistently under the gaze of white people—Merrick, Daphne, other women (153). Ludmila says, "I saw white women, how they watched him on the sly. He was handsome in the western way, in spite of his dark skin" (126). The pair, Daphne and Hari, cannot visit any other space but Bibighar without being observed (400). Daphne feels as though she and Hari are "exhibits," anomalies on display (393). Interestingly, Bibighar becomes the ultimate platform of display for the hybrids as assailants observe and assault the lovers in the garden.

Daphne describes Bibighar, which means "house of women" (138), as "the one place in Mayapore where [she and Hari] could be together and be utterly natural with each other" (379). Elsewhere, their union cannot exist, and they are persistently bombarded with the "pressure and disapproval from outside" (382). Bibighar offers them—for a time—a space for union. Daphne describes this space as a "restricted, dangerous little space" (390). Her love for Hari compels her to evolve, to change; she writes, "only by making yourself [meaning herself] tiny could you squeeze into it and stand, imprisoned but free, diminished by everything that loomed from outside, *but not diminished from the inside*" (390). At Bibighar, Daphne encounters a feeling that was neither Indian nor British but "general and universal … a general human emotion" (398). As they make love, Daphne recounts, "this was not me and Hari. Entering me he made me cry out. And then it was us" (417). Before, the pronouns *us* and *them* held significant value in differentiating between black and white, between colonizers and colonized. Daphne's intimate reference symbolizes an unencumbered bond or oneness between lovers. As much as miscegenation was detested by the British at the time, the coupling of Hari and Daphne offends the British because it involves factors other than race, such as gender inequality. Daphne notes, "they couldn't face with equanimity the breaking of the most fundamental law of all—that although a white man could make love to a black girl, the black man and white girl association was still taboo" (367). Daphne captures the tension in gendered power relations:

> The [white] women look worse than the men because consciousness of physical superiority is unnatural to us. A white man in India can feel physically superior without unsexing himself. But what happens to a woman if she tells herself that

> 99 per cent of the men she sees are not men at all, but creatures of an inferior species whose colour is their main distinguishing mark? What happens when you unsex a nation, treat it like a nation of eunuchs? Because that's what we've done, isn't it? (411)

In other words, society tolerates and even accepts sex between white men and Indian girls; the union mirrors the metaphorical rape of British over India. However, sex between white women and Indian men revolts society's supposedly proper conventions. The situation emphasizes the fact that gender is as much a component in social and power relations as race and class. In the colonized Anglo-Indian space, race dictates authority. Class defines status. Gender complicates the power structures because women, white and black, are subject to men. Herein lies Daphne's laments.

Ultimately, the rape reveals the threat hybridity represents. Hybridity threatens to subvert established orders, political systems and power structures in Scott's text. Cultural hybrids undergo much resistance. Between five and six men accost the post-coital pair, battering Hari, raping Daphne (*Jewel* 417). After the assault, Hari weeps: "He cried for shame … for what had happened to [Daphne] that he'd been powerless to stop" (418). Almost unintelligibly, he begs Daphne for forgiveness. For what reason does he seek forgiveness? For his inability to protect her? For the crimes of his gender? For the sins of the Indians? Thereafter, Hari and Daphne "clung to each other like two children frightened of the dark" (418). Fearing Hari's own safety, Daphne pushes him away and swears him to secrecy despite his appeals and confessions of love (419). He promises her his silence. Then, she runs. The running girl exposes the mystery of the text's opening image. Ironically, Daphne runs to preserve their union. She recognizes the dangers of

their actions: “All that I saw was the danger to him as a black man carrying me through a gateway that opened on to the world of white people” (421). They both hereafter deny their encounter that fateful night. The rape represents another element of power relations between the whites and the blacks. The Indians assert power when Daphne accepted an intimate relationship from a black man. She “invites” them into her space: “They assaulted me because they had watched an Indian making love to me. The taboo was broken for them” (421). Her actions ironically empower them to violate the hybridized space she and Hari construct.

Returning to Scott’s moral continuum, Daphne and Kumar attempt to build a relationship steeped in love; their affections transgress boundaries. Daphne attempts to erase the differences grounded in years of tense racial history. Unlike Miss Crane (before her moment of epiphany), Daphne resists the ideology behind the white man’s burden:

> I thought that the whole bloody affair of *us* in India had reached flash point. It was bound to because it was based on a violation. Perhaps at one time there was a moral as well as a physical force at work. But the moral thing had gone sour … the moral issue has gone sour on them as well as on us. We’re back to basics, the basic issue of who jumps and who says jump. Call it by any fancy name you like … It’s become a vulgar scramble for power on their part and an equally vulgar smug hanging-on on ours. And the greater their scramble the greater our smugness. You can’t hide that any longer because the moral issue, if it ever really existed at all, is dead. It’s our fault it’s dead because it was our responsibility to widen it, but we narrowed it down and narrowed it down by never suiting actions to words. (*Jewel* 411-12)

Her rape exposes the fallacies imbedded in the purported imperial mothering; that morality tries to veil the power struggles at play. That morality is dead.

Scott purposefully chooses a "flawed" English girl to fulfill this significant, hybridized role rather than a virginal Victorian "Angel in the House." By the purported, rigid English conventions, Daphne's moral standards are less than ideal. Daphne admits to having explored her sexuality long before Hari, long before the rape (*Jewel* 363). However, her carnal desires pale in comparison to her love for Hari. In fact, Daphne divulges, "It is only Hari I have ever loved" (363). She continues, "I was in love with him. I wanted him near me. I told myself I didn't care what people said. I didn't care what he'd done, or what people like Ronald Merrick thought he'd done or was capable of doing. I wanted to protect him from danger" (410). After Daphne loses Hari, she determines to bear his child. The birth promises to realize the equality she desires: "This is why, especially, the child I bear is important to me. … its skin may be as dark as Hari's or almost as pale as mine, or somewhere in between. But whatever colour—he, or she, is part of my flesh and blood; my own typically ham-fisted offerings to the future" (364). Intuiting her approaching death, Daphne implores her aunt, Lady Manners, to mind the child (376-77). Her child becomes the physical representation of the hybrid, the pinnacle of what Daphne calls her "vindication" (376).

After the Bibighar rape, the English further condemn Miss Manners, while the Indians express some sympathy: "out of it, out of all its mysteries, to them [the Indians] there seemed to be at least one thing that emerged … That Daphne Manners had loved them. And had not betrayed them, even when it seemed that they had betrayed her" (*Jewel* 158). Silence emerges in this space as well. As with Miss Crane, power shifts back

into Daphne's hands after the assault, but she refuses to divulge the details of the rape; she refuses to incriminate her attackers. Thereafter, the British mistreat and eventually exile Daphne for being unwilling to abort her "othered" child. Daphne denies the English "public revenge" and so incurs their hatred (156). She even tells the detective that "they [meaning the rapists] could have been British soldiers with their faces blacked" (440). Instead of retaliation, Daphne chooses silence, a silence she breaks only in her journals and just before her death (361). Her silent protest responds to the silent conspiracy seen earlier in the novel such as when both Merrick and Chatterjee keep the details of Hari's arrest from Daphne, knowing that Hari's unprovoked confinement would only drive the girl more quickly to the Indian. Daphne later realizes "the *extent* of the silence that surrounded this association" as a conspiracy "rooted in love as well as fear" (366-67). Even then, they kept the knowledge of Hari's condition following the Bibighar event. Daphne responds in a like manner, in silence: "Your silence is for what you believe is my good, and mine has been for what I think is Hari's" (364). Likewise, Hari keeps his honor and refuses to speak of Bibighar except to deny that he had seen Daphne (449). He maintains silence in the midst of accusations and in spite of his innocence. Daphne recognizes his silence as a further indication of Hari's Englishness: "acting like a white man should when a girl made him give a promise … It was marvelous. Marvelous because he was black" (450). Harry ultimately loses his identity. As the narrator notes, "Kumar was a man who felt in the end he had lost everything, even his Englishness, and could then only meet every situation—even the most painful—in silence" (339). Daphne's journal cradles the silences in her life. Thereafter, Daphne "surrounded herself,

and Kumar's memory, with this kind of silence. They hated her for it. The Europeans" (155). Silence functions as a final defense against society's scorn.

Daphne's rape and pregnancy evoke repercussions beyond the Anglo-Indian boundaries, creating a stir in England, among the English society where her aunt, Lady Manners, resides. The moral codes of this space and time urge the people to condemn and scandalize Daphne, as well as Lady Manners. In effect, Daphne's taint smears Lady Manners' reputation, and her community exiles her too. Daphne apologizes to her aunt for the "trouble and embarrassment" she has caused (*Jewel* 361). She writes, "I sometimes try to put myself in your shoes and work out what it must be like to be the aunt of 'that Manners girl.' I know that's how people speak of me and think of me, and that it rubs off onto you" (361). Furthering the text's construction of the moral continuum, Lady Manners must choose between her loyalty to her people or to her niece. She chooses to help carry Daphne's burden. In a letter to her aunt, Daphne applauds her aunt's "loving care" and thanks her for "voluntarily taking on the responsibility for me, and for never once making me feel this was a burden" (361). The moral continuum of human affairs includes a conventional Englishwoman, torn between her sense of self and what may be considered her moral obligation. Conversely, the general English society chooses to ostracize the tainted girl who refuses to cast aside her connection with the Indians. Lady Manners chooses basic human compassion, while the incriminators call for Daphne "To get rid. To abort. To tear the disgusting embryo out of the womb and throw it to the pi-dogs" (151).

Daphne gives her life to realize the bond between the two races through her child: "she carried India in her belly" (*Jewel* 155). Though she dies after childbirth, her

daughter represents more than the love between her parents (450). Parvati represents the hope of an undivided nation, and so Daphne's journey ends in hope. Her fight for oneness with Hari is realized in her daughter. The continuity of the text's moral continuum emerges in the final pages of *Jewel*. Mirroring the image that opens the narrative, *Jewel* concludes with the image of a fleeing girl. This time, the girl is Daphne's brown child, Parvati, running towards her own future as she waves to the stranger (462). The "moral continuum of human affairs" continues.

Chapter V

CONCLUSION

> Humanity expects other things from us than this grotesque and generally obscene emulation. … for ourselves and for humanity, comrades, we must make a new start, develop a new way of thinking, and endeavor to create a new man.
>
> —Frantz Fanon

The discussions of space, power and hybridity in Scott's *Jewel* remain applicable in our postcolonial world. Globalization has secured matters of identity as pertinent factors within and outside of literary studies. The postcolonial world has become a multicultural, transnationalized space or "a place of mixture" (Young 129). Hybridity has arguably become the norm, while the notion of autonomous identity, increasingly problematic. In spite of the cultural amalgamation, hybridity does not negate social and global power structures. Unequal power relations remain a central component in the postcolonial world as much as the inevitability of multiculturalism. Blurred borders impact one's identity, but in the politicized economy, space and history indicate political power, as evident in the juxtaposition of the "West" versus the "Third World." Yet to demarcate strict boundaries between, as Hall puts it, the "West and the Rest" is misleading because the western world houses wretched spaces, while Third World displays obvious pockets of affluence.

Underscoring the theoretical debates on identity and power is the (mis)distribution of wealth and the reality of poverty. In contemporary India, "people starve to death …not

because there is no food, but because they have no entitlement to the food that is there" (Young 135). Young notes that while India maintains a high food-production rate, political corruption and bureaucracy have resulted in rampant malnutrition across the country. This lack of responsibility or morality underscores Scott's narrative. Historical and political crimes impact today's reality; however, it does not dissolve basic human compassion. As Scott's text reveals, an opportunity to enact human dignity resides in every space, regardless of its political or social entrapments. This is not to say, however, that political corruption should be ignored. Particularly, the remaining books of *The Raj Quartet* demonstrate the consequences of a depraved government in the context of India's struggle for independence. Book four, in particular, illustrates the graphic collision of forces during the Partition. Also, the sequel to the *Quartet*, *Staying On*, reveals the aftereffects of the Partition, where the political and social structures under imperialism recur under the guise of independence and capitalism. Dominance exists outside of hegemony, in other words.

Still, Scott's *Jewel* envisions a world where differences, particularly racial differences, invalidate discrimination, a world where intercultural diversity becomes the norm. Miss Crane journeys toward this revelation, and Daphne accomplishes a hybridized reality and liminality. Scott's fatalism cannot be ignored, however. As she clasps Mr. Chauduri's dead hand, Miss Crane cries, "I'm sorry it's too late" (413), while Daphne does not live to see the product of her and Hari's love. The fatalistic occurrences in the narrative emphasize two ideas. One, Scott resists idealism and accepts or recognizes the fallibility of human nature. However, the advent of humanity that occurs within the inevitable trauma anticipates the second idea—the moral continuum to which

Scott subscribes. Sister Ludmila's Sanctuary promotes human dignity even within troubled times; it also highlights the importance of humanism, a morality grounded in basic human compassion. Applied outside of its literary context, Scott's narrative urges the empowered—keeping in mind that power exists everywhere and in every human interaction—to take responsibility for the "untouchables" of our postcolonial world.

WORKS CITED

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. London: Verso, 2006. Print.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. *Borderlands: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987. Print.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?" *Critical Inquiry* 17.2 (1991): 336-57. Print.

Arnold, Kathleen R. "Homelessness and Panopticism." *Homelessness, Citizenship, and Identity: The Uncanniness of Late Modernity*. New York: State U of New York P, 2004. 87-128. Print.

Bakhtin, M. M. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. 1981. Austin: U of Texas P, 2008. 84-258. Print.

Banerjee, Jacqueline. "Women of Affairs: Contrasting Images of Empire in Paul Scott's *The Raj Quartet*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 44.3 (2009): 69-85. Print.

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

Bignall, Simone. "Postcolonial Agency and Poststructuralist Thought: Deleuze and Foucault on Desire and Power." *Angelaki: Journal of the Theoretical Humanities* 13.1 (2008): 127-47. Print.

Boyer, Allen. "Love, Sex, and History in *The Raj Quartet.*" *Modern Language Quarterly* 46.1 (1985): 64-80. Print.

Childs, Peter. *Paul Scott's Raj Quartet: History and Division*. Toronto: U of Victoria, 1998. Print.

Crane, Ralph J. “Playing the White Man: Ronald Merrick, Whiteness, and Erotic Triangles in Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet*.” *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 39.1 (2004): 19-28. *Print.*

D’Cruz, Glenn. “My Two Left Feet: The Problem of Anglo-Indian Stereotypes in Post-Independence Indo-English Fiction.” *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 38.2 (2003): 105-23. Print.

Derbyshire, John. “The Unrecorded Man.” *New Criterion* 26.6 (2008): 11-16. Print.

Derrida, Jacques. “Differance.” 1967. *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Boston: Bedford, 2007. 932-49. Print.

---. “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences.” 1966. *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Boston: Bedford, 2007. 914-26. Print.

Disraeli, Benjamin. *Wit and Wisdom of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. London: Longmans, 1886. Print.

DuBois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: Dover, 1994. Print.

Eagleton, Terry. *After Theory*. New York: Basic Books, 2004. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. 1961. New York: Grove, 2004. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977. Print.

---. *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Random House, 1978. Print.

---. “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History.” *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rainbow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. Print.

---. “Prison Talk.” *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980. Print.

---. “Subject and Power.” *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1983. Print.

---. “Two Lectures.” *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1980. Print.

Fredric, Jameson. *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*. Princeton, Princeton UP, 1972. Print.

García-Canclini, Néstor. *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. 1989. MN: U of Minnesota P, 2005. Print.

Gorra, Michael. *After Empire: Scott, Naipaul, Rushdie*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997. Print.

Gutting, Gary. *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Haswell, Janis. “Images of Rape and Buggery: Paul Scott’s View of the Dual Evils of Empire.” *Studies in the Novel* 33.2 (2001): 202-23. Print.

Hitchens, Christopher. “Victoria’s Secret.” *Atlantic Monthly (10727825)* 301.1 (2008): 121-27. Print.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981. Print.

---. *The Prison-House of Language: A Critical Account of Structuralism and Russian Formalism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1972. Print.

Kraidy, Marwan M. “Hybridity in Cultural Globalization.” *Communication Theory* 12:3 (2003): 316-39. Print.

MacDonald-D'Costa, Alzena. "India's Uncanny: Anglo-Indians as (Post)colonial Gothic." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 23.3 (2009): 335-49. Print.

Mahoney, Blair. "Book Reviews." *Contemporary South Asia* 8.2 (1999): 261-62. Print.

Mezey, Jason Howard. "Mourning the Death of the Raj? Melancholia as Historical Engagement in Paul Scott's *Raj Quartet*." *Studies in the Novel* 38.3 (2006): 327-52. Print.

Mijares, Loretta. "'You Are an Anglo-Indian?' Eurasians and Hybridity and Cosmopolitanism in Salman Rushdie's *Midnight's Children*." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 38.2 (2003): 124-45. Print.

Nealon, Jeffrey T. *Foucault Beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications since 1984*. Stanford: Stanford U P, 2008. Print.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. "Racial Formations." *Racial Formation in the United States from the 1960s to the 1990s*. London: Routledge, 1994. 53-76. Print.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. "Tracing Hybridity in Theory." *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. London: Zed, 1997. 257-81. Print.

Richter, David. "Postcolonialism and Ethnic Studies." *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. New York: Bedford, 2007. 1753-76. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. "Outside the Whale." *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta, 1991. 87-101. Print.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. Print.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. Preface. *The Wretched of the Earth*. By Frantz Fanon. 1961. New York: Grove, 2004. xliii-lxii. Print.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. 1923. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Print.

Scott, Paul. *The Day of the Scorpion*. New York: William Morrow, 1976. Print.

---. *The Jewel in the Crown.* New York: William Morrow, 1976. Print.

---. *The Raj Quartet*. New York: William Morrow, 1976. Print.

Shome, Raka. "Space Matters: The Power and Practice of Space." *Communication Theory* 13.1 (2003): 39-56. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*. NY: Columbia UP, 2010. Print.

Trinh T. Minh-ha. *Woman Native Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1989. Print.

Weinbaum, Francine S. "Paul Scott's India: *The Raj Quartet*." *Critique* 20.1 (1978): 100-10. Print.

Werbner, Pnina. "The Dialectics of Cultural Hybridity." *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. London: Zed, 1997. 1-26. Print.

Whitaker, Reg. *The End of Privacy: How Total Surveillance is Becoming a Reality*. New York: New P, 1999.

White, Hayden. "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact." 1974. *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Boston: Bedford, 2007. 1383-97. Print.

Winant, Howard. *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War II*. New York: Basic, 2001. Print.