RACIALIZING WHITE RESIDUES: SEDITIOUS ANGLO-INDIANS AND OTHERS

BY

DEBOJOY CHANDA

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2018

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Anustup Basu, Chair
Associate Professor Susan Koshy
Associate Professor Manisha Basu
Associate Professor James Hansen

ABSTRACT

My dissertation interrogates the discursive residues of the notorious colonially instituted Anglo-Indian question in decolonized India. To problematize these residues, I structure my dissertation as a fragmented genealogy of default colonial and post-colonial perceptions of Anglo-Indians as sexually and racially 'fallen.' Via this piecemeal genealogy, I ultimately argue that Anglo-Indians inhabit what Anglo-Indian anti-racism activist Cedric Dover would call *mongrel bodies*. These bodies, given their infinite and indeterminate racial intermixture, are in a state of continual flux, thus defying reduction to a question in firmly delineable terms of race.

Complicating the Anglo-Indian question further, I read into some figurations of 'fallen' Anglo-Indians from the genealogy, retrieving traces of acts by which these figurations protested their condensation into a racial question. As I show, these figurations did so by performing the intermixed character of their mongrel bodies at levels that included biopolitics, law, gender, citizenship, literature, censorship, and language. Examining these performances of intermixture, I suggest that in the final reckoning, the unavoidable factor of racial indeterminacy should be perceived as straddling not only Anglo-Indians but *all* groups. The end of the decolonized Indian nation-state, I accordingly gesture, is to recognize mongrelism as an inevitable phenomenon—one that fractures closed categories of race and community. This phenomenon thus engenders a coming community of mongrels that rejects reduction into otherness in terms of 'fallenness.'

Demonstrating the beginnings that shaped Anglo-Indians along the lines of sexual and racial fallenness, I discuss the colonial delineation of the Anglo-Indian question through readings of texts by American sociologist Edward Reuter, Anglo-Indian philanthropist Kenneth Wallace, and Cedric Dover. In doing so, I demonstrate how, after 1857, the discourse of fallenness helped imperialist historiographers and novelists such as George Dodd, George Trevelyan, James Grant,

and Philip Meadows Taylor demarcate Anglo-Indians as a threat to English governance in India. The irony to this claim, as Anglo-Indian 'prostitute' Amelia Horne insinuates in her 1913 memoirs, is that 'English' becomes a mixed racial and governmental category in a colony.

When the Anglo-Indian question spills over into decolonized India, it brings with it figurations of Anglo-Indian women ranging from prostitutes reminiscent of Horne, to prestigious teachers of English literature and the English language. I contend that in its emphasis on prestige, this spectrum intermixes and fractures discourses of Anglo-Indian fallenness. I argue this point through examinations of post-1947 texts by Bangla novelists Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay and Narendranath Mitra, Indian cartoonist Mario Miranda, Bangla filmmaker Aparna Sen, and Indian cabaret dancer Miss Shefali. The problem to the colonial-era prestige associated with English literature and the English language, I assert, is that the English literary canon paradoxically helped frame Anglo-Indians in terms of the discourses of fallenness I speak of, thus subjecting its Anglo-Indian readers to self-alienation. The end of the English canon, though, sees an Anglo-Indian authorial voice emerging into self-recognition through its calculated dilution of the sanctity of the canon. I outline this process of self-recognition through readings of texts by Aubrey Menen and Ruskin Bond, both of who were racially intermixed at multiple levels.

In the final reckoning, as I discuss, Anglo-Indians constitute neither a monolithic race nor a monolithic community. There are in fact multiple Anglo-Indian communities, with their internal configurations of race and sex constantly changing. I outline this point through a reading of a 2012 televised documentary by Dhiraj Singh and a 2015 novel by Indian journalist Vikas Kumar Jha. My claim paves the way for recognizing indefinite racial and sexual intermixture as defining not only Anglo-Indian bodies but *all* bodies, rendering the Indian nation-state a uniform space of mongrels and mongrelism rather than that of a 'good' racial majority and its others.

To My Parents Durgadas Chanda and Sumita Chanda

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: TALES OF MONGRELISM: FICTIONS OF DEGENERACY AND RACIAL INTERMIXTURE, AND EURASIANS IN INDIA

caste*:* a breed*, race,…*orig*. a 'pure' breed*

- *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*

race: *the descendants of a common ancestor*; family; a *breed*, or variety

- *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*

genera: (from…to "generate," to "produce"), *generation*, family, *race* or kind

- *First Book of Etymology*

degenerate: (from "*genus*"): to *sink* from one's *genus* or *race*; to *fall* from a nobler state

- *First Book of Etymology*

My dissertation's fundamental topic of inquiry is a racial discourse that the British Government produced in colonial India after 1857, and the post-colonial trajectory and avatars of this discourse. This was a discourse that, drawing upon and transposing Anglo-American associations of mixed race upon Eurasians in India, reductively codified Eurasians as racially, and therefore sexually, degenerate.[1] To put it differently, the founding tenet of this codification was that being of 'mixed' and not of 'pure' European breed, Eurasians in India were tautologically 'degenerate' in body and mind. The molding of a Eurasian community along these lines of degeneracy was, I would hazard, significant to inaugurating discourses of racialization in India, the notion of a mixed race being central to categorizations of race overall.

In the first part of my dissertation, I discuss how, until the formal decolonization of India, the British Government constructed India's Eurasians in terms of racial degeneracy, thus

constituting Eurasian bodies as a 'problem.' 'Fallen' despite being partially descended from a previously privileged European stock, these hypersexual bodies of mixed race had to be carved as 'Indian' and a 'problem' to parallelly sustain conceptions of British racial supremacy in India.[2] The heart of the problem, though, was that Eurasians were reluctant to be cast as a problem: being of white stock, they demanded the right to work under the British Government, and to be politically identified as citizens of the British metropole. I argue that the colonial production of Eurasians as 'half-castes,' that is, as a mixed race, undoes the attachment of the discourse of degeneracy to their bodies, the color 'white' as a signifier of some 'unmixed' race being itself a problematic coordinate in that whiteness is actually in a continuous state of flux. As Eurasian anti-racism activist Cedric Dover (1904-61) famously put it in a 1936 article critiquing racial segregation and miscegenation discourse in the United States of America, "The truth is…that there are no half-castes because there are no full-castes" (*Know This of Race* 31).

Inhabiting the colonially produced fictions of racial degeneracy I allude to, Eurasians in India, from 1858, occupied what I term the space of 'sexual sedition,' that is, the space of a sexual outlaw as an unnamable hypersexual monstrosity—a monstrosity claimed to threaten colonial governance. The transposition of race upon sexuality indicated by the term is not opposed to the notion of racial degeneracy I speak of: discourses of racial and sexual degeneracy can seamlessly fold into each other.[3] Despite, or perhaps precisely because of their molding as hypersexual figures, Eurasians in India functioned as unwilling and unwitting conduits for the conservative gendering of upper-caste Hindu households in Bengal since at least the late-nineteenth century well beyond the inception of decolonized India.

In attempting to write back to the fictions of sexual sedition that Eurasians as gendered and sexualized subjects were forced to inhabit, multiple Eurasian authorial voices in the

twentieth century found their literary output being censored. This censorship, as I discuss, was, rather ironically, the result of these authors' texts being deemed 'seditious' owing to their apparently overt sexual content. However, the discursive edifice of sexual sedition, as I have indicated previously, cannot but fall apart because the center—racial whiteness—does not hold. Questioning the 'full-caste' of the white colonial male British body against which lacking Eurasian bodies were sculpted, Eurasians themselves perpetually rewrote configurations of whiteness/Britishness in India both before and after decolonization, as I show. In keeping with this rewriting of a normative perception of whiteness, my corroboration of the claim that "there are no half-castes" is not unexpectedly founded upon the fact that race is defined by inevitable intermixture. That I elucidate this point through a demonstration of the intermixture inherent to the English language, may be viewed by the reader as a gesture toward questioning German philological constructions of Aryan racial superiority.[4] It is, after all, to oppose the yardstick of white bodily 'purity' that I theorize English as an indeterminately intermixed language. In the final reckoning, as I show, Eurasian bodies qua both norm and seditious exception become indistinguishable from 'thoroughbred' European and Indian bodies, not only because of infinite and uncertain racial intermixture, but also because there is no *one* Eurasian community fashioned out of the discourses of racial and sexual degeneracy.[5] Community is, after all, much like race and language, a configuration that is in a continuous state of flux across time and space, so that what needs to be conceptualized are *multiple communities* of *intermixed or mongrel bodies*—bodies that lie beyond the essentialist eugenic bent inherent to 'mixed race' as a signifier. These multiple communities are, as I indicate, in a process of incessant engendering, as are the mongrel bodies configuring and inhabiting them.

If I use sizable parts of my dissertation to delineate the discourse of racial/sexual degeneracy along the grain, it is because the act of reading along the grain facilitates the act of reading against it: examining the production of 'degenerate' Eurasians across colonial and post-colonial India, I elaborate upon how these Eurasians, inhabiting many figurations, leave traces of protest against their constitution as racial/sexual exceptions. The intention of my dissertation is, however, not to give the reader an exhaustive historiography of such traces of protest—it is merely a modest effort to construct a fragmented genealogy of some points at which these traces powerfully rupture the discourses of Eurasian degeneracy. I uncover these traces through close readings of an archive of fictional and non-fictional literary texts, historiographic accounts, commercial and documentary films, and cartoon panels. These texts, films, and panels were published and/or released between 1859 and 2015. Given the vast span of time covered by my archive, the genealogy I construct cannot but be a fragmented one.

'Good' Bodies and Mongrels: A Dialogue between Edward Byron Reuter and Cedric Dover

Before discussing the colonial racialization of Indian Eurasians, it would be necessary to ask what I mean by *race* vis-à-vis a mixed race. Given Cedric Dover's use of the term 'half-caste' for Eurasians in India, an examination of the word 'caste' might prove telling in this context, particularly because 'mixed race' and 'half-caste' were terms used almost synonymously in England, the United States, the French West Indies, and the Dutch East Indies since at least the mid-nineteenth century.[6] This use of 'half-caste' to describe racially intermixed figures ties in with the etymological description of 'caste' as 'pure breed.'

A eugenicist who participated in a transnational anti-racist collective—a collective involving, among others, American Civil Rights artists and activists like W. E. B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, and Paul Robeson[7]—Dover partially draws his conceptualization of a mixed

race from President of the American Sociological Society Edward Byron Reuter's article "The Superiority of the Mulatto." Reuter's article, published in the *American Journal of Society* in 1917, claims that the "Negro people in America," as a "race," "show[s] a great preponderance of individuals of *mixed blood*," and that among the 139 subjects of the "*supposedly best-known* American Negroes" whose antecedents Reuter has studied, there are "not more than four men of *pure Negro blood*" ("The Superiority of the Mulatto" 83; emphases mine). In this claim about the ostensible superiority of a Mulatto body, race qua 'full-caste' seems to function as a transcendental signifier that is founded on an ineffable 'purity' of blood; it becomes a signifier that Reuter uses to cover a spectrum of Negro bodies, racializing the Mulatto body vis-à-vis a 'pure' Negro body in terms of the intermixture of blood or the lack thereof. Given the minimal number of individuals of "pure Negro blood," Reuter's article determines 'pure' Negro bodies as dying out, with Mulatto bodies effectively supplanting them and *becoming* Negros. While the claims about the intermixture of blood and *multiple Negro bodies* seems radical in the article, especially for its time, Reuter's assertion about the superiority of the Mulatto body because of its "mixed blood" is problematic. His tacit indication is, after all, that 'pure' Negro blood mixed with white blood makes for better bodies because of the superiority of white blood, as will be seen (Reuter, "The Superiority of the Mulatto" 85).

Reuter's article argues that even in a non-American "racial situation," the superiority of a "mixed-blood race" holds good against a "pure-blood native race." Race as a transcendental concept, then, seems to immanently manifest itself as per "racial situation" in the form of *groups* coded via 'pur sang' or otherwise. Indeed, Reuter goes on to use the words "group" and "caste" interchangeably to describe such embodiments of 'race' ("The Superiority of the Mulatto" 85). The three words—group, caste, and race—begin, thereafter, to function along vectors in which

caste and social class become synonymous in the article: a Mulatto "*middle-class group*," Reuter asserts, "ha[s] risen to prominence in political or professional affairs" because its members are of a "*mixed-blood caste*" ("The Superiority of the Mulatto" 86-87; emphases mine). This simplistic collapsing of the '*mixed*' and the '*middle*' in terms of a corresponding alignment between *blood* and *caste* does not come as a surprise, functioning as *caste* did along the lines of *class* in the context of a feudal aristocracy in the metropole.[8] With the elements of class and of class mobility that Reuter refers to, though, another component almost self-evidently adds itself to the roster—the possibility of the assimilation of Mulattos into a privileged social class. Reuter's article disturbingly ties this last factor back to a claim about racial supremacy, appending a threat to Mulattos about the loss of this supremacy, as will be seen.

Toward the end of his article Reuter writes that the *class distinction* he discusses along the lines of *racial intermixture*, laid the base for a specific configuration of "social prestige of the mixed-blood group…that is not only culturally and traditionally superior, but one whose ancestry contains practically every superior man the race in America has produced." Without alluding to what he means by a monolithic "race in America," Reuter claims that the "mixed-blood group" he writes about grows "superior" by interracial breeding through generations. Via this process of generation through racially intermixed descendants, Mulatto bodies in various stages of mixing will, Reuter argues, reconstitute the superiority of "*the* race in America" (Reuter, "The Superiority of the Mulatto" 106; emphasis mine). This reconstitution will be effected because eventually, the article indicates almost as a tautological argument, 'pure' Negro blood will no longer be manifested in terms of darkness of bodily color. Reconvening race as a transcendental signifier via skin color, the Mulattos' class mobility and racial superiority are, in the article, thus connoted by their "lighter color"—a color that, through racial mixing, aims for "Near-

Whiteness," silently acknowledging the supremacy of white bodies (Reuter, "The Superiority of the Mulatto" 104-06). Whiteness, therefore, continues to function as the transcendental telos of all Negro bodies; it is the privileged color—and the color of privilege—that Mulattos should, Reuter suggests, aim to assimilate into.[9] If the reader permits an etymological pun, the telos of interracial generation across generations that Reuter's article constructs, is evident at its closing: by continually mixing and, indeed, melding into whiteness, the Mulatto body can sustain its class mobility. Failing this, the Mulatto will have to give in to the social immobility ostensibly characterizing the "pure-blood native race" of Negros: to reiterate a theme Reuter has articulated—this time in a different key—the Mulatto body will *become* Negro in terms of both *caste* and *class*, thus giving in to a trajectory of *racial 'fall'* both physically and intellectually.

Reuter's Mulattos are discursively made to face this threat of racial and social 'fall' or 'degeneracy' more pointedly in his lengthy 1918 treatise titled *The Mulatto in the United States Including a Study of the Role of the Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World*. In the treatise, this threat is imposed upon Mulattos through their dogmatic exposure to another community of "mixed-blood race" in another "racial situation"—a community that has, it is said, succumbed to the threat of racial degeneracy by refusing the telos of whiteness or "Near-Whiteness" that, Reuter indicates, it should have sought. The community Reuter refers to is that of "[t]he Eurasians or Indo-Europeans…of mixed European and Asiatic blood born and raised in Asia" or, to be more precise, in colonial India (*The Mulatto in the United States Including a Study of the Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World* 28).

Portraying India's Eurasians in such apparently self-evident biologistic terms, Reuter suggests that by lacking whiteness in their bodily constitutions, Eurasians in India, though they be racially intermixed, could not attain the bodily vigor of Mulattos; they consequently lost the

social mobility enabled to the Mulatto body. The white body was, across "racial situations," the 'pure' body embodying the physical vigor that lesser bodies like those of the Mulattos needed to and perhaps could aspire toward; the telos of all bodies was plainly white racial supremacy. Lacking the physical vigor to aspire toward this supremacy, India's Eurasians succumbed before the degeneracy that threatened upward Mulatto biological and social mobility; these Eurasians were accordingly prevented from assimilation into the 'pure' white British colonial community.

This is not quite how a proto-biopolitical racializing of Indian Eurasians played out in the nineteenth century, as I discuss in my dissertation. At any rate, opposing Reuter's ostensible call to Mulattos to endlessly intermix and thus eventually approximate to 'Near-Whiteness,' 'pur sang' and the 'pure' white body fold into each other in colonial India as untouchably transcendental—*the 'unmixed' white body of the colonizer is the only biologically and socially 'good' body*. A 'mixed-blood' body of part-European provenance accordingly becomes an aberration in India.

Borrowing Reuter's notion of an intermixture of blood as the determinant of bodies, Dover, while conceptualizing Eurasians as a 'mixed race,' abjures notions of white racial supremacy and negates Eurasian social aspirations to 'Near-Whiteness.' As a Eurasian born in India, Dover maintains from his first text as a eugenicist, *Cimmerii Or Eurasians and their Future* (1929), to his last text as a transnational anti-color activist, *American Negro Art* (1960), that a 'pure' race is conceptually problematic and physically impossible. In other words, *all* bodies are indeterminately intermixed in terms of race. Dover's position is largely influenced by the Second World War, the glorification of a 'pure' race being politically redolent of "German colonial excesses and reports of Nazi brutalities" in favor of an Aryan racial supremacy (*Hell in the Sunshine* 12).[10] It is, among other reasons, because of this redolence that Dover feels the need

to interrogate what subsequently came to be known as the 'Eurasian question.' This Eurasian question codified a colonial discourse of Eurasian racial and sexual fallenness that burgeoned from the late-nineteenth century onward, and temporally proliferated beyond the decolonization of India.

In *The Mulatto in the United States*, Reuter describes the Eurasian question as being founded on the fact that Eurasians, being almost self-evidently born of the mixing of British and Indian blood via "concubinage," embodied the dilution of the apparently indefatigable fiber of racially and morally 'pure' British bodies. Eurasian bodies born through concubinage were, Reuter writes, "Physically…slight and weak…[Eurasians we]re naturally indolent and w[ould] enter into no employment requiring exertion or labor." These Eurasians would rather, Reuter goes on to state, settle for professions demanding less physical labor, such as clerical work "where only routine labor [wa]s required." In *The Mulatto in the United States*, then, "concubinage" becomes a means to translate sexual fall into racial fall (Reuter 29-30). This fall was marked by Eurasian bodies whose apathy denied them the social mobility of Mulatto bodies aiming for 'Near-Whiteness.'

Birth from concubinage aside, because a thoroughbred British child's almost sole physical contact in infancy in colonial India was with "native servants" who worked as wet nurses for him, Reuter asserts that "all the stronger traits of manhood are feebly developed in [the British child]." While he does not clarify how this process is effected, according to discourses of Eurasian degeneracy in the Dutch East Indies, the nurses' milk transubstantiates into native blood in the child's body, diluting his 'pure' white blood (Stoler 162). Degenerating through this transubstantiation from British to Eurasian, in manhood the racially 'fallen' Eurasian child was physically "often darker even than the Asiatic parent" and was, in mental

propensities, "wily, untrustworthy, and untruthful. He [wa]s lacking in independence and [wa]s forever begging for special favors" (Reuter, *The Mulatto in the United States* 29-30). The collapsing of color—that fundamental marker of racial difference—with the absence of a sound moral fiber in a biologically 'good' white body thus ensured that Indian Eurasian bodies lost their upward class mobility into colonial British society.[11] That the British Government of India would biologize Eurasian bodies into degeneracy can perhaps be traced to the fact that it wanted to deny Eurasians citizenship in the metropole—a matter I discuss in the following section.

At any rate, then, claims involving race, class, caste, blood, and color helped Reuter code Eurasian bodies in India as lacking. Indeed, the specter of the Negro who had not succumbed to Near-Whiteness haunted Eurasians well before Reuter: Eurasians were, as early as the 1890s, being equated in the common sense of the default colonized Indian subject with Negros. This matter should not be overlooked, colonized subjects' use of the word 'Negro' in the Indian context being inflected by the accompanying pejorative American connotations (Bear 121).

Critiquing Reuter's position of setting one "mixed-blood race" against another and threatening both with degeneracy, Dover argues in 1937 that a transnational community of mixed races should be the ideal to be aspired toward. These mixed races would, after all, be bound by one fundamental factor: their members would all be "marginal men" located in nations that were seeking decolonization and/or democratization (*Cimmerii* 10-11; *Know This of Race* 32). Unsurprisingly, Dover seems to prefer to do away with the term half-caste. After all, if caste bears the connotation of a 'pure' race, Eurasians—the "marginal men"—because of the ultimate impossibility of determinately tabulating their 'pure' racial antecedents in terms of 'halves,' are essentially "mongrels." While Dover does not explicate his conception of a 'mongrel,' two of the word's ramifications are unavoidable: first, a mongrel is defined by indeterminable racial

intermixture sans any identifiable type or breed; second, mongrels qua pariahs are delineated by marginalization in terms of class, thus performing a refusal to aspire toward social—and therefore racial—upward mobility. Gesturing toward the engendering of this community of mongrels, Dover embraces mongrelism to negate the discourses of racial and sexual degeneracy thrust upon Eurasians. His coming community of mongrels, indicates Dover, will challenge racialization by questioning essentialisms like 'pur sang,' in terms of which bodies were made eugenically quantifiable and therefore racially definable. Having written his first noteworthy polemic as an anti-color activist—*Cimmerii*—from a eugenic position, by the time he makes this claim for a transnational mongrelism in his political treatise *Hell in the Sunshine* (1943) fifteen years later, Dover has abjured his voice as a eugenicist, recognizing that eugenics lays the foundations for the racist claims that figures like Reuter make. Dover's parting argument opposing eugenics in *Hell in the Sunshine* was, unsurprisingly, that "We are essentially mongrels: that is the whole point of us. To be mongrels is our mission…Race and mongrelism are irreconcilable terms" (*Hell in the Sunshine* 135-36). In other words, if race be a concept denoted by 'purity' of blood—a 'full-caste'—then mongrelism, as a political ideal beyond the grasp of eugenics, would fragment a race into "mixed-blood" bodies beyond enumeration.

Why, though, would the British administration codify the Eurasian question and translate the excuse of Eurasian degeneracy into that of class mobility that it denied "marginal men" in India? A conjectural but pragmatic answer would be that by making poor Eurasians—or mongrels, if the reader so pleases—inhabit these fictions of degeneracy in the colony, the British Government could coerce them into setting aside aspirations to push for citizenship in the metropole, as I will show in the following section.

A Racial 'Inferiority Complex:' Gendering, Citizenship, and the Eurasian Question

Perhaps the most exhaustive account of the Eurasian question—replete with its Eurasian writer's habitation of the prejudices that the question produces—is *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached* (1929), a treatise written by a Eurasian inspector of schools named Kenneth Wallace.[12] In the treatise, Wallace claims to critique Reuter's eugenic position which determined Eurasian bodies in racially quantifiable terms. He states that he will supplant this position with a psychological analysis of Eurasians in India. What ultimately emerges in the treatise, though, is a reiteration of Reuter's belief in eugenic tabulations of Eurasian bodies. Furthermore, Wallace's treatise tacitly sets aside the right of Eurasians to work and attain social mobility, and to determine their location of citizenship. That Wallace, in a manner recalling Reuter, ties the elements of bodily labor and class mobility together to constitute Eurasians as a 'problem,' is noteworthy.

Wallace's treatise opens with a foreword by one Lt.-Col. A. A. E. Baptist who would, three years after the publication of the treatise, go on to become the Director of the All-India Institute of Hygiene and Public Health. In the foreword, Baptist points out in an understated fashion that Eurasians could indeed eugenically count as 'British,' the British themselves being "a race of extremely mixed origin; Anglo-Saxon, German, Norwegian, 'Nordic,' French, and other races." However, the British had codified themselves in multiple colonial situations in terms of an "ill-considered…desire for race-preservation [which] ha[d] caused them to decide that the half-breed [wa]s beyond the pale—and beyond the pale he remain[ed]." Because of this location of 'half-breeds' in otherness, Eurasians had, as Baptist points out, been robbed of the right to claim Britishness of identity, with the Census Regulations reducing them to "Statutory Natives of India." Baptist traces this situation of Eurasians "beyond the pale" to the aftermath of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. True to his claim, the Sepoy Mutiny was, as I describe in my

dissertation, indeed the moment after which the British consolidated a 'white' racial identity for themselves, distancing themselves on a planarity of power from the colonized Indian subject by, among other means, gendering the colonized into awe and fear of white skin.[13] Because the solvency of white into brown had accordingly to be prevented from identification as 'British,' Eurasians were, from 1858, denied the right to identify themselves as British. They were consequently, writes Baptist, "[e]masculated" into a racio-chromatic "inferiority-complex." This complex, Baptist goes on to correctly state, had no "biological basis" (iii-v).

Even as he overtly disclaims subscription to racially inflected biologisms, Baptist asserts that because of British neglect, "Moral instruction [among Eurasians] is not insisted upon enough, whilst the girls—the mothers of the race—are not taught domestic economy and hygiene efficiently…as they ought to be taught" (vii). This assertion alludes to the post-1857 perception that Eurasian women were inevitably hypersexual prostitutes and were therefore tautologically carriers of venereal disease.[14] In other words, the reference to venereal disease was a translation of the discourse of Eurasian racial fall into that of Eurasian sexual fall. Baptist's suggestion is thus that Eurasian women need to maintain *sexual* hygiene and a *marital* economy to keep their ostensible proneness to sexual fall at bay. As I discuss in my dissertation, such assertions were partially efforts to keep British soldiers—'pure' white bodies—away from cantonment brothels for the good of king and country, so that they did not contract venereal disease and fail to fulfill their military responsibilities in colonial India. Hence, perhaps, the allusion to "race-preservation," venereal disease being believed to take away from the *masculinity* of the white soldier's body—the masculinity on which the military 'goodness' of the British Government of India was predicated. Translating race into sex yet again, then, the sexual othering of Eurasian women in India *gendered* British soldiers into a racial *masculinity*—a masculinity whose

seeming infallibility was dependent on a concomitant *sexualizing* of Eurasians along a tangent of *racial fall*.

Continuing this gendering of Eurasians while simultaneously adding the element of *class*, Wallace opens his treatise by describing an ethnographic observation of poor Eurasians living in Chowringhee Road, Park Street, and Dharamtala Street in Calcutta. This 'sample' of Eurasians, Wallace asserts, though limited to vicinities in Calcutta, "all present the same fundamental problem" that ails Eurasians across India—an apathy toward labor. Hence the proliferation of poverty among Eurasians all through the country (Wallace 2). It is interesting to note that Wallace's apathetic Eurasians are *solely male*, lacking the *masculine* inclination to labor that defines the white soldiers in the employ of the British Government. The Eurasian men's disinclination to labor ties in with Reuter's argument about Eurasians' absence of social mobility. Their *un-masculine* disclination to work, in a nutshell, seems to constitute the greater part of the Eurasian question, at least from Wallace's ethnographic point of view.

Apart from the reluctance toward labor, Wallace defines the Eurasian men he observes in terms of the element of color, recalling the transcendentalization of "Near-Whiteness" that determines a sound mind in a sound body for Reuter's half-castes: "Observe these people. Almost all are swarthy of complexion, some more, some less; some fair, as fairness is understood in India; others dark, as darkness is understood in India," as opposed to notions of fairness and darkness in the metropole (4). *Color* and *gendering* as cause, and bodily *laziness* as biologistic effect, seamlessly blend in the paragraph to explain why these poor Eurasians would remain trapped in their poverty. Indeed, that the greater number of Eurasians inhabit this discursively produced space of laziness seems, by Wallace's skewed judgment, to be soundly validated by his claim that *all* Eurasians—both in Calcutta and across India—are poor. Gendering and discourses

of bodily degeneracy, by my reading, do not seem to lag too far behind each other in this inscription of Eurasian bodies—bodies defined by an un-masculine disinclination to work (Wallace 12).

Trying to collate a collective psychological understanding of Eurasians in India, Wallace says, among other things, that Eurasians possess "a blind loyalty to the European that has…served only to *emasculate* the community by encouraging an attitude of dependence" (14-15; emphasis mine). The "emasculated" Eurasian's dependence upon the British Government in India refers to the reservations for jobs that were set aside for Eurasians in the railways, customs, post, and telegraph services in 1928, a year before Wallace's treatise had been published. The proto-biopolitical governmental justification for these colonial reservations was indeed an emasculating one—using discourses of Eurasian racial and sexual degeneracy as an excuse, from at least 1859 the British Government sent Eurasians for training to vocational institutions. These institutions—proliferating well into the twentieth century—cloistered Eurasians into an almost monastic invisibility that rendered dilutions of British bodily whiteness imperceptible to the colonized populace. The institutions simultaneously maintained Eurasians in poverty by depriving them of educational resources, and thus of professional—and social—mobility, the administrative hope being that all Eurasians would eventually die out as a result of this poverty (Mizutani 118-21; Blunt 73-74, 108; Bear 10). Wallace's ascription of emasculation to the Eurasians' inability to conduct "honest labour" in their absence of "indications of *virility*," overlooks this freezing of a considerable number of Eurasians into *class immobility*; it mistakes what was a physical ability to labor and a once politically recognized right to work, for a gendered "attitude of dependence" upon job reservations doled out by the British administration (9; 14-15; emphasis mine). In short, Wallace essentially overlooks how gendering and discourses

of bodily degeneracy fed into each other to systematize Eurasians into social immobility, unlike Reuter's Mulattos who could in theory—and in theory alone—reach for 'Near-Whiteness.' The feeding of *gendering* into conceptions of *masculine labor* and, thereby, into discourses of *administrative whiteness*, however, perhaps served an additional purpose that was more important to the British Government—the exclusion of Eurasians from citizenship in the metropole.

In 1831, an incipient community of Eurasian philanthropists sent a petition to the Court of Directors of the British East India Company. The petition had been penned by Eurasian philanthropist John William Ricketts. Its intent was to argue against the prevention of India's Eurasians from being employed in the British East India Company's covenanted civil service—a source of employment that was, prior to 1791, theirs by political right. This right was, I would suggest, inextricable from the right to citizenship in the metropole that Eurasians—at least of part-British blood—contemporaneously possessed. After all, only the 'British' were allowed the right to be employed by the East India Company (Hawes 66; Chaudhuri 88). A scathing response to Ricketts' petition was published in *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register* in the year the petition was sent to the East India Company's Court of Directors. The response, written by an anonymous British critic, stated that there were "five classes" of Eurasians in order of superiority, based on patrilineality and wedlock, and only the "first class," born of European patrilineal wedlock, qualified for citizenship in the metropole and for work in the Company's covenanted service (*The Asiatic Journal, Volume 5* 15-16).[15] In other words, *gendering* via holy wedlock and *racial superiority* founded on white patrilineage determined British citizenship and the political right of Eurasians to retain covenanted employment in the Company. It is not hard to conjecture why 'other' Eurasian bodies were not deemed fit for British citizenship: they were

adjudged racially and sexually degenerate because they were not transfused with the white masculinity of European fathers via the legitimacy of a *domestic marital economy* and, by extension, of a *sexual hygiene* shorn of 'concubinage' and of venereal disease. I would, however, speculate that this classification of most Eurasians out of citizenship was, in the final reckoning, an attempt to exclude as many chromatically solvent bodies—or marginal men—as possible from the metropole.[16] After the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, though, the "first class" was also excluded from considerations of citizenship and the right to work in the East India Company's covenanted service because, among other reasons, its chromatic solvency was considered a threat to white 'British' hegemony in India. Ironically, then, citizenship in the metropole and the right to work under the auspices of the British Government in India were intertwined by the discursive conduit of Eurasian 'fall.'

Eurasians, then, were not dependent on "the half loaf" from the British prior to 1791—that "half loaf" was theirs by right. It was this right that Ricketts' petition was politically re-iterating. In refusing to see the political incisiveness of the petition or, indeed, to acknowledge the petition at all, Wallace refuses to consider several factors that maintained the greater number of Eurasians in poverty. Eurasians were indeed perhaps "emasculated" into an "inferiority-complex" because they found themselves denied the rights of citizenship in the metropole and employment under the British Government. That, though, is, I would assert, precisely how the Eurasian question could translate into a politicization of Eurasian voices—a politicization demanding the return of what was the Eurasians' by right, one of the first steps to this end being Ricketts' 1831 petition (Hawes 66). Overlooking this point and accordingly disregarding how race, sex, color, gendering, and citizenship entangled into each other to constitute the Eurasian question, Wallace resorts to biologisms redolent of the classification of Eurasian bodies in *The*

Asiatic Journal. He initially seems to embrace Dover's call to mongrelism, quoting views to the effect that "the nations are all mixed in blood beyond the possibility of disentanglement" (Chaudhuri 52). In the same breath, though, he claims that Eurasians, though lacking in the will to labor, need not suffer from an "inferiority-complex" because "instances could be adduced to show that there is plenty of *good blood* and *consequent possibilities* in this…race" (Wallace 19; emphasis mine). Falling back on the very eugenic argument about *good blood* and, therefore, of *good bodies* that mongrelism abjures, Wallace neglects the politicization of the voices of poor Eurasians.

Occupying precisely the ideological position that Wallace does not, multiple Eurasians, by embracing mongrelism, took the British Government to task for disowning Eurasians of the aforementioned rights to work and citizenship. This can be seen in, for instance, an exchange of letters in *The Calcutta Journal* that laid the groundwork for Ricketts' petition. These letters recognized the term 'Eurasian' as a mere essentialism for bodies beyond eugenic classification—an essentialism nevertheless necessary for politicization against the British. One A. H., writing in November 1821 in *The Calcutta Journal*, suggested that 'Eurasian' was, in the end, the best "compound" to encapsulate bodies beyond the ambit of proper names. He endorsed the term 'Eurasian' because, he indicated, it was through an essentialist category alone that these mongrel peoples could articulate their voices in Ricketts' petition.[17] Taking the opposite tack, one 'Phileriphus' wrote in response to A. H. that "As my father was born in Philadelphia and my mother in Rohilcund [sic], the word which A. H. proposes [Eurasian]…would not suit *me*" (Chaudhuri 86). The term 'East Indian' and not 'Eurasian' was eventually agreed upon, perhaps so that Eurasians could identify themselves in the petition as the political offspring of the East India Company—the offspring toward who the Company had proved politically callous.

When the petition's efforts to upbraid the Court of Directors and the British Parliament failed, famed poet Henry Louis Vivian Derozio (1809-1831)—a driving force behind the petition as a member of the "fifth class" of Eurasians—said to the petitioners that their "calls for justice must be incessant as [their] grievances are heavy," that they should "complain again and again…until [they] are answered" (Chaudhuri 90). The failure to politicize their voices haunted Eurasian philanthropists and activists well into the twentieth century, with Eurasian activist Herbert Alick Stark lamenting in his 1926 polemic *Hostages to India, Or The Life Story of the Anglo-Indian Race*, "Thrown out of soldiering [in 1791], the only profession to which [Eurasians] had been reared,…was a sad spectacle" (52). Questioning the Eurasian question via the signifiers of labor, class mobility, and British citizenship that poor Eurasians still clung to in 1926, Stark, as a mongrel, tellingly chose to identify himself as British. He simultaneously remained suspicious of the political ramifications of the then imminent decolonization of India. His suspicions led him to write to the metropole, "When full measure of self-government is given to India, what will be the fate of our descendants and kinsmen in *that* land." With Indian self-governance spelling the dying away of the last promising shadows of British citizenship, Stark took his white forefathers to task for the lot of the largely poverty-stricken Eurasians left behind in India—*that* land which the Eurasian question disabled Eurasians into alienated identification with (98; emphasis mine).

Considering these issues, the reluctance to work that Wallace finds among poor Eurasians can be perceived as the residues of politicized Eurasian voices—voices questioning the disregard of the British Government toward them and expressing their reluctance to let go the last threads connecting them to the metropole, that is, to the promised land they were denied entry into. The discourses of racial/sexual degeneracy that gendered Eurasians out of British citizenship and

robbed them of secure employment, can therefore be viewed as having been appropriated by the men Wallace observes, to be utilized by them in a performance of silent rebellion against the Government. In other words, performing their gendered position as subjects de-politicized into un-British degeneracy, the Eurasian men loitering around the streets of Calcutta may be deemed as enacting a protest march—a march they articulate by signifying apathy and poverty. This performance of "degenerescence" as *political rebellion* can therefore be read as an act of *sedition*. To put it differently, because the Eurasian men use their *sexualization* into "*emasculation*" to take the British Government to task, I find embedded within Wallace's framing of the Eurasian question a trace of what I have termed sexual sedition. In Wallace's treatise, the streets of Calcutta become, after all, spaces inhabited by racially and sexually aberrant subjects—subjects perceived to threaten colonial governance thanks to their pathetic lot. It is such acts of Eurasian resistance to discourses of degeneracy in colonial and post-colonial India that I examine in my dissertation. As I demonstrate through multifarious figurations of Eurasians qua sexual outlaws, these discourses are still alive and well in decolonized India. However, as I will now describe, the Eurasians' spaces of citizenship are themselves rendered multifarious by the factor of mongrelism: the number of *Eurasian homelands* founded on the factor of citizenship can be said to be as many as there are *new Eurasian bodies* perennially *en-gendered*.

In Search of a (New) Home: New Bodies, New Homelands, and the Question of Citizenship

I have previously referred to Eurasian authorial voices that were trying to write back to fictions of Eurasian racial and sexual degeneracy. One such authorial voice that I discuss at length in my dissertation is that of Ruskin Bond—a figure who belonged to the "fifth class" of Eurasian bodies because though born in colonial India, he was British by blood.[18] In short, he

was not thought to be of a "mixed-blood race" while paradoxically being Indian by citizenship. Interestingly, in writing against the discourses of Eurasian degeneracy, Bond found himself juridically entrapped in charges of sedition and on the verge of being jailed. Regarding the charges of sedition that were brought against him because of the 'sexually explicit' contents of his 1974 novella *The Sensualist*, Bond stated that questioning discourses of sex was different from "sexual anarchy"—a fact that, according to him, the greater part of India's conservative Hindu population would not grasp because it was "too repressed." Hence, unsurprisingly, the charges of sedition Bond faced (Quraishi). The irony was that a proliferation and not a conservative repression of discourses of racial/sexual degeneracy helped code the Eurasian question and produce Eurasian bodies as 'fallen.'

Underscoring the proliferation of these discourses of 'fallenness,' when Wallace discusses the Eurasian question, he genders *female* Eurasian bodies almost solely in terms of prostitution. Wallace's later emphasis on the Eurasian body qua the fallen corporeal frame of the prostitute is in keeping with the simultaneous fascination and repulsion that Eurasian prostitutes exercised not only upon British colonizers but also upon a default Brahmanic common sense, both before and after the decolonization of India, as the reader will find explicated in my reading of Manishankar Mukhopadhyay's 1962 Bangla novel *Chowringhee* (9).

Chowringhee is important to the archive I construct for my dissertation on another count: it sees the emergence of several *new Eurasian bodies* that do not fit into India because their racial provenance is askew, rendering their *homelands* and their sites of *citizenship* precarious. For instance, in the novel, Marcopolo [sic], the manager of one Hotel Shahjahan in Calcutta, is the son of a dead Middle-Eastern owner of a hotel in Greece. After the hotel owner and his wife die in an earthquake, Marcopolo is adopted by a priest settled in Italy. Having lived in Italy for a

while, Marcopolo proceeds to Rangoon where he faces the Japanese conquest of Burma. He eventually finds himself in India where he takes up the position of the manager of the Shahjahan. Ultimately, he leaves India for Africa where he establishes his own hotel. When discussing his travels, he can best describe his position as that of a "refugee"—a position clarified by the ramifications of his name. He has no home, and citizenship seems a concept that eludes him all through the novel. For purposes of convenience, though, for as long as he lives in India, Marcopolo, it is indicated, passes for Eurasian (Mukhopadhyay 74).

Marcopolo's beloved Susan Munro is Indo-British by race but Indian by citizenship because she was born not in the metropole but in colonial India. Ergo, she belongs to what Ricketts' petition would perhaps categorize as the third class of Eurasians—a class that was defined as 'Indian' after 1831.[19] "Made in Calcutta," her Indian citizenship depleted her allure as a prostitute of white European provenance—a provenance that could have helped her make a handsome living for herself in Calcutta had she been "made in Europe, or made in the U.S.A." (Mukhopadhyay 72).[20]

The most interesting figure in terms of race and 'home' in *Chowringhee* is one Rosie, Marcopolo's secretary. Despite her professional incompetence, she can hold on to her job at the Shahjahan with ease because apparently being of part-European descent, "there is no shortage of takers for her bodily gifts." Not being able to tolerate the daily insinuations about her ostensible occupation as a prostitute, though, she bursts out before the receptionist of the Shahjahan one day, saying, "I know I am disgustingly dark. People call me a *Negro* behind my back.[21] You people cannot stand the sight of this *fallen* woman" (Mukhopadhyay 177-79; emphases mine). Eventually, Rosie reveals her racial descent and her 'home' to the protagonist—her forefathers were African slaves, and she lived in a Calcuttan slum inhabited by the descendants of African

slaves. She says of these descendants, “Despite a hundred years having passed, these people from the far-off land of Africa are yet to mesh into and become [culturally] one with the ‘Indian ocean.’ Misery, poverty, lack, and suspicion have maintained them in a state of slavery to the present day” (Mukhopadhyay 423). The ‘Indian ocean’ as a metaphor constitutes India as a space for cultural intermixture—an ideal homeland for mongrels. The translation of this metaphor into materiality is, however, impossible for as long as mongrelism is shadowed by eugenics. This was a fact that 2,000 Eurasians witnessed when they tried to find asylum in Australia to escape the nebulous dangers that, by their understanding, governance in decolonized India entailed for them. Fetishizing Australia as a prospective homeland because of its emphasis on whiteness, these Eurasians found themselves victims to Australia’s political ideal of ‘Near-Whiteness,’ as will be seen.

By April of 1947, that is, mere months before the formal decolonization of India, about 1,400 Indian Eurasians had applied for citizenship in Australia—a number that escalated to 2,000 in September, that is, a month after decolonization. Because this period saw the White Australia Policy at its zenith, the Australian Department of Immigration’s eugenic categorization of both familiar and new bodies for purposes of entry and citizenship, had unsurprisingly become almost manic in character (Blunt 146-52).

For admission into Australian citizenship, Eurasians had to eugenically document the fact that they were “more than 50% European” and, in addition, had to be ‘European’ in appearance. If married, their spouses had to be Europeans or, at any rate, Eurasians who were ““predominantly European” in blood, in appearance, and in way of life.” The immigration form noted under the rubric of “Race” that “If wholly European [the applicant should] state “European”; otherwise “Indian”, “3/4 Indian”, “1/2 Indian”, “1/4 Indian”, or other race, as the

case may be." The humiliations of this racially inflected process notwithstanding, the Eurasian applicants refused to embrace the fact of mongrelism, wanting to inhabit a space that would grant them citizenship founded on their "Anglo-Saxon stock," as the *West Australian* put it (Blunt 146).

In a desperate effort to expedite this process of settling in Australia before the decolonization of India, on August 15, 1947, that is, on the date of formal decolonization, 700 Eurasians from India creeped into the hold of the HMAS *Manoora*—a ship heading for Fremantle Harbor in Western Australia. Whatever their racial antecedents, these Eurasians *had* to be secretly accepted into Australia to prevent the more racist implications of the White Australia Policy from becoming public knowledge. After this incident, people of "predominantly European descent," that is, of *at least* 75% white European blood alone were accepted as Australian citizens. In the end, these eugenically framed policies failed to infallibly prove descent vis-à-vis the proliferation of mongrel bodies: the Society of Genealogists, helping verify the Eurasian applicants' descent, was forced to declare that European racial descent "is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to prove, since so many families have the blood of *many* foreign nations in their veins" (Blunt 152; emphasis mine). Ultimately, Eurasians began to be allowed onto Australian soil, although they were not extended citizenship unless they had undergone a series of travails (Blunt 152).

The Australian case demonstrates mongrelism's facilitation of the forging of Eurasian communities across the globe, with Reuter's eugenic telos of Near-Whiteness being rendered more precarious until it began to be recognized as inseparable from a fiction, as among the Society of Genealogists. Consequently, now that Eurasians in the 'Anglo-Indian homeland' of McCluskieganj (located in the Indian state of Jharkhand) claim that they are white, and that their

counterparts who have indulged in sexual intercourse with the *Adivasis* [lit. "original inhabitants"] of Jharkhand are *racially degenerate*, their claims are, in a sense, incontrovertible. After all, mongrelism would articulate that assertions of whiteness and racial fall are shifting fictions. Simultaneously, because a community is configured by myths that its members generate and sustain, McCluskieganj's claims of whiteness or the lack thereof may be deemed absolute, if only because these claims are accepted as part of the inhabitants' common sense. Ergo, while 'Europeanness' had been laid bare as a myth in Australia, whiteness is treated as a consciously performed fiction in McCluskieganj, permitting Eurasians to settle in both locations on the common foundation of their mongrel bodies. The sedition that these 'fallen' bodies can now exercise, I would conjecture, lies in their potential to engender further local, national, and transnational mongrel communities. Indeed, the discarding of Nazism with its telos of Aryan supremacy has already seen the formal inauguration of this passage to mongrelisms on a transnational scale. To prescribe—as All-India Anglo-Indian Association President Frank Anthony had—externally determined bounds such as Indian citizenship for Eurasians despite their mongrel bodies, is problematic. After all, such limits would configure mongrel communities as closed, rather than allowing them to spread their wings beyond race (7).

Whatever the end of these communities, we can say with a degree of certainty that 'new' mongrel bodies and communities were always afoot and were always taking what course they would. What is ethically needed is the affirmative acknowledgement of this phenomenon to negate politically fraught racial movements in the present, such as Neo-Nazism under Donald Trump's Presidency in the United States. It is, therefore, by gesturing toward the necessity to recognize the fact that *all* bodies are mongrel—and therefore *new*—bodies that I close my questioning of the Eurasian question.

The Chapters

Part One: Tales of Fallenness

In the first chapter, "The Sexual Degeneracy of Empire: Obliterating the Eurasian in Colonial India," I argue that after the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, the British Government of India essentially codified the much-discussed discourses of racial and sexual degeneracy and applied them to Eurasians living in India. This constituted Eurasians as 'fallen,' attributing their 'fallenness' to their status as a 'mixed-blood race.' To demonstrate this codification within my limits, I examine how these discourses of degeneracy were delineated using, among other points of entry, the myth surrounding one Judith Wheeler, the Eurasian daughter of the British commander of Kanpur. This commander, Hugh Wheeler, was said to have failed to rout the mutineers of 1857 in Kanpur because his body had been "emasculated" in a way that a 'good' white British militarized body could not possibly have been. Judith was inserted into the axiom in that given her Eurasian racialization, she was claimed to have retroactively depleted her father's masculinity through her *sexual degeneracy* as a 'prostitute.' This degeneracy, claimed to be traceable to the racial intermixture Judith embodied, was codified by the British Government using the justification that Judith had had consensual sexual intercourse and eloped with one of the mutineers. Racial fall thus folded into sexual fall and vice versa.

Having subscribed to this discourse of fallenness by tracing it to the Eurasians' status as a 'mixed race,' the British Government officially rejected Eurasian claims to British racial affiliations. Gendering, racializing, and sexualizing Eurasian women as 'prostitutes,' the British Government inscribed Eurasians into the space of sexual sedition, that is, the space of make-believe in which they were perceived to be a threat to a militarized and masculine colonial governance in India—a threat that the emasculation of a Hugh Wheeler was said to have taken to

its limit. I examine the proliferation of this discourse via the myth of Judith Wheeler by reading two erstwhile British historiographic treatises about the Mutiny—George Dodd's *The History of the Indian revolt and of the Expeditions to Persia, China, and Japan, 1856-7-8* (1859) and George Otto Trevelyan's *Cawnpore* (1866); and two nineteenth-century British imperialist novels—James Grant's *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny* (1869) and Philip Meadows Taylor's *Seeta* (1881).[22]

Against the backdrop of the Mutiny, another figure blamed for her intertwined racial and sexual 'fallenness' a la Judith was Amelia Horne, a Eurasian woman who survived the Mutiny and consensually lived with the mutineer who saved her. Reading Horne's 1913 memoirs, I discuss how she laid claim to being an Englishwoman by problematizing the deployment of 'English'—a racial category from the metropole—in the colony. In this way, Horne indicated the undifferentiability of 'English' and 'Eurasian' bodies in the colony, taking a noteworthy step toward questioning the racial and sexual discourses that framed these bodies after 1857. Most importantly, perhaps, Horne gestured toward mongrelism in the colony, refuting contrasts between the bodies of the colonizer and of the colonized.

In the second chapter, "Sexual Sedition and Legal Excess: Figurations of Anglo-Indian Women and Their Capital from the 1950s to the 1980s," I start by discussing the unsettling stability of the tautology that Eurasian women were sexually fallen—a tautology that, even after the decolonization of India, sustained itself with additions and alterations in a conservative Hindu Bengali common sense. Examining Bangla novelist Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay's conservative detective novellas *Chiriyakhana* [*The Menagerie*] (1953) and *Aadeem Ripu* [*Primal Instinct*] (1955), Narendranath Mitra's Bangla novella *Mahanagar* [*The Big City*] (1965), Mario Miranda's 1960s Anglophone cartoons featuring a Eurasian office secretary named Miss

Fonseca, Aparna Sen's Anglophone film *36 Chowringhee Lane* (1981), and Hindu Bengali cabaret dancer Miss Shefali's 2014 memoirs, I make three points in this chapter: 1. The figure of the Eurasian prostitute assisted the *gendering* of the Hindu Bengali wife *into sexual docility as opposed to sexual fallenness*; hence the stability of fictions of the tautological Eurasian prostitute in a conservative Hindu Bengali setting; 2. Despite this apparent stability, Eurasian women slipped through the cracks of their supposed 'fallenness' in twentieth-century India by covering a spectra of figurations—figurations that ranged from cabaret dancers with their apparent 'fallenness,' to teachers of the *English language* and of *English literature* decorated with the *cultural capital* that was appended to these disciplines. This spectrum, with its diverse range marked by often incommensurable figurations, *fractured and intermixed the discourses of Eurasian racial and sexual degeneracy*; 3. Through the intermixture of these discourses, Eurasian women emerged beyond the shadows of colonial sexualization that would discursively frame the body of a Judith Wheeler or an Amelia Horne. Ergo, if the Government of West Bengal moralistically deemed Eurasian Suzette Jordan sexually seditious in 2012 on grounds similar to those used against Wheeler or Horne in colonial India, Jordan's laying claim to her proper name was enough to facilitate her pursuit of justice for herself. This was, after all, the use of a proper name for a body that was intermixed, thus rupturing governmental attempts to shame the *'improper' body*, there being, in effect, *proper names for bodies* that are always already '*improper'* or *mongrelized*.

Part Two: Mongrelizing Literature and Language

In the third chapter, ""I Am Not, Myself, a Brahmin:" Toward an Anglo-Indian Authorial Subjectivity," I demonstrate how the *cultural capital* constituting the prestige of the Eurasian teacher of English in India, is inseparable from the sacralization of an English literary canon.

Equally inseparable from this English canon, though, is what I term the 'Eurasian text'—a text written by a British author of imperialist proclivities, be he from the metropole or from the colony. The 'Eurasian text' puts together many of the discursive fragments constructing Eurasian racial and sexual fallenness that I speak of, detouring a Eurasian's telos toward self-recognition in the English canon. Therefore, an emergent post-colonial Eurasian authorial voice, attempting to write back to these tales of fallenness, would find itself in collision with the canon that frames it in terms of *self-alienation*. This collision, as I show, concomitantly splits the canon into two fragments—1. a self-sacralized body linked with the law, and 2. a profane/'fallen'/'seditious' body replete with sexually 'obscene' contents that could be subjected to censorship.

Writing into the English canon, what the 'fallen' Eurasian authorial voice had to find for itself to survive charges of sedition, was a means to emerge whole while concurrently problematizing *sexual sedition*. I discuss how the Eurasian voice achieves this end by mimicking and mocking the English canon's portrayals of Eurasian degeneracy—an exercise that gestures toward this voice's splitting and *mongrelizing* of the canon's superficial sacredness. I examine this trajectory of the Eurasian authorial voice through readings of four twentieth-century novels by Eurasian writers Aubrey Menen and Ruskin Bond. Two of the four novels I read were juridically declared seditious for being sexually 'obscene,' thus effectively silencing Menen's and Bond's authorial questioning of the discourses of Eurasian 'fallenness.' As I show, Bond took the teleology of the Eurasian authorial voice's self-recognition to its end, locating the emergence of his voice in the fictional figure of a Eurasian woman. This woman had been saved by one of the mutineers of 1857 with whom she had lived a la Wheeler and Horne. Her voice in Bond's novel was not the voice of sedition but of desire—mocking the Eurasian text, it also

mocked the discourse of *sexual sedition* by mutely articulating *sexual desire* for the figure of the mutineer.

In the fourth chapter, ""The Original Anglos" and Others: The 'Genuine' Half-Castes of McCluskieganj," I discuss the portrayal of a Eurasian *homeland* in India in the state of Jharkhand—the village of McCluskieganj that I have referred to. Such a homeland is perhaps forged by its inhabitants' denial of their habitation of an ex-colony once ruled by their white forefathers. I discuss how multiple documentaries now focus on McCluskieganj as a "little England" in India, but inevitably dwell upon the body of one Kitty Texeira, a Eurasian woman who became an outcast in McCluskieganj because she married an *Adivasi*, Ramesh Munda. *Sexually intermixing* with Munda, she is no longer deemed Eurasian in terms of *caste*, given the *degeneracy* her body has undergone through miscegenation. Texeira is, nevertheless, the focal point of the documentaries because her articulation of the English language is redolent of the *cultural capital* of "an educated and well-off [Eurasian] community," although she *looks* an "*Adivasi mazdoor* ["laborer"]." This tells a tale about Indian perceptions of the power/knowledge inherent to the *English language*, while *social mobility* through *labor* are, as in the codification of the Eurasian question, not considered the stuff of bodies adjudged *insufficiently white*.

Contradicting this tale founded upon language, Frank Anthony addresses the matter of the cultural Indianization of the English language while calling for the political Indianization of Eurasians as *citizens* of decolonized India. Even as English has failed to be constitutionally considered an Indian language, it is a language from which all Indian languages have borrowed to *mongrelize* themselves. In short, the English language has *mongrelized* into cultural Indianness by carving its way into other Indian languages although it is itself not considered juridically Indian. Parallelly, the protected inhabitants of "little Englands" like McCluskieganj,

must abjure their precarious and shifting claims to whiteness and politicize themselves by fighting shoulder to shoulder with the *Adivasi mazdoors*—they must *become Adivasi mazdoors*, giving these marginalized figures a voice in the politically fraught space that is the decolonized Indian nation-state. In this way, they can also politicize themselves while understanding the workings of the ex-colony that is now their land of citizenship, as Hindi journalist Vikas Kumar Jha's 1999 ethnographic novel on McCluskieganj suggests. It is also by this self-politicization that they can carve their way into visibility in the Indian nation-state. In short, by being in favor of *multiple pluralized communities* where *Eurasian whiteness*—or "Near-Whiteness"—is seamlessly commensurable with the labor of an *un-Eurasian mazdoor*, Eurasians take a step toward embracing their *mongrel bodies* in a *mongrelized ex-colony*, just as Texeira has embraced her *mongrel* relationship with Munda. This paving of McCluskieganj as one of *multiple pluralized Eurasian communities*, facilitates the Eurasians' self-location in a nation they apparently feel alienated from. It is only by setting aside figurations founded on degeneracy and portrayals of sexual sedition—as in the case of Texeira qua racial/sexual outcast in a "little England"—that Eurasian mongrelism can take the Indian nation-state to the next level.

On a parting note, I want to clarify that my dissertation does not contribute to a burgeoning body of ethnographic studies conducted by diasporic Eurasian philanthropists—a body that passes itself off as scholarship under the rubric of 'Anglo-Indian Studies.' I need to articulate this self-positioning because 'Anglo-Indian Studies' essentially rearticulates the Eurasian question using a different formation: Eurasians from the West extend financial aid to inevitably poor Eurasians in India, with the first group reducing the second to objects of pity whose wretched living conditions they study and record (Williams 57). Apparently resembling ethnography, this is a re-coordination of Orientalism: a more financially privileged group from

the West exercises power/knowledge over a less privileged group in the East, and conducts academic seminars in renowned institutions of education to underscore this exercise of power/knowledge. If anything, this is reminiscent of the zeal that Christian missionaries would display in colonial India. Furthermore, disregarding the emergence of a transnational mongrelism, Anglo-Indian Studies regressively categorizes Eurasians under a closed racial rubric, therefore demanding that much more problematization. If my work succeeds in conducting such an act of problematization in howsoever minimal a fashion, I would deem my scholarly labors to have been worth it.

---

[1] According to the late All-India Anglo-Indian Association President Frank Anthony, Eurasians, beginning with the publication of the census reports of 1911, were officially referred to as 'Anglo-Indians.' I nevertheless use the pre-1911 category 'Eurasian' all through the introduction to 1. maintain a sense of uniformity and thereby ensure that the reader receives a sense of continuity, and to 2. convey the sense of transnational kinship that Eurasians in India shared with mixed races in other countries across the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Referring to Anglo-Indians as 'Eurasians' across countries is also a significant ethical gesture, indicating as it does that attempts to compartmentalize mixed-race bodies in terms of determinate eugenic coordinates within a specific racial situation are ultimately futile.

[2] The irony of Eurasians being officially identified as 'Indian' from 1858 onward is inescapable, this identification being based upon the unarticulated coordinate of citizenship at a moment when the colonial Indian state was founded on the denial of citizenship to colonized subjects.

[3] Michel Foucault writes in the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1976) that

> the [governmental] analysis of heredity was placing sex…in a position of "biological responsibility" with regard to the species…Thus it appeared to be the source of an entire capital for the species to draw from…Innovations that merged together quite well, for the theory of "degenerescence" made it possible for them to perpetually refer back to one another; it explained how a heredity that was burdened with various maladies…ended by producing a sexual pervert. (118)

The connection between the production of a species—its *generation*—and its biological *de-generation* via the conduit of sex, is extremely noteworthy in this passage.

The colonial state was often the space where such discourses of "degenerescence" were produced, with many of these discourses later travelling to the metropole. This would explain why discourses of Eurasian racial degeneracy, delineated along the lines of sex, were to be found in both colonial India and the British metropole (Stoler 14-15).

For an incisive examination of the colonial production of interconnected discourses of racial and sexual degeneracy vis-à-vis a mixed race of part-European provenance, see Ann Laura Stoler's *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Stoler examines this phenomenon against the backdrop of the nineteenth-century Dutch East Indies. Note through a comparison of the first and third chapters of my dissertation, and Stoler's book, that the discourses of degeneracy marking 'mixed races' in both British India and the Dutch East Indies are almost seamlessly interchangeable. Also note Stoler's use of the category 'Eurasian' in both colonial locations, underscoring the transnational trajectory of the discourses of mixed bodies. Because, in my introduction, I observe such a trajectory in India through a partially transnational lens, I follow Stoler's example and use the nomenclature 'Eurasian' all through.

[4] Through the systematic contrast between the so-called Indo-Germanic (later expanded into the 'Indo-European') language family and 'other' language families, comparative philology constructed a supranational tribal history. This philological historiography positioned white Christian Europe at the center of contemporary world history. From German philosopher, poet, and literary critic Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803) and his fellow-German poet, philologist, and Indologist Karl Wilhelm Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829), to German philologist and Orientalist Max Muller (1823-1900) and beyond, nineteenth-century comparative philology coded a belonging to Indo-European or 'Aryan' cultural origins as being synonymous with belonging to a chosen people—a people whose ostensibly supreme linguistic and literary inheritance was inextricable from their supremacy as a race. Continuing this trend of belief, Arthur comte de Gobineau, in his *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines* [*Essay on the Inequality of Human Races*] (1853–55), wrote at length about Aryans as the summit of white racial supremacy for their having colonized ancient India, Egypt, and Greece, while Muller, as a philologist, problematically intertwined language and race to corroborate this discourse of Aryan supremacy.

Claiming that Sanskrit had acquired for itself a place in a supreme "republic of learning"—a 'republic' of the aforesaid Indo-European family of languages—Muller, in his *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (1859), bolstered the Aryan invasion theory that British archaeologist Mortimer Wheeler (1890-1976) had postulated. According to Muller's appropriation of Wheeler's theory, a group of Indo-European invaders from Central Asia had brought a Brahmanic Sanskrit civilization with them to the Indian subcontinent, and had settled in India by subjugating an inferior racial group—a group that inhabited the subcontinent and spoke a 'Dravidian' family of languages. Drawing from the *Rig Veda* to code 'Aryan' as a

philological signifier of racial supremacy, Muller best charts his problematic intertwinement of race and language vis-à-vis the notion of a 'chosen' people in his claim that "[t]he object and aim of philology, in its highest sense, is but one, to learn what man is, by learning what man has been" (*A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* 8; *Lectures on the Science of Language Delivered at the Royal Institute of Great Britain in April, May, and June 1861* 279). He thus essentially racializes "man" via language. His Strasbourg lecture of 1872 does not contradict this racialization despite its self-proclaimed delinking of race and language (Molendijk 112). His biologization of man in terms of race, one might conjecture, was probably assisted by the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in the same year as *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*.

Releasing language from racialization, I gesture at the mongrelism of bodies toward the end of my dissertation. This act becomes an ethical imperative because of what, in the larger context of race in the twentieth century, Peter van der Veer describes as "the most pernicious opposition in the history of modern Europe"—the opposition between the Aryan race and language family on the one hand, and the Semitic race and language family on the other (138). It was, after all, by deploying this opposition that Adolf Hitler, Chancellor of Germany from 1933 to 1945 and leader of the Nazi Party, nationalistically justified the large-scale extermination of Jews, the supremacy of the Jews having apparently been lost by their racial/sexual intermixture with non-Aryans (Gordon 92).

On the Indian front, right-wing Hindu nationalist movements that are collectively merged under the term 'Hindutva' subscribed, to lesser or greater extents, to conceptions of Aryan supremacy. While Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883-1966), the figure who formally coined the term 'Hindutva' in 1923, stated that India qua a Hindu nation was determined by the racial

mixing of the Aryans and the peoples they encountered, Madhav Sadashiv Golwalkar (1906-1973), perhaps the most prominent ideologue of Hindutva after Savarkar, wrote

> [t]o keep up the purity of the [Aryan] race and its culture, Germany shocked the world by her purging the country of the semitic Races—the Jews…Germany has shown how well nigh impossible it is for Races and cultures, having differences going to the root, to be assimilated into one united whole, a good lesson for us in Hindusthan to learn and profit by. (*The Hindu Nationalist Movement and Indian Politics 1925 to the 1990s* 55)

Through this right-wing ethnic reasoning, Golwalkar alludes to the extermination of India's Muslim minority which he identifies as an "internal threat"—a "foreign body" lodged into and undermining a monolithic Hindu society. While Golwalkar was, according to Christophe Jaffrelot, more concerned with religious and cultural unity than with racial purity, the cultural elements delineating his conception of India included, among other components, Sanskrit as the "mother language" of India and as "an expression of the Race spirit" (*The Hindu Nationalist Movement and Indian Politics 1925 to the 1990s* 55). These ideologies and their outcomes collectively considered, the compartmentalization of a linguistic group or a language can be said to be dangerous for its contorted usage as a means for the expression of a 'pure' "Race spirit." It is for this reason that I tacitly gesture at the end of my dissertation toward questioning philological constructions of racial purity by disavowing the possibility of isolating a certain language in an 'unmixed' state. This enables me to emphasize the impossibility of recuperating a 'pure' bodily whiteness qua "full-caste," continually shifting as the borders of whiteness do.

Indeed, in the context of a mixed race in India, Muller himself attested to the racial intermixture between the British and the Indians—an intermixture that, he asserted, was proof of

the tie bonding India's primordial Brahmanic Sanskrit narrative and the British association with the Indo-European language family:

> It would have been next to impossible to discover any traces of relationship between the swarthy natives of India and their conquerors, whether Alexander or Clive, but for the testimony borne by language…What authority would have been strong enough to convince the English soldier that the same blood was running in his veins and in the veins of the dark Bengalese [sic]? And yet there is not an English jury now a days [sic], which, after examining the hoary documents of language; would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton. (*A History of the Ancient Sanskrit Literature* 11-14)

While Muller attests to Indo-British intermixture in this passage, he seems to simultaneously gloss over the power differential between an "English jury" and the "dark Bengalese." It is, however, an avowal of this differential that we see in Muller's attribution of color to mark the colonized subject.

[5] I use the terms 'European' and 'Indian' vis-à-vis Eurasian bodies as a deliberate act of essentialism.

Early twentieth-century Eurasian activists, speaking out against what they deemed was the callousness of their British forefathers toward them, conceived of India's Eurasians as constituting a monolithic community. See Herbert Alick Stark's 1926 polemic *Hostages to India, Or The Life Story of the Anglo-Indian Race*. This conception of a monolithic community lingered on as late as 1969 in Frank Anthony's theorization of Anglo-Indians as a group. See Frank Anthony's *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community* (1969).

[6] The earliest application of the transnational category 'half-caste' that I have come across has been in English writer Dinah Mulock Craik's 1851 novel *The Half-Caste*. Published in Britain, the novel sees its 'half-caste' protagonist Zillah Le Poer, daughter of a British merchant and an Indian princess, go to Britain for the first time after her birth in India. Since she is 'Indian' from her mother's side, she is treated degradedly as a servant by her uncle Le Poer in whose house she is forced to put up while her parents live in India. That the term 'half-caste,' while used with racial inflections in 1851, was—at least in Craik's novel—yet to develop the more complex ramifications of colonial racialization that would haunt it later, can be witnessed in the fact that though Zillah's uncle reduces her to servitude, the fact that she is a citizen of Britain is never brought into question. After the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857—otherwise known as the First War of Indian Independence—Eurasians in India would, for the most part, not receive the luxury of citizenship in the metropole, as I discuss later in the introduction.

[7] See Nico Slate. *The Prism of Race: W. E. B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, and the Colored World of Cedric Dover*.

[8] Benedict Anderson genealogically gestures toward the inextricability of *class* and *race* from the conduit of *blood*; he suggests that the emphasis on maintaining a '*purity'* of blue blood via dynastic transmission can be traced to a threat that aristocratic groups—"upper *classes*"—perceived from popular nationalisms (149-50). This perhaps helps explain another connotation of the 'purity' of a *'pure' breed* that is etymologically linked to *caste*.

Speaking in the context of the *varna* system in India, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar delineates caste along lines that are somewhat similar. In his paper *Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development* which he read at Columbia University in 1916 (a mere one year before Reuter's article was published), Ambedkar defines *varna* qua caste as "an

enclosed class"—one whose "essence" functions through endogamy as its general mechanism (6-15). As the reader will find, my dissertation focuses in part of the first chapter on *how* upper-class British administrators stopped marrying Eurasians from 1858, if only because these administrators, as India's rulers, had to maintain their 'purity' of masculine militarized blood.

[9] The unsettling construction of this telos of class founded on color in a racially inflected article is hardly surprising—as C. L. R. James puts it in the context of Mulattos as slaves in Haiti prior to the San Domingo Revolution, a slave could be kept in a state of subjugation because his *black skin* was made a self-evident marker of his identity as a slave. This marker was, by extension, intended to function as a means to translate the lack of whiteness into a perception of inferiority and degradation, and to instate the almost untouchable superiority of the master in a common sense shared to lesser or greater degrees by colonizer and colonized alike (James 39). See C. L. R. James' *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* (1963).

[10] See endnote 4.

In 1942, against the backdrop of the Second World War, Dover questioned a colonial location of Eurasians at the nadir of a "Nordic Utopia"—a utopia created by the "ineptitude of Nazi racialists" (*Hell in the Sunshine*, 12). Ironically, the specter of racial degeneracy via intermixture of blood manifested itself in Adolf Hitler's justification for exterminating "racial" Jews in the aftermath of the German losses resulting from the First World War. Hitler writes in his autobiography *Mein Kampf* [*My Struggle*] (1925)

> After a thousand years and more, *the last visible trace of the former master people is often seen in the lighter skin color* which its blood left behind in the subjugated race, and in a petrified culture which it had originally created… As in daily life the so-called

> genius requires a special cause, indeed, often a positive impetus, to make him shine, likewise the genius-race in the life of …*the Aryan gave up the purity of his blood* and, therefore, lost his sojourn in the paradise which he had made for himself. *He became submerged in the racial intermixture, and gradually, more and more, lost his cultural capacity, until at last, not only mentally but also physically, he began to resemble the subjected aborigines more than his own ancestors*…Thus cultures and empires collapsed to make place for new formations. *Blood mixture and the resultant drop in the racial level is the sole cause for the dying out of old cultures; for men do not perish as a result of lost wars, but by the loss of the force of resistance which is contained only in pure blood*. *All who are not of good race in this world are chaff*. (*Mein Kampf by Adolf Hitler. Volume One – A Reckoning. Chapter IX: Nation and Race*)

The continual references to 'pure' blood and the bodily vigor ostensibly inherent to it, find parallels in what Reuter states about India's 'degenerate' Eurasians vis-à-vis their biologically 'pure'/'unmixed' white colonial forefathers.

[11] This social mobility was certainly afforded to Mulattos in Jamaica or Martinique where there was what Kathryn Talalay calls a "three-color caste system," the three colors in question being white, "mulatto," and black. Talalay, however, justifiably expresses skepticism about whether this three-color system enabled Mulattos mobility in the United States, where 'one drop of black blood' was enough to codify a body as Negro. Indeed, this one-drop rule was being legally codified in many states in America even as Reuter was writing his article (Talalay 130).

[12] It is noteworthy that Wallace's book was published in 1929—the same year that saw the publication of Dover's polemic *Cimmerii, or Eurasians and Their Future*. Because it notoriously took the British to task for their abjuration of responsibility toward the social mobility and well-

being of Eurasians, Dover's polemic gained more circulation than Wallace's treatise did, as Priyaranjan Sen's review of *Cimmerii* in *The Calcutta Review* testifies (285).

[13] See Mrinalini Sinha. *The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali in the Late Nineteenth Century*.

[14] On a similar note, Reuter states in *The Mulatto in the United States* that Eurasian women in India frequently opted for prostitution (29-30).

[15] The "first class" consisted of those born of European patrilineal wedlock; the "second class" was inhabited by those of European patrilineage born out of wedlock; the "third class" referred to those subjects born of European mothers in Indian patrilineal wedlock; the "fourth class" alluded to those born of European mothers and Indian fathers out of wedlock; the "fifth class" put together those of Indo-Portuguese lineage and/or Indian Christians and/or—as is implicitly indicated in *The Asiatic Journal*—those passing for Eurasian (*The Asiatic Journal, Volume 5* 15-16).

[16] The irony to this chromatic solvency was heightened after 1858 when poor whites living in India also juridically *became* 'Eurasian.' This intertwinement of chromatic and financial solvency probably mattered because in a British colonial administrative imaginary, the good white masculine body had to be financially sound to emanate administrative power and, on a more practical note, to be able to return to the metropole. In short, poor whites became part of the "fifth class" of Eurasians because of their lack of financial resources. If so, the "fifth class" could be claimed to be the residentiary rubric for a multitude of 'other' bodies that were racially, chromatically, and financially solvent to differing degrees—a fact that I have indicated in footnote xv (*The Asiatic Journal, Volume 5* 15-16). This elastic nature of the fifth class unwittingly gestures toward the mongrelism that Dover calls for.

[17] A. H. writes in one of his most noteworthy letters, "My father having been a German, I do not see, how I can, without tacitly disavowing my origin, call myself an Indo-Briton, an Asiatic-Briton, or even an Anglo-Asiatic." Regardless of this, he feels that 'Eurasian' is the best term that can be used for Ricketts' "excellent…Address" to the directors of the East India Company (Chaudhuri 86).

[18] In the third chapter of my dissertation, I explain why I use the word 'author' and not 'writer' in this context, Roland Barthes' and Michel Foucault's brilliant problematizations of the figure of the author notwithstanding.

[19] See footnote 15.

[20] All the translations from the original Bengali are mine.

[21] Recall my statement that Eurasians were, as early as the 1890s, being equated by colonized Indian subjects with "Negros."

[22] I am in no way suggesting that the myth of Judith Wheeler was the only means by which discourses of racial and sexual fall were appended to Eurasian bodies in the aftermath of 1857: as I have stated, Judith, as a narrative coordinate, functions as a point of entry for my examinations of legends of Eurasian 'fall.' Consequently, the reader will find the themes inaugurated in this narrative coordinate echoing throughout my dissertation.

CHAPTER ONE: THE SEXUAL DEGENERACY OF EMPIRE: OBLITERATING THE EURASIAN IN COLONIAL INDIA

Barely a year and a half after the Sepoy 'Mutiny' had been brought to its knees by the Anglo-Indian[1] retribution upon the 'mutineers,' a legal case took colonial India by storm. The case involved Josiah Dashwood Gillies, an Assistant Surgeon in the employ of the British East India Company. Despite his professional success and popularity, Gillies was charged by Duncan Macpherson, Inspector-General of Hospitals in India, with "disgraceful" professional conduct that rendered him "a discreditable member of [the medical] profession." The charges were occasioned by the death of one Mrs. Stonehouse, the wife of an Anglo-Indian Lieutenant in the Madras Native Infantry. Mrs. Stonehouse had been under Gillies' care when giving birth to her child. She subsequently died of pregnancy-related complications. Gillies was charged with having caused "the greatest distress to the poor sufferer" by physically exposing her whole body as he attempted to examine her aching abdomen. He was also alleged to have excluded nurses from the space of confinement while "perform[ing] many menial services on [Mrs. Stonehouse's] person" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 103-05). Much as Macpherson's suggestion was that the actions Gillies had performed on Mrs Stonehouse just fell short of rape, Gillies was exonerated of the charges because he was found to have acted with sound medical "skill and judgement" in his treatment of Mrs. Stonehouse without having hastened her unavoidable death (Ballhatchet 104-05). The tacit charge of sexual 'violation'—evidently an outgrowth of the rumors of brown men raping white women during the Mutiny—was consequently also dismissed, at least on paper (Ballhatchet 103-05).

The most interesting allegation brought against Gillies, though, was perhaps the only articulately expressed and coherent of the charges—his supposed "worse than empiricism in his

treatment of the late Mrs. Stonehouse" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 103). I would propose that Gillies' successful diagnosis of Mrs. Stonehouse's pregnancy-related complications provides an explanation as to what this "worse than empiricism" might have been: Gillies had diagnosed Mrs. Stonehouse with puerperal peritonitis, a disease linked by contemporary continental medical research with venereal disease (Ballhatchet 102-06; Bernuntz and Goupil 46). In light of this research and the currency it had gained, the indication of Gillies' diagnosis—at least to the average imperially-minded member of the Anglo-Indian administration—would seem to be that Mrs. Stonehouse's husband had passed venereal disease on to her after having exposed himself to an Indian prostitute. Almost all erstwhile military cantonments were, after all, appended to brothels notorious as fertile breeding ground for venereal disease, particularly in the Madras Presidency where Mr. Stonehouse had been stationed. In other words, Mr. Stonehouse had implicitly betrayed the British empire in India on two counts: 1. By contracting venereal disease, he had compromised his masculinity to betray the "manly spirit" of the British empire, and that too just when the administration was regaining its foothold in India after the Mutiny (Macaulay, "Clive" 130); 2. At precisely the moment when it was being proved that many Anglo-Indian soldiers had in fact raped Indian women during the Mutiny, thus threatening to people India with biracial offspring, Mr. Stonehouse—a thoroughbred Englishman—and not the brown mutineer-rapist of the Anglo-Indian imaginary was proved, in the public eye, to have 'raped' his wife by sexually infecting her (Lehning 131). The Eurasian was the biracial Caliban who was, for all practical purposes, said to result from interracial sexual union/rape, thus inhabiting a cosmos of sexual disgrace. With Gillies himself being a biracial Eurasian, the unkindest cut to Mr. Stonehouse's English racial identity was that Gillies conducted the diagnosis of Mrs. Stonehouse's ailment, apparently dragging Mr. Stonehouse down to his own level of

racial/sexual disgrace in the process: the Eurasian man was, in nineteenth-century Anglo-Indian discourse, stereotypically not quite/not white/not masculine, and the Eurasian woman was associated with sexually 'illicit' practices (Hawes 16). The incident compromised Mr. Stonehouse's position in that he had been diagnosed as lacking in the white racial masculinity requisite for imperial administration, thus coming to resemble the Eurasian's racial and sexual position. Hence perhaps Macpherson's self-righteous indignation against Gillies' diagnosis.

I begin with this anecdote because it sums up a significant factor that had come to define the Sepoy Mutiny via colonially-conceived racial discourses. The post-1857 moment was one when the racial prejudices of India's white rulers, having piled up to generate fictions about the colonized, could raise these fictions to the level of truth-effect and subsequently play them out in a more tightly-administered colonial dispensation. Central to this dispensation was, as I have stated, the discourse of the 'masculine' strength of colonial officials and soldiers, on whose shoulders the stability of the British empire in India was said to depend. This was inextricably connected with the need for this fiction of strength to be restored in the aftermath of the Mutiny, dependent as the submissiveness of the 'effeminate' colonized subject was on the truth-effect of this myth. The necessity for this second baptism into masculinity arose because of the explosion of venereal disease among the soldiers and (to a lesser extent) the officials via the brothels appended to their cantonments. This medical anomaly had in fact compromised the colonial response against the mutineers in Lucknow, which had been one of the main centers of the Mutiny.

If the indisputability of the masculinity of empire had to be reinstated after such a setback, the empire had to morally portray itself as possessing an indefatigable sexual discipline founded—at least theoretically—on restraint, thus exorcizing the specter of sexual degeneracy

and weakened masculinity haunting it via venereal disease. This specter of venereal disease was displaced upon the Eurasian, with a project of stereotyping Eurasians into pathological sexual fallenness being systematized after 1857. This stereotyping helped proliferate the belief that it was in fact the Eurasian and not the Anglo-Indian who was lacking in masculinity. Simultaneously, the marriage between an Anglo-Indian husband and an Indian wife, and the resultant birth of their Eurasian child was said to reduce the 'masculine' military prowess of the husband. This discursive paradigm was projected as an explication of why the Anglo-Indian soldiery had, however temporarily, been routed by the mutineers of 1857 in Lucknow. Ergo, interracial marriages were systemically obstructed by the British Government after 1857, and marriages between Anglo-Indian military officers and their female racial counterparts were tacitly made the administrative norm.

This pathologization of the Eurasian was also part of the Utilitarian need to create a racial distance between white colonizer and brown subject—the ruler was to be projected in terms of an indefatigable sexual discipline, this discipline being connotative of a racial superiority vis-à-vis the colonized subject. To assist this projection of discipline, rumors of mutineers raping Anglo-Indian women had to be put to rest to schematize the Anglo-Indian conjugal space as the fundamental unit of imperial control. Within this unit, the Anglo-Indian woman's sexual 'purity' would keep the colonized subject—her prospective rapist—at bay, and Anglo-Indian sexual discipline would subsequently bring any further uprisings to their knees.

To show this entire project at work, in this chapter I will examine the originary Mutiny myth of the brown mutineer-rapist i.e. the myth of 'Judith of Cawnpore' that had clutched in its stranglehold the white imaginary in both metropolis and colony. This Judith, daughter of the English commanding officer at Kanpur during the Mutiny, had, by her own admission lived with

her mutineer who had saved her life. It was consequently concluded that Judith had been living in 'concubinage'—a state not dissociable from interracial rape in a colonial understanding. Whether or not Judith was indeed Eurasian, this narrative of her concubinage, in an inexplicable disjunction between cause and effect, situated her as racially Eurasian in the annals of the Mutiny. To examine the production of this seemingly self-evident truth-effect by the white patriarchy of empire, I will analyze George Dodd's and George Otto Trevelyan's vastly different treatments of the myth. By investigating these narratives, I show the process by which insinuations of sexual 'impurity' were deflected upon the Eurasian in general, and the Eurasian woman in particular. I examine this process of deflection in conjunction with two Victorian novels—James Grant's *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Mutiny* (1863) and Philip Meadows Taylor's *Seeta* (1872). I use these novels to demonstrate how the upper-caste Hindu discourse of *satitva* i.e. sexual fidelity to one's husband unto and beyond death, was appropriated into the Anglo-Indian conjugal space, inscribing the Anglo-Indian wife as a white *sati* i.e. a sexually 'pure' woman who preferred death to being raped by the brown mutineers strewing colonial India. Simultaneously, the Eurasian woman was produced as a hypersexual monstrosity lacking in *satitva*. This lack was fabricated to help consolidate the administrative belief that the Anglo-Indian colonizer had, in his best interests, to marry his female racial counterpart. By avoiding rape, this counterpart would concomitantly avoid the symbolic castration of her husband and of empire. In opposition, the lack in the Eurasian woman's *satitva* was said to jeopardize the Anglo-Indian soldier's masculinity and the inexorable expansion of the British empire. Venereal disease was what had endangered the masculinity of empire, and with venereal disease this story would have to come full circle. Missionaries associated with the social-purity movements completed this circle of lack by identifying Eurasian women as the "prostitute class

of India," perennially infected by venereal disease and needing treatment in the lock hospitals appended to the cantonment brothels.

Through this post-1857 reductive racial and sexual lens, the Eurasian helped tacitly instate as policy what had remained merely discursive in Trevelyan's text—her own exile from the urban spaces of empire, and the attendant restitution of white colonial masculinity to the veneer of fullness. I emphasize the articulation of policy and the tacitness of this articulation in the same breath because the forging of the Eurasian as an unspeakable and unnamable anomaly was facilitated by paradoxically allowing her to be much spoken and written about as precisely an anomaly. Stereotyping can, after all, be said to be an act of simultaneous speech and silence—it is a disavowal of an aberration that simultaneously acknowledges the supremacy of the forger producing this aberration through repeated articulations. This marriage of acknowledgement and disavowal is what pigeonholed the Eurasian woman into occupying the space of what I call 'sexual sedition'— the space of the sexual outlaw qua unnamable and unspeakable monstrosity, a threat to the masculine governance of British India.[2] It was 'sedition'—the possibility, in this case, of compromising the 'masculinity' of empire—that was unnamable, and that could be spoken of only after it had found an object upon which it could displace itself. This object was the sexually-degenerate Eurasian. Once this object of sexual degeneracy could be spoken of in terms of 'legal fictions,' her degeneracy could be exaggerated to the level of truth-effect, framing her as a figure who dislodged empire from within.

The imperial appropriation of *satitva* is, however, ridden by a paradox—the Anglo-Indian *sati* could, as I show, never possess enough *satitva*, not least because the Hindu widow, the fundamental denominator of *satitva*, was herself the most frequently-encountered inhabitant in the cantonment brothels. Lower-class Eurasian women did not necessarily constitute the

"prostitute class of India." The figure of the perennially-fallen Eurasian woman could be problematized further because she was racially produced in opposition to a transcendental racial 'Englishness' in the colony. As I show through a reading of Eurasian Amelia Horne's 1913 memoirs about the Mutiny, the masculinity of imperial administration could be said to occupy the space of a chimerical fiction—the fiction that a second act of anti-colonial insurgency could not arise, given the apparent infallibility of imperial masculinity. Given the legal location of such anti-colonial insurgencies under 'sedition,' this rubric, I suggest, can be used to define the space from which the 'legal fictions' of empire were generated. These legal fictions included most importantly, a transcendental metropolitan 'Englishness' of race, and by extension an appropriation of this metropolitan identity by the English in the colony, the fallenness of the Eurasian being defined against this version of 'Englishness' located in the colony. Ironically, this indigenized Englishness, as my reading of Horne shows, would always be found lacking when compared with its metropolitan counterpart. I therefore suggest that 'sedition' could function as the space for the production and containment of colonial anomalies, and for the simultaneous exposure of these anomalies as a string of open-ended legal fictions. The post-Mutiny figuration of the Eurasian worked within this space which produced her as oversexed and perceived her as a threat to the sexual discipline and racial supremacy of empire. Hence my use of the term 'sexual sedition' to describe the cosmology that the Eurasian was made to inhabit in colonial India immediately after 1857.

The Origins of Eurasian Sexual Degeneracy

I will have to open my argument by addressing the question of beginnings because the figuration of the Eurasian in terms of inveterate sexual degeneracy sprang out of a long-standing

prejudice against Indians of European racial descent. This prejudice predated the foundation of the British empire in India in 1757.[3]

Since the soldiers of the British East India Company came to India taking it for granted that, as Eric Stokes succinctly puts it, "the climate or disease would carry them off," there was a dearth of British women willing to come to India (2). The lack of steamships that would allow these women to travel to India comfortably and safely, did not help either. Consequently, the Company encouraged its employees to marry Indian women. It hoped that marriage, as an ostensibly disciplinary institution, would keep the soldiers from 'wickedness.' What it had not counted on was the explosion of the Eurasian population in India that would result from these interracial marriages. This was a population against which the Company was prejudiced from the start because it was unclear whether the Eurasian's allegiances lay with the Company or with the native inhabitants of India. This made the Eurasian appear a looming political threat to empire, leading Cornwallis, Governor of the Presidency of Bengal, to refuse Eurasians appointment to the East India Company's civil, military, and marine services after 1791 (Hawes 1-20).

To make matters worse for the Company, most of the unions that its white soldiers contracted with Indian women were out of wedlock because the legal registration of marriages was an expensive affair, while these soldiers were, for the greater part, poor and/or in debt. This predilection for unions outside wedlock also percolated upward among the officials in the upper echelons of the administration, so that between 1757 and 1800, only one in four Anglo-Indian covenanted civil servants, one in eight Anglo-Indian civilian residents, and one in ten Anglo-Indian army officers, were in legally-recognized unions. This statistic is of course based on the number of marriages on record, so that the actual number of non-marital unions can be assumed to have been much higher. At most, unions contracted sans legal solemnization by military

officers, were recognized in military cantonments by an extended 'service family,' with the supervising colonel and his officers undertaking the responsibility of guiding each couple's 'marital' life (Hawes 1-20).

Such unions forged outside the disciplinary lines of marriage were, according to a military officer of the Company writing in 1818, detrimental to "the health, the morals, and the discipline of the men" because of an apparent causality linking such a "system of concubinage" and the military discipline of the men serving empire (qtd. in Hawes 13). A careful reading of the military officer's letter reveals a concomitantly self-evident causality linking the military "system of concubinage" lacking in morals, and the reproduction of this same lack in the Eurasian child born of 'concubinage.'[4]

With the arrival of Utilitarianism on the scene, the truism in between the lines of this letter—that the Eurasian born of 'concubinage' was no more than a 'concubine' herself—came to be propagated throughout colonial India as a danger because of the belief that "It is upon [the Indians'] continued impression of the superiority of [the Anglo-Indian] character that [empire's] existence must depend," as East India Company administrator Sir John Malcolm put it (qtd. in Hawes 27). Conveniently, the administration could disseminate the required sense of moral superiority through the ready-to-hand axiom dissociating its predominantly white Anglo-Indian administration from the racial and therefore moral lack in the not quite/not white Eurasian (Hawes 37). Whiteness came to stand for racial and moral pre-eminence, and the Eurasian came to be barred from a share in this supremacy because by a self-propulsive inevitability, she was born of non-marital unions and was therefore allied with sexually 'illegitimate' practices not recognized by the colonial state e.g. prostitution, homosexuality, and incest. These practices were said to be matters relating to the "satisfaction of natural impulse" that the Eurasian

supposedly craved from birth (Mizutani 118-21). The discourse of Anglo-Indian sexual discipline that ensued, was made to stand for the spurious hegemonic desirability among 'effeminate' Indians for Anglo-Indian racial dominance—a dominance that was racially superior because of the "manly spirit" with which it exercised sexual self-restraint (Macaulay, "Clive" 41).

When White Masculinity Rarefies

According to W. J. Moore, Surgeon-General of Bombay, it was, taking the aforementioned racio-sexual prejudice into account, in the Anglo-Indians' best interests to marry their racial counterparts to sustain the mythic "superiority" of white masculinity among the colonized. However, Moore also argued that the pre-1857 'concubinage' in which the greater part of the soldiery was living, served an important purpose—it satisfied a soldier's 'masculine needs.' This satisfaction, he stated, was imperative to the use of the soldier's 'manly' energies for king and country. In the absence of British wives, prostitution involving Indian women seemed to be the only way to satisfy these 'needs' There were, after all, "only two ways of satisfaction, viz, masturbation and mercenary love," and "[t]he former, as is well known, leads to disorders of both body and mind" (qtd. in Balhatchet 10). The Company finally decided to affix *lal bazaars* or red-light areas to the Anglo-Indian cantonments around the end of the eighteenth century. The Governments of the various presidencies had no option but to tacitly recognize this arrangement as a requisite to maintaining the stability of the British empire—the East India Company's imperial pursuits were said to depend on the satisfaction of the masculine energies innate to the "blood of England" (qtd. in Ballhatchet 38).[5]

Alas for empire, that which was expected to sustain Anglo-Indian masculinity took away from it: venereal disease became pronouncedly rampant among the soldiers since at least 1805.

The subsequent framework within which the cantonments were bound in a desperate effort to satisfy the soldiers' masculinity while keeping venereal disease at bay, was to augment the *lal bazaars* with 'lock hospitals'—an indigenized version of the Victorian establishment in which "disordered" and "diseased Publick [sic] women," "liable from their general habits to occasion the diffusion of the fatal complaint," were sent for regular treatment (qtd. in Ballhatchet 10-12). The "disordered" and "diseased Publick woman" was, quite literally, locked up in the lock hospital for treatment. Once cured, she could go back to satisfying the "blood of England" in the *lal bazaars* (Ballhatchet 10-12).

In the early 1830s i.e. at the precise time when the East India Company had to renew its charter to be permitted to continue its trading operations with India, the governments of the various presidencies discovered that contrary to their expectations, the lock hospitals were not helping check venereal disease. The primary reason that the Medical Board posited for this failure was the prostitutes' unwillingness to complete their course of treatment since they were having to put their livelihoods on hold while being treated. To cut corners, the governments of multiple presidencies shut down lock hospitals (Ballhatchet 11-32).

During the Sepoy Mutiny, the absence of lock hospitals and the consequent lack of a soldiery free from venereal disease proved a considerable problem. This was especially the case in Lucknow, the capital of Awadh which became a center for the Mutiny. The statistics of venereal disease among the Anglo-Indian soldiers at Lucknow was very high, so that the resistance there was caught quite off-guard when the Mutiny broke out. The need for an Anglo-Indian soldiery that was 'masculine' enough, as opposed to having the blood of England "tainted with the venereal poison," was felt like never before (qtd. in Ballhatchet 38).[6] Immediately after the Mutiny, a strictly-administered lock hospital was opened in Lucknow (Ballhatchet 36-38).

The venereal depletion of Anglo-Indian 'manliness' with "the Army as its great focus and factory"[7] had now come to a climax (qtd. in Ballhatchet 38). In the aftermath of the Mutiny, the administration decided to deal with the problem head on to avoid similar future contingencies. The Utilitarian results of this decision were the adoption of the 1864 Cantonment Act and the 1868 Contagious Diseases Act in all the presidencies. The Contagious Diseases Act was intended to groom a breed of Indian prostitutes whose movements would be limited to the cantonments with which they were registered, and who could therefore not spread venereal disease outside these cantonments. Complementing this policy, the Cantonment Act was expected to prevent the incursion of other prostitutes—who might or might not be prospective carriers of venereal disease—into a cantonment with which they were not registered (Banerjee 67).

Evidently, for the administration to contain the rarefaction of white masculinity within the quarantines of the lock hospital was to prevent the 'effeminate' Indian from comprehending the threat that his 'manly' colonizer faced. However, this containment had to be augmented not only at the level of practice but also discursively through a reconfiguration of the mythography of white masculinity. This was to be a reconfiguration under the sign of the Mutiny that could displace the apparition of venereal disease upon the quintessential not quite/not white/not masculine figure i.e. the Eurasian.

This project was largely executed by George Otto Trevelyan, nephew of Thomas Babington Macaulay. Trevelyan wrote an account of the events of the Sepoy Mutiny as manifested in Kanpur, and published it in 1866. The account is in fact less a chronology of the events, and more an effort to prove how a Eurasian child born of an Anglo-Indian father recursively infected her father's masculinity, making him fail to oppose the mutineers. Trevelyan links this recursion to the sexual degeneracy inherent to the Eurasian child born and bred in a

"system of concubinage" (63). It is through this credo of Eurasian sexual degeneracy that Trevelyan explains the failure of the imperial resistance at Kanpur.

The protagonist of Trevelyan's narrative is Hugh Wheeler, commander of the Anglo-Indian forces at Kanpur. In analyzing the causes of Wheeler's military failure, Trevelyan expresses a strong disapprobation of Wheeler's identification with the sepoys under his command—an identification that expressed itself in the way he "worshipped" them and "spoke their language like one of themselves" (63). This disapproval can be traced back to the influence of Trevelyan's father Charles.[8] According to the senior Trevelyan, to "set the natives on a process of European improvement," what was essential was "diffusing European knowledge, and…naturalising European institutions" in colonial India. This process of Europeanization had, though, to be set to work at a lagging pace to ensure that "[t]he natives will not rise against us…there will be no struggle, no mutual exasperation" (qtd. in Stokes 47). This Utilitarian belief was in stark opposition to an older paternalistic administration of law and governance intent on conserving what were perceived to be India's precolonial institutions. The declared intent of this paternalistic system was the administration of justice to make the Indian look upon her Anglo-Indian savior as "*ma-bap*" i.e. mother and father (Stokes 18-21). George Trevelyan views Hugh Wheeler as one of the last torchbearers of this dying school of governance; hence his critical attention to Wheeler's "predilection for the natives of Hindostan" that culminated in the natives rising against the Company in an unprecedented manner (63). It is to Wheeler's dangerous romance with the native that Trevelyan causally traces the start of Wheeler's failure as a military leader. Wheeler's "unsoldierlike" leadership of the resistance at Kanpur was, by Trevelyan's assessment, redolent of the 'effeminacy' of the native "Bengalee" who, said Macaulay, "scarcely ever enlists as a soldier" unlike the "manly" Anglo-Indian ("Clive" 73; 130).[9]

Before proceeding any further, it is necessary to clarify that which Trevelyan leaves out of the picture—the matter of Lucknow. In light of the countrywide discussions of venereal disease in the *lal bazaars*, it is highly unlikely that Trevelyan would have been unaware of the problem that Lucknow was facing during the Mutiny. Indeed, Lucknow always lies in the peripheries of Trevelyan's account, as an eternal constituent of his cognitive map of Kanpur—it is the place from where the expected relief arrives at Kanpur only when it is too late. Lucknow and its soldiery manifest themselves in Trevelyan's account as a dangerous supplement that deducts from the 'manly spirit' of the resistance to the Mutiny by bringing venereal disease into the spatiality of Kanpur.[10] The need to prevent the blood of England from being "tainted with the venereal poison" was felt like never before. Immediately after the Mutiny, the Government opened a strictly administered lock hospital in Lucknow (Ballhatchet 36-38).

In the spirit of the confinement of this "poison" within the lock hospitals, to speak of masculine lack in terms of venereal disease was to name that which could not be named—that which needed to be contained, confined, and rendered invisible within the darkness of the lock hospital in Lucknow. The losses of the Mutiny had reduced the Anglo-Indian soldier affected by venereal disease to an unnamable aberration that a *Daily Telegraph* article could only refer to as a "womanish man," recalling the effeminacy that Trevelyan attributes to Wheeler (qtd. in Ballhatchet 90). But to be not-masculine was also to be not quite/not white—which brought the Eurasian to haunt this chain of signification. From this viewpoint, Wheeler's 'unsoldierly' lack in masculinity was almost inevitably shadowed by the apparition of the Eurasian. Little wonder that Trevelyan, to preserve the 'manly spirit' of empire, completes his picture of Wheeler using the Eurasian as a coordinate. The unnamable monstrosity that was venereal disease was veering toward a name—the Eurasian (Andrew and Bushnell 52).

Wheeler's intimacy with the native culminated, much to Trevelyan's vociferous disgust, in his displaying "the strongest proof which it is in the power of a man to give" i.e. by marrying an Indian woman, and by giving birth to a Eurasian child to situate himself within the "system of concubinage" (63). After sketching this picture of Wheeler's prohibited sexual exploit, Trevelyan covers scores of pages dogmatically condemning the atrocities that the mutineers had perpetrated upon Kanpur's Anglo-Indian inhabitants. The references to these events, though, merely serve as an excuse, a pre-text that leads Trevelyan to the climax of his narrative. This climax is merely an extension of the 1858 decision made by the Select Committee on Colonization and Settlement to the effect that only individuals who were "the progeny of an unmixed [Anglo-Indian] race" would henceforth be appointed as soldiers by the administration. According to an article published in the *Calcutta Review*, "The unmistakable hand of nature having separated and dissociated the black race from the white, terrible and portentous effects might be expected to flow from their unnatural union. It is feared that in the fatal mélange which would thus be produced, the European stock would shortly lose all its virtue and pre-eminence" (qtd. in Mizutani 31). This subtraction of the European's "virtue and pre-eminence" i.e. of his imperial masculinity, constitutes the climax of Trevelyan's narrative. Trevelyan claims that this subtraction is exactly what Wheeler's ostensibly Eurasian daughter Judith perpetrated upon her father, causing Wheeler's "unsoldierlike" defeat at the hands of the mutineers.[11] Lucknow, as the dangerous supplement to this defeat, would have had a different story to tell about the loss of colonial 'virtue and pre-eminence.' But the aberration of venereal disease flowing between Lucknow and Kanpur could not be named, which is why Trevelyan decides to settle for the Eurasian as the anomaly, the "womanish man" who can be named without qualms of imperial conscience.

The ultimate intent of Trevelyan's narrative, as a cog in this strand of opinion, is to prove that Judith reduced Wheeler to the 'not-masculine' lack by which the Eurasian was self-evidently defined. This line of reasoning stands the climax of Trevelyan's narrative in good stead:

> Ali Khan, a young trooper…had selected, as his share of the booty, the youngest daughter of Sir Hugh [i.e. Judith]. He must have been one of a pair who were observed "leading away…a lady on horseback"…Meanwhile the poor girl was living quietly in the family of her master under a Mahomedan name…*She was by no means of pure English blood*. *To some the very statement of the fact may appear heartless, but truth demands that it should be made*." (212-13; emphasis mine)

There was, ironically, little proof that Judith was Eurasian. She has been depicted in most colonial accounts as a Eurasian, but almost all these accounts seem to have fallen back upon Trevelyan's text for information on Judith's racial antecedents.[12] The quoted passage has only to be put in dialogue with George Dodd's multiple anecdotes about this same Judith, to help figure out the precise ramifications of Trevelyan's narrative. Dodd, in his 1859 *History of the Indian Revolt*, expends a considerable portion of text to the beatification of 'Judith of Cawnpore.' With the propagation of rumors of brown men raping white women, the colonial administrative common sense needed a mythic white martyr after the Mutiny—a martyr threatened with rape by a mutineer, a martyr who could be sanctified into beatitude for having fought off rape. Dodd's Judith fulfilled this function. Contrary to Trevelyan, Dodd claims that Judith was Anglo-Indian and had proved herself a heroine during the Mutiny by protecting her sexual purity in the face of rape. She had, according to Dodd, preferred death to rape and imprisonment in the harem of Nana Saheb, the leader of the Mutiny at Kanpur:

> According to [Judith's] ayah's narrative,…the women and elder girls...were sought to be tempted by an emissary of the Nena [sic] to enter quietly into his harem. They one and all expressed a determination to die where they were, and with each other, rather than yield to dishonour. They were then destined to be given up to the sexual licence of the sepoys and *sowars* [horsemen] who had aided in their capture; but the heroic conduct of Sir Hugh Wheeler's daughter is said to have deferred the ruffians. What this 'Judith of Cawnpore' [sic] really did, is differently reported. Her heroism was manifested, in one version of the story, by an undaunted and indignant reproach against the native troops for their treachery to the English who had fed and clothed them, and for their cowardice in molesting defenceless women. In another version, she shot down five sepoys with a revolver, and then threw herself into a well to escape outrage;[13] in a third, given by Mr. Shepherd,[14] this English lady, being taken by a trooper of the 2d native cavalry to his own hut, rose in the night, secured the trooper's sword, killed him and three other men, and then threw herself into a well; while a fourth version, on the authority of the ayah, represents the general's daughter as cutting off the heads of no less than five men in the trooper's hut.[15] *These accounts, incompatible one with another, nevertheless reveal to us a true soldier's daughter, an English gentlewoman, resolved to proceed to any extremity in defence of her own purity*." (139-40; emphasis mine)

Indeed, the incompatibility of Dodd's many narratives does not matter to him. What matters is that his Judith inserts herself into an Anglo-Indian common sense as a woman who had proved herself an "English gentlewoman" because she had defended her 'purity.' More significantly, her "defence of her own purity" had, by a curious tautology, proved that she was racially English. Ergo, for Judith to be white was for her to be shorn of the Eurasian woman's sexually 'illicit'

practices. It was by extension to have her recursively prove that her Anglo-Indian father was white and therefore masculine i.e. a "true soldier," unlike Trevelyan's "unsoldierlike" Wheeler.

Trevelyan's narrative closes with the reinforcements from Lucknow arriving on the scene of defeat to providentially restore imperial control over Kanpur. Unfortunately, Kanpur had already lost by having had a Eurasian render the masculinity of empire circumspect: "To some the very statement of the fact may appear heartless, but truth demands that it should be made" (Trevelyan 212-13). This quote is also a pre-text to not speak of that which was more likely the cause of the defeat at Kanpur—venereal disease.

Dodd's narrative of white Judith engulfed the greater Anglo-Indian imaginary in which she remained haloed within the whiteness of her virginity.[16] However, Trevelyan's version also had its desired effect by emphasizing the need to bring the Eurasian more strictly within administrative clutches. In fact, the two versions of the Judith narrative are, if carefully examined, not essentially different from each other. The "English gentlewoman," by resisting rape and thus preventing her Anglo-Indian patriarch from symbolic emasculation, becomes a metonym for a successful familial unit where she can stand without scruples for whiteness, and where whiteness can stand for masculinity. The Eurasian, on the other hand, deducts from this masculinity by not resisting dis-location into a harem—a space that, in later nineteenth-century Anglo-Indian missionary discourse, was perceived as a counterpart of the *lal bazaar* (Sagar 285; Clark 147). This perception of the harem was what enabled American social 'reformers' like Elizabeth Wheeler Andrew and Kate Bushnell to say in their report about the Contagious Diseases Act that "there is a class in India being trained to prostitution…and many of this class are the children of Englishmen…*This is, properly speaking, the prostitute class of India*, *those born to their fate*" (52; emphasis mine). Reminiscent of the military officer's letter that I quoted,

Andrew and Bushnell's reasoning made the Eurasian and the prostitute in the *lal bazaar* synonymous in their location within 'concubinage.' This synonymity, of course, traces its origins to 1858 when, in the wake of the Select Committee's decision to not employ the 'unsoldierlike' Eurasian, Moore could confidently say that "The question…is not yet decided if a healthy and vigorous [i.e. masculine] European stock" with "an admixture of native blood" "can be propagated and maintained" (qtd. in Mizutani 34).

Moore's pseudo-scientific diagnosis was merely part of a larger attempt to fix the Eurasian into sexual deviance for her lack in whiteness. On 28 July 1859, designated as a day of Thanksgiving for the defeat of the mutineers, Bishop Cotton, the Metropolitan of the Anglican Church in India, applied to Canning, the first Viceroy of India, to establish schools for Eurasian children to indoctrinate them away from their racial and sexual degeneracy. His application culminated in missionary John Graham's establishment of St. Andrew's Colonial Homes in Kalimpong. Graham's institution was part of a larger effort to conjure Eurasians away from the view of the urban colonized, and to ensure that the dilution of white masculinity remained, as far as possible, imperceptible within colonial urban spaces (Mizutani 138-48). Other efforts to effect this invisibility included cloistering Eurasians into farming settlements such as those established in India by Charles Booth,[17] training Eurasians for work on board ships which would be at sea for the greater part of the year, and forcing Eurasians to emigrate to the Andaman Islands in the Indian Ocean (Mizutani 118-21; Blunt 73-74, 108). This need for invisibility became a pressing concern because, according to James Ranald Martin, ex-surgeon in the Bengal army, the Anglo-Indian soldier's fathering of a Eurasian child made him "become domesticated in Indian habits;…he becomes an old Indian; in fact, an indolent man, and too much domesticated in India" (qtd. in Mizutani 32-35). This causality and the racialized language in which Martin

couched it made it reminiscent of what Trevelyan had to say about the dynamics between his Eurasian Judith and Hugh Wheeler. Continuing this thread of bias, an article published shortly after the Mutiny in the *Calcutta Review*, "Can India be Colonized by Europeans?," stated that in a situation in which Anglo-Indian masculinity had failed to control the Mutiny, colonization in the conventional paternalistic sense had to be absolutely forbidden. The fundamental factor that, according to the article, would effect this purpose, was the prohibition of miscegenation amongst Anglo-Indian officials and soldiers (Mizutani 35).

Sir William Mansfield and Sir Bartle Frere concluded in 1863 that for the "improved health and constitution of the soldiery," legal marriage was an absolute necessity, married men being much less prone to visit *lal bazaars*, and being by extension that much less susceptible to venereal disease (Ballhatchet 34-35). This conclusion was followed by a series of administrative decisions leading Anglo-Indian soldiers and officials to realize that they had no option but to marry Anglo-Indian women. If they flouted this option, their sons of mixed race could not, unlike before 1857, be inducted into the East India Company's covenanted civil service—a matter that the Select Committee's 1858 decision had already settled. This would leave these sons with no certainty of financially lucrative employment. In addition, the Eurasian child would have her right to inherit her Anglo-Indian father's property jeopardized because she would be paradoxically subject to the Hindu laws of inheritance. The interpretation of these laws by the *pandits* employed by the East India Company ensured through a twisted logic that the child was denied the right of inheritance because she was racially not 'Hindu enough' (Mallampalli 190-94). The doors of Britain were also barred upon the child and her mother (Hawes 8). The suggestion that these various laws be implemented, dates back to at least 1791 when Cornwallis

started his attempts to apply discriminatory policies against the Eurasians. It was, however, only after 1857 that these policies began to be implemented on a large scale.

Many lock hospitals reopened in the decade following 1857, and Anglo-Indian soldiers were by and large granted permission to continue their sexual exploits in the *lal bazaars*. Nevertheless, the policies overtly and covertly barring miscegenation, paved the path for white domestic conjugality as the norm among Anglo-Indian officials and soldiers.[18] The endpoint of it all was the carefully administered disappearance of the Eurasian—insofar as that was possible within a colonial setting—in order to sustain the myth of the 'manly' Anglo-Indian in the eyes of the colonized.[19] This disappearance of the Eurasian from the public spaces of colonial India was not merely about the banishment of the Eurasian's dangerous claims to white masculinity. It was, indicates eugenicist Cedric Dover, more about a concerted effort to reduce Eurasians in number by leaving them with no option but to marry their racial counterparts. The hope, Dover suggests, was that the Eurasian population would eventually diminish into extinction (16). No blood would be shed even as the separation of the colonizer from the colonized would be effected to bring colonial rule back the self-presence of its lost glory.[20]

The erasing of the Eurasian into invisibility at the level of discourse and practice—with varying degrees of success—was thus effectively concurrent with the consolidation of the masculine foundations of empire. As for Dodd's white Judith, whether or not she was white, the fact remained that both Dodd and Trevelyan were aiming for the same quod erat demonstrandum—that no Anglo-Indian women had been raped during 1857, that, to use Trevelyan's words, "our ladies died…without apprehension of dishonour" to save the white masculinity of their patriarchs (255; emphasis mine). Trevelyan makes up for robbing the Anglo-Indian imaginary of its white goddess of Kanpur by overcompensating with accounts of Anglo-

Indian women who had apparently pleaded for death when faced with rape.[21] White Judith ultimately became something of an advocate against miscegenation among Anglo-Indians. Simultaneously, the Anglo-Indian wife found herself enmeshed in an ideology demanding that she follow Judith's example to avoid potential rapists who would inevitably prowl after her in the colony.[22]

The Anglo-Indian wife was not quite the metropolitan British angel in the house: as the patron saint of white masculinity, she became the means to keep the brown rapist at bay. She made the Anglo-Indian "household" the fundamental unit of empire by exercising power over—to start with—her native servants. After 1857, these servants became prospective rapists of white women in Anglo-Indian handbooks published to guide the Anglo-Indian wife in the 'governance' of her 'household' (Sharpe 93). As Flora Annie Steel and Grace Gardiner state in oracular fashion in their 1888 handbook for the guidance of the Anglo-Indian wife qua "housekeeper and cook" (whose housekeeping and cooking would be done entirely by her servants), "the end and object" for the formation of the "household machine" was to make of it "that fundamental unit of civilisation" which "can no more be governed peacefully…than an Indian Empire." This "fundamental unit of civilisation" and the "Indian Empire" were analogous because they were one and the same, haunted by mutineer-rapists. For the Anglo-Indian wife to 'govern' this 'machine' with an iron hand was for her to ward off the anti-colonial insurgent-rapist's violation of her body. This act was basic to facilitating the successful/masculine governance of the colony by her husband (Steel and Gardiner 7-9). By rubbing off the mark of the Eurasian from her flawless white skin, this Anglo-Indian goddess could help bring the sexual degeneracy of the colony under control, enabling her husband to declare his masculinity safe. To obliterate the mark of the curse of the not quite/not white/not masculine and consolidate this colonial

"civilisation," white Judith's sisters first needed to fight back the specter of rape proliferating in the narrative space of 1857.[23]

Crossing (Out) the Eurasian Styx: Brown Women Saving White Men

The planarity of sexual 'purity' on which Trevelyan situated the Anglo-Indian wife as the patron goddess of white masculinity, could only be said to hold its stead if allocated a signifier which the native mutineer-rapist granted recognition. This signifier that Trevelyan and his co-imperialists overtly or tacitly used for their womenfolk, was, I would suggest, that of the *sati*. To put it succinctly, the Anglo-Indian wife and daughter had to become a white *sati* to lay the foundations for that "fundamental unit of civilisation," the colony. She could attain this status by preferring death to rape in the act of fighting back the prospective rapists peopling the colony: by keeping herself sexually inviolable, she would, in the same stroke, prove her sexual and marital fidelity toward her white husband and patriarch, thus preventing his emasculation by the colonized subject. The rapist's recognition of the white *sati* was, indicates Trevelyan, a dire necessity if the administration had to maintain control over a country of potential mutineer-rapists (109-10).[24]

A comparison between what James Grant says of the colonized male subject's view of the Anglo-Indian wife, and what Trevelyan has to say about the same, underscores their shared belief that the mutineer could dare to think of raping the white goddess of the Anglo-Indian household because he was not able to recognize her sexual divinity.

Trevelyan says of the brown rapist:

> No one can rightly read the history of the [Indian] mutinies unless he constantly takes into account the wide and radical difference between the views held by Europeans and Asiatics with reference to the treatment and position of the weaker sex. *We, who still live*

> *among the records and associations of chivalry…persist in regarding women as goddesses. The Hindoos, who allow their sisters and daughters few or no personal rights,...cannot bring themselves to look upon them as better than playthings*. (Trevelyan 109-10; emphasis mine)

Trevelyan's goddess, though, is more than a colonial version of the angel in the house, as I will discuss.[25]

Grant, a shrill hyper-imperialist novelist, clarifies the 'Asiatic's' viewpoint about the Anglo-Indian "goddess" by having one of the 1857 mutineers in his novel *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Mutiny* (1863) say: "Feringhee [white] women—what shall we say of them? They walk in public with men; they ride on horses, they drive in carriages, and sit at table with men; they dance—dance like Nautch girls [courtesans]!" (279-80). Trevelyan ramifies the extent to which this sexual divinity is misinterpreted by appending a footnote that explicates a monolithic Hindu understanding of the Anglo-Indian woman (110). The footnote cites an exchange between two Hindu wives in Dinabandhu Mitra's Bangla play *Neeldarpan* [*The Mirror of Indigo*] (1858-59)—an exchange strongly reminiscent of the passage from Grant's novel. In the exchange, one of the wives says of an Anglo-Indian indigo-planter's "Feringhee" wife, "She has no shame at all. When the Magistrate of the district …goes riding about through the village, the lady also rides on horseback with him" (Dinabandhu Mitra 25). Grant enlightens the 'Asiatic' reader by having a Hindu mutineer in *First Love and Last Love* identify in the Anglo-Indian wife's 'courtesan'-like behavior and predilections a preference to die rather than have her sexual and marital fidelity to her patriarch violated. This leads the mutineer to view the wife as the "holy suttee" (Grant 272). *First Love and Last Love* is suffused by the Hindu discourse of *satitva* via Anglo-Indian women who would much rather die than be raped—a wish that the patriarchs

of their families shared for their own sakes, and, needless to say, for the sake of king and country. Doctor Weston, an English padre, ruminates on the fate of his daughters—the three heroines of the novel, Lena, Kate, and Polly Weston—beset by the mutineers at Meerut, and thinks, "what might they not endure, amid those black and yelling hordes, who were now in full march, flushed with rapine, crime, and slaughter? He prayed of God, in his inner heart, that if they could not be saved, that death might fall on…them at once…in any form He pleased" (Grant 144). To be saved, and to be subjected to death "in any form" sound interchangeable in Doctor Weston's reflection. The missing signifier when it comes to being saved in the first instance, is that of being saved from rape, with rumors of rape proliferating across the length and breadth of the novel and driving the Anglo-Indian characters into a frenzy.

Grant's "holy suttee" is made to borrow from the discourse of *satitva* (i.e. *sati*-ness) inundated in the aura of feminine godhead.[26] This aura was nationalistically magnified around the middle of the nineteenth century to engulf the body of the upper-caste Hindu wife/daughter—a body to be viewed as that of the mother-goddess epitomizing India as a Hindu nation. The sexual purity of this 'goddess' was said to be at stake thanks to colonization, leaving her lamenting the loss of her chastity.[27] Because the discourse of this mother-goddess was bathed in the radiance of divinity, Bhudev Mukhopadhyay, as if to retract Trevelyan's statement about the Hindu patriarch's mistreatment of his womenfolk, could say, "In the Arya system the wife is a goddess. In the European system she is a partner and companion" (qtd. in Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments* 126). Paradoxically but not surprisingly, the Brahminic patriarch's worship of the Hindu wife and mother qua the nation-as-mother goddess, could only find fulfillment in his complete control over her sexuality, and his demand for her strict obedience to his dictates (Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments* 116-26).

Much as Trevelyan wants to prove otherwise, he is borrowing from Grant's discourse of the "holy suttee" to formulate the Anglo-Indian woman-as-goddess, as his reference to *Neeldarpan* proves. *Neeldarpan*, written in support of the Indigo Mutiny,[28] is about an upper-caste Hindu family of landlords benevolently protecting the peasants working on their land, from subjection to Anglo-Indian indigo-planters' wiles and tortures. The elder patriarchs of the family eventually die in their efforts to protect the peasants, and the greater number of their wives die in tandem out of conjugal loyalty to their husbands. Ultimately, the play ends up losing track of the Indigo Mutiny, making its plotline all about the 'good' Hindu wife's "constancy and faithfulness to her husband," this constancy and loyalty being her "loadstone." Chastity was the "stone of gold which is…so valuable that it makes the beggar woman, a queen" and which therefore cannot be "soiled" at any cost (Dinabandhu Mitra 51-52).[29] The Hindu wife's job is to remain confined in the inner sanctum of the Hindu household i.e. the *andarmahal*, unlike the 'shameless' Feringhee wife exposing herself to the public gaze. She has only to satiate her husband's "desire," but not in a way that "agrees best with prostitutes" (Dinabandhu Mitra 18-33). She is, in her multiple manifestations in the play, compared to the various goddesses of the Hindu pantheon in that her single-minded marital fidelity exalts her to the status of divinity, beyond the corpus of flesh and blood. This divinity is located in opposition to the prostitute's lack of such a norm of fidelity, trapped as she is in her fleshly trade. When faced with the prospect of induction into a harem, the question that inevitably surfaces in the mind of the Hindu wife in *Neeldarpan* is, "Is virtue something to be sold? Has it any price?" (Dinabandhu Mitra 23). The sum and substance of her vocation is summarized by Saralata, a female character in the play who says to her husband Bindu Madhab, "Oh, Lord of my life!...[T]he husband is the object

of the wife's thought, of her understanding, her study, her acquisition, her meeting, her society; in short, this jewel, the husband—is all to a virtuous woman" (Dinabandhu Mitra 33).

The Hindu wife is a goddess because she lays herself prostrate before her husband whom she treats as her "lord," devoting all her sexual energies to him in return for his protection. In his absence, she would much rather die, as indeed happens with Saralata herself by a deus ex machina in *Neeldarpan*. She is, in this way, exalted to the status of the "holy suttee." Much as Trevelyan contrasts the Hindu wife with her Anglo-Indian sisters, white Judith, unlike her Eurasian incarnation, is strongly reminiscent of the Hindu wife qua goddess—she apotheosizes herself as she bolsters the masculinity of the British empire by embracing death rather than Nana Saheb's harem. She prefers her bodily obliteration to the prospect of being reduced to the position of a prostitute, unlike Eurasian Judith who lives with her captor/savior in 'concubinage.' If the mutineer misinterprets the Anglo-Indian wife/daughter-as-goddess in a light that "agrees best with prostitutes," that is because the Anglo-Indian woman can go out into public spaces while her Hindu counterpart has to remain in the *andarmahal*. There is no incongruity in this freedom of movement—the colony is an extension of the Anglo-Indian household as the "fundamental unit of civilisation."

Or perhaps the white *sati*'s freedom of movement was more exaggerated than *Neeldarpan* would have readers believe. One Lady Wilson, the wife of a senior Anglo-Indian civilian in India, had to say of the average Anglo-Indian woman married to a colonial administrator in the nineteenth century:

> [M]ost Europeans…would not allow a [European] lady to accept an Indian gentleman's proffered hospitality. They, would not permit her to drive through an Indian town, be a spectator of tent pegging, or receive an Indian as a visitor, far less dine with him. *They*

> *would, in short, prefer her to be as wholly absent from every kind of society as are the inmates of a zenana*. (qtd. in Sinha 47; emphasis mine)

Setting aside any counter-orientalist notions of a white harem, Trevelyan borrows the discourse of *satitva* to posit the white *sati* as the sacred icon that the mutineer-rapist is initially unable to recognize. Trevelyan attributes this initial disavowal to the perception of the Anglo-Indian wife and daughter's ability to step freely outside her home. Ultimately, the white *sati*'s willingness to die for her patriarch makes her prospective rapist recognize her sexual sanctity. Trevelyan accordingly fills his account of the Mutiny to absurdity with Anglo-Indian women who would prefer death to abduction/rape. By preferring death to rape, they make their bodies susceptible only to the imperialist's sexual desire; in the process their bodies underscore and, indeed, invigorate the imperialist's 'masculinity,' facilitating it to reign undisputed over the colony. With their sexuality subject to their patriarchs' control, they step outside into the public spaces of the colony after 1857 almost as if to put their sexual inviolability in danger while simultaneously protecting it. In doing so, they allow their patriarchs the opportunity to enact retribution upon the mutineer-rapists haunting these spaces. Discursively speaking, then, the colony is indeed the spatiality of the white harem that Lady Wilson speaks of, and it is here that a paradox lies: the Hindu wife/daughter's *satitva* was predicated on her *zenana*—her home—as both her space of cloister and sexual control (Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments* 121). The Anglo-Indian wife/daughter could never be *sati* enough because her *satitva* was centered on her ability to step from the home into the colonial world. In this world, her *satitva* could only be put to the test as and when she faced the danger of rape head on. Her commission of suicide to escape her rapist would prove the plenitude of her *satitva*. Unfortunately, with her death, this plenitude would also die at the very moment it was born. Her *satitva* thus lay in

deferral—neither could she be *sati* enough in life, nor could her patriarch be rendered 'masculine' until she had committed suicide to escape her rapist. In short, this 'masculinity' could only claim itself at the moment when its plenitude was simultaneously born and put in negation through the white *sati*'s death and absence.

At any rate, through his recognition of the Anglo-Indian woman's *satitva*, the mutineer-rapist apparently effected his self-negation as a colonized subject by not violating this *satitva*, as the dire absence of raped white women in the pages of Trevelyan's account proves. This self-negation was not too difficult to accomplish since official and unofficial investigations largely revealed that many of the Mutiny's chronicles of rape were fictions. For instance, an anecdote doing the rounds claimed that Nana Saheb's men had tortured and raped most of the Anglo-Indian women in Kanpur in a house called Salvador Hall. The rumor turned out to be just that—a rumor that helped justify the unsparing execution of the sepoys who had participated in the Mutiny at Kanpur (Blunt 413).[30]

At any rate, the investigations, for all practical purposes, lived up to Trevelyan's unstinted belief that the Anglo-Indian women had died "without apprehension of dishonour" (255; emphasis mine). Trevelyan somewhat ironically posited these investigation reports as proof that the Anglo-Indian reinforcements from Lucknow had indeed managed to save the women from rape, thus exculpating the administration's white masculinity from the threat posed to it by communities of brown rapists. Through his Anglo-Indian *satis*, Trevelyan overcompensated for Wheeler's "unsoldierlike" defeat at Kanpur—an overcompensation that helped him bolster the tottering masculinity of Lucknow with the rhetorical question, "If the Nana knew the valour and strength of our officers too well to allow him to be merciful, how came it that he did not respect…our ladies?" (109).

Complementing such accounts as Trevelyan's, the rumors of rape were kept in circulation in the English imagination—both in metropole and colony—through a spate of dogmatic Victorian novels. Grant's *First Love and Last Love* was probably the most famous of them. [31] A text that struggles to straddle a liminal space between fiction and self-asserted historiography, *First Love and Last Love* has graphic portrayals of a large number of rapes. Paradoxically, the novel is also filled to the brim with the discourse of *satitva* through Anglo-Indian wives and daughters wishing for death rather than rape (Grant 144).

Pertinaciously drawing on Dodd's *History* and referring to figures said to have actually participated in the Mutiny,[32] *First Love and Last Love* is forever haunted by the leitmotif of the supposed rapes at Salvador Hall. Polly Weston, the quintessential white *sati*, is crucified naked while refusing to give in to the sexual lures of the mutineers. She almost willingly effects her martyrdom by walking the straight and narrow into what she knows is a trap. This trap that might emasculate Doctor Weston, is mapped as follows: having been lured in search of her father "past the Bank, which in former times had been the residence of the hideous little hooknosed Begum Sumroo, and her adopted son, the miserable Dyce Sombre," Polly is captured by the mutineers and inducted into one zenana and then another (Grant 144-48). This Dyce Sombre was in fact the adopted Eurasian son of Begum Sumroo, ruler of the princely state of Sardhana. Dyce Sombre, possibly born out of wedlock, was adopted by the Begum while also being related to her by some oblique tie of blood contracted out of wedlock. Married to a courtesan, and finally apprehended and convicted of lunacy, Dyce Sombre was a hedonist with access to numerous prostitutes from whom he contracted venereal disease multiple times. Ultimately, as with Nana Sahib's adopted son Baji Rao II—to whom *First Love and Last Love* refers in conjunction with Dyce Sombre—the administration deprived him of the rulership of Sardhana.[33]

Dyce Sombre—although he died a good six years before 1857—is located by Grant in the moment of the Mutiny, in the space of danger leading Polly Weston to lascivious Mutiny leader Mirza Abu Bakr. Dyce Sombre epitomizes this space of danger because he is Eurasian, has contracted venereal disease, has a bevy of prostitutes at his disposal, is born outside holy matrimony, and is therefore, all things considered, the quintessential threat to the masculinity of Polly's sanctimonious father, for whom Polly is desperately searching in Sardhana. The fiction of the Eurasian's sexual degeneracy is made to become one with that of the mutineer-rapist as Polly wades through the Styx of Sardhana. However, for the Anglo-Indian *sati* to enter the space of Dyce Sombre's habitus is for her, also to satisfy her responsibilities toward the white masculinity of empire by facing the mutineer-rapist head on: Polly's journey into Sardhana is the Anglo-Indian woman's rite of passage into becoming a white *sati*. Philip Meadows Taylor's 1872 novel *Seeta*, is moralistically geared toward indoctrinating the Anglo-Indian wife and daughter into this rite of passage.

Meadows Taylor, an East India Company administrator, had perhaps partially taken the idea for *Seeta* from Utilitarian scientist Edward John Tilt's claim that a marriage between an Anglo-Indian official and an Indian woman of upper-caste Hindu background would ensure a good "Eurasian breed" (qtd. in Mizutani 34). As per the tenets of the cantonment brothels, what Tilt meant by a good Eurasian 'breed' was one born of upper-caste Hindu wives who did not behave in a way that "agreed best with prostitutes" i.e. who maintained their *satitva*, unlike the Hindu women of lower castes residing in the cantonment brothels (Ballhatchet 43). Ostensibly borrowing this leaf from Tilt's viewpoint, Meadows Taylor indicates in *Seeta* that the Anglo-Indian woman has, like Polly Weston, to not only make her way into *satitva* but also, in the process, to cross out the habitus of the race "trained into prostitution." In this way alone could

she establish the Anglo-Indian marital unit as the basic unit of the British empire. Reminiscent as this dangerous crossing is of the quintessential mythic *sati* Seeta's proving of her *satitva* to her husband Rama through her test by fire,[34] the name that Meadows Taylor selects for his novel is quite significant.

In the upper-caste nationalistically-inclined household, the Hindu widow functioned as the lowest common denominator of *satitva* in that instead of being burned alive with her husband's corpse, she was required to "perform austere duties" and "avoid sensual pleasures," thus restoring her inexplicably lacking marital purity to plenitude.[35] It is very telling that *satitva*, in these terms, seems always already to be defined by lack—a point that I will discuss later. In her efforts to remove the specter of lack shadowing her *satitva*, the widowed eponymous protagonist of *Seeta* sees no other way out than to avoid the obstacle of the Eurasian lying in her path, as I will show.

The male protagonist of the novel, Cyril Brandon, Anglo-Indian Deputy Commissioner of Police at the Nurpur district of present-day Himachal Pradesh, saves the widowed Seeta from being raped by a dacoit-turned-1857 mutineer named Azrael Pande.[36] Brandon falls in love with Seeta who, after some initial reluctance, marries him, having eventually lost her belief in *satitva* after her first husband dies in Pande's hands. Through her disclaimer of the discourse of *satitva*, though, Seeta finds herself always hounded by a sense of lack. This lack functions in conjunction with what Azrael Pande asks of a set of interlocutors early on in the novel: "Now the law is gone forth, that Hindoo widows may marry again…Think, any one of you, where your honour would be, if your widow married another man? Where would be the old respect and love which sealed the devotion of its life by holy suttee? Now, every woman who pleases, may, *like a prostitute*, take on a new husband" (Meadows Taylor 149-50; emphasis mine). The onus for the remarriage

rests on Seeta against the dictates of her conscience and better judgment—or so a late nineteenth-century nationalist cosmology leads her to believe. She overcompensates for this lack by compulsively reading about the myth of Savitri, another of the quintessential *satis* of Hindu myth.[37] The mytho-poetic cosmology of *satitva* makes her believe that she has inevitably to die to save Cyril's racial honor. Azrael Pande, meanwhile, joins a band of 1857 mutineers, and is determined to drive the Anglo-Indians out of India. He plans to crown his participation in the Mutiny by killing Cyril and enslaving Seeta to make her his private prostitute.

To backtrack to Tilt, the "Eurasian breed" born of unions involving the upper castes would, according to him, show the same signs of degeneracy "of both body and mind" as any other Eurasian (qtd. in Mizutani 34). Accordingly, it was in the best interests of the Anglo-Indian husband to marry a racial counterpart as a wife, eugenically expelling the Eurasian (Mizutani 34). When it comes to the question of bearing a good "Eurasian breed" not outlawed by the British empire in the post-1857 moment, Seeta suddenly gets to know that if she has a child by Cyril, this child "would have no rank and *no name*; *he would indeed be illegitimate*" because "[B]y the rites of [her] faith [Seeta is] Mr. Brandon's wife…But the English law does not recognize that" (Meadows Taylor 373; emphasis mine). This official alteration in the "English law"—an outcome of the Mutiny—is located in the novel 15 years before its time. The law under discussion is the Indian Christian Marriage Act of 1872 inaugurated in the year that *Seeta* was published. The intent of the Act was apparently to legalize interracial marriages through solemnization under an officially-recognized clergyman. This clergyman would complete the solemnization by granting the spouses marriage licenses (Mallampalli 30). The legal value of these licenses was, however, largely precarious. Thanks to an amendment introduced into the Act by one Hon'ble Sir Andrew Scoble, bishops in India were given a new lease of official power:

they could refuse to recognize many clergymen, "invalidating the marriages"—particularly the interracial ones—solemnized under these clergymen's supervision. This had the additional effect of "possibly rendering [the] offspring illegitimate" (Amendment 41-42). As a result, a marriage license, by a curious twist, became a signifier of a 'disreputable' marriage, particularly if it was interracial (David 182).

In the retroaction of Scoble's amendment upon Cyril and Seeta's marriage, Cyril's fellow Anglo-Indians begin to look upon him, in light of his prospective biological conception of an aberration with "no name," as an "immoral" figure and a "positive pollution." Seeta, for her part, is considered the equivalent of a cantonment prostitute (Meadows Taylor 167). As the bearer of the sacrament of pollution, Cyril is about to be expelled from his post as Deputy Commissioner because he has "set laws of morality at defiance" (Meadows Taylor 238-39). This morality is, of course, that of white masculinity in the face of which Cyril, like Hugh Wheeler, is about to be set at lack.

Distressed by the misery that her child may cause Cyril, Seeta prefers not to bear children because by living in conjugality with Cyril, she had, she is told by Anglo-Indian officials' white wives, reduced the "great pride" of the Englishman, her status being considered no better than that of a "nauch [sic] girl" (Meadows Taylor 167; 200). In her subsequent self-enforced celibacy, the novel compares her to Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi who, like Nana Sahib and other independent princes and rulers, were not allowed to adopt children who could inherit their kingdoms. Contrary to its depiction of Seeta, though, the novel obliquely indicates that Lakshmi Bai could not bear biological children because she was lesbian: she always dressed like a man, and had "her sister, or companion"—also dressed like a man—by her side at all times (Meadows Taylor 415). Within the cosmos of the novel, Seeta has now, under the aegis of the Indian

Christian Marriage Act, to save Cyril from emasculation at the hands of their unconceived Eurasian offspring's outlawed status and sexual deviance. She can only do that if she proves Cyril's masculinity via her *satitva*—which she does. By dying as she rescues Cyril from Pande's attempts to murder him, she prevents her own enslavement and loss of sexual/marital purity, making up for the originary lack in her *satitva*. The torch of *satitva* now passes to the Anglo-Indian Grace Mostyn whom Cyril marries after mourning Seeta's death for a time.

The last chapter of the novel sees Grace promoted to the rank of white *sati*. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of Seeta's death, Grace, Cyril, and their daughter Rose stand in worshipful silence before a "large, masterly drawing in water colour" of Seeta. This "memorial" of Seeta aligns in montage fashion with a "little altar" in Cyril and Seeta's onetime home. Before this altar, even as Cyril's family looks on at the water color, "Brahmins offer flowers and sing hymns today. And many a girl lays a garland there and prays to the sweet spirit, whose death she commemorates!" This montage passes on the worship of the *sati* to Grace who looks on at the painting of Seeta to imbibe an inexplicable sense of lack—Grace's beauty is "great, but not greater than that of the picture." Nor can it ever be, because Cyril and Seeta are "fond lovers still" across the beyond (Meadows Taylor 441-42). This lack that frames Grace is the lack that haunts the white *sati*—the *sati* who can never be *sati* enough. Notwithstanding this lack, Grace's status as an Anglo-Indian allows her to compose her familial unit as the foundation for that "fundamental unit of civilisation" where not only Rose but all Indians are her children. The colonized Indian subjects are, after all, "almost like children,…easily led, when once they have given their faith" (Meadows Taylor 431). They had given this faith to the mutineers' claims of freeing India from British colonialism. Now this faith would have to be "easily led" by Grace as the white *sati*—the successor to Seeta's throne. Cyril and Seeta's Eurasian child, unborn, is

unable to fulfill the potential threat of illegitimacy, freeing Cyril's masculinity from "positive pollution." This sanctification paves the way for the disappearance of the Eurasian race that the post-1857 moment demanded of empire, making for a "healthier spirit" among the Indians as subjects—a spirit bolstered on the gendered distance between the masculine ruler and the feminine ruled (Meadows Taylor 425). The femininity of the colonized would henceforth be directed to the worship not of Seeta but of the white *sati* of the colony. The Eurasian's non-signification with "no name," permitted by this prism of the white *sati*, makes the Anglo-Indian 'home' the unit where the Anglo-Indian wife and daughter facilitates the maintenance of a 'masculine' hand over the mutineer-rapists/'Pandies.' Henceforth no Pandies will infect the faith of the children of empire.[38]

Quite ironically for the Anglo-Indian patriarch's 'manly' spirit, the appropriation of *satitva* by Anglo-Indian masculinity is, in *Seeta*, facilitated by the brown woman saving the white man from the brown man. This inverts the imperial codification of the practice of *sati* qua widow-burning, in which the white man saves the brown woman from the brown man's wiles.[39] This imbalance of race and gender is furthered by the fact that though the Eurasian woman was being figured within sexual degeneracy as the "prostitute class of India," statistics taken in 1864 proved that the Hindu widow, that fundamental unit of *satitva*, was in fact also the fundamental unit of the cantonment brothel, particularly in Bengal (Ballhatchet 43; Ratnabali Chatterjee 24). Henry Beverley, Inspector-General of Registration in Bengal, said that the most interesting feature of the 1881 Bengal Census pertained to the widows—or their pronounced absence—in the *andarmahal*:

A curious feature in these statistics is the enormous proportion of widows among the

> female population, no less than 21 per cent…The explanation of this is that among Hindus the remarriage of widows is not usually permitted, and is practically unknown[40]...The error to which census operations in [Bengal] is most liable…is an understating of th[is] female population…below their true figure [because of] National prejudices among the upper classes. (686-89)

Connecting the atmosphere of fear pervading the Hindu household on the day of the census collection with the "understating" of the number of widows in the household, is not too difficult: the number was understated because widows were forced into prostitution by the male members of their household (Chattopadhyay 126). As the Home Department had concluded in 1872, "In Bengal, the prostitute class seems to be chiefly recruited from that of ranks of Hindu widows. The prominence of Hindu women among the prostitutes of Bengal, often it is stated: women of good caste and that even in districts where a large Mohammedan population predominates is the most curious feature disclosed" (qtd. in Ratnabali Chatterjee 24). The lowest common denominator of *satitva* was often enough expelled from her household because, as Rammohan Roy rightly believed, other male members of her family wanted to lay hands on the property she could have inherited from her dead husband once the passage of the Dayabhaga Law gave her some right to such inheritance (Mani 59). In the event that the avarice of her male relatives left her with no financial resources to fall back on, prostitution was one of the only options of sustenance open to her, making upper-caste Hindu widows flock to the cantonment brothels in Bengal through at least the 1880s (Ratnabali Chatterjee 13).

The figuration of Eurasian women as the "prostitute class of India…born to their fate" was thus an act of displacement that repressed a fact of no small significance—the Hindu widow whose austerity and self-denial helped discursively define *satitva* itself, was quite often not *sati*

enough. The cantonment brothel had endangered imperial masculinity, leading the colonizer to turn to the angelic white *sati* in the house. In doing so, the colonizer discovered that *satitva* itself was always already defined by lack. In other words, while the white *sati* was expected to replenish imperial masculinity when it had been threatened by venereal disease, the discourse defining the position of the white *sati* was itself found lacking. Coming full circle, venereal disease bred by the cantonment brothel robbed the masculinity of empire of its projected plenitude. Indeed, Nabakumar Datta's Bangla novel *Swarnabai* [*Swarna the Courtesan*] (1888) goes so far as to claim that Hindu Bengali widows in cantonment brothels were perennial carriers of venereal disease. Given Datta's patriarchal depiction of the Hindu widow as an oversexed outcaste, his truth-claims should be taken with more than a grain of salt.[41] At any rate, findings like Beverley's were, in the final reckoning, merely statistical exercises: they did not prevent the induction of Hindu widows into cantonment brothels.

The process of defining the Eurasian in terms of racial lack was, however, not simple. After all, this definition of lack was only possible when measured against a yardstick of 'Englishness' of race. As Eurasian survivor of the Mutiny Amelia Horne points out in her memoirs of the Mutiny, the constituents of this yardstick are at best nebulous in the colony. This leads to the open-ended question of how a Eurasian identity should have been colonially figured if it had to be found lacking in racial and sexual terms.

'They' Have Never Been 'Masculine:' The Eurasian Writes Back

Amelia Horne, one of the survivors of the Mutiny at Kanpur, published her memoirs in 1913 under the nom-de-plume of Amelia Bennett. Living in financial penury in Calcutta at the turn of the century, Horne claims that though she had written her account in 1858, she was publishing it only in 1913 to warn the British administration against the threat that the "secret

societies" burgeoning in Bengal posed to its rule. Given their potential to "overthrow British rule," these secret societies could, according to Horne, repeat the threat of 1857—the threat of an anti-colonial insurgency. This threat was one that Wheeler had overwritten, and the British Government, claims Horne, was on the verge of making a similar mistake (*Ten Months' Captivity* 1212).

It should be stated at this point that Horne's status as a Eurasian had, after the Mutiny, always already constrained her within the bounds of racial and sexual lack. But when the man who had saved Horne from the ravages of the Mutiny, Maulvi [doctor of law] Liaquat Ali, was being tried in 1872 for the "horrors and ill treatment of English women," the masculinity of empire ironically hinged to a great extent upon Horne's testimony (qtd. in Anderson 145). When called upon as a witness against Ali, Horne testified in his favor. Needless to say, her testimony was not looked upon favorably on the grounds that she had apparently lived in 'concubinage' for a short while with Ali—a matter about which she maintained a studied silence. Her silence had the paradoxical but not unexpected effect of consolidating the belief that she had indeed lived in concubinage, given her racial status. This helped discredit her testimony (Anderson 124-56). For all her taciturnity, Horne's memoirs talk back to the straitjacketing figuration of the post-1857 sexually-fallen Eurasian woman through two claims: 1. The cultural constituents of 'Englishness' in colonial India are nebulous; 2. The moment of Anglo-Indian masculinity is always already haunted by lack for as long as it underestimates the insurgent capabilities of the colonized.

When speaking of the "secret societies" against the backdrop of 1913, Horne is probably referring to the Jugantar group, a loose confederation of several insurgent groups located in western Bengal, and the Anushilan group which functioned in Dhaka in erstwhile eastern

Bengal. These groups, while largely aligned with the Indian National Congress' ideological position, did not share the party's de jure doctrine of non-violence (Partha Chatterjee, "Bombs and Nationalism in Bengal" 2). 1913 was the year in which the Anushilan group had tried to assassinate Charles Hardinge, the erstwhile Governor-General of India. This would explain why Horne underscores the Government's need to preempt its prospect of being overthrown instead of disavowing such a possibility. She refers to the possibility of such an overthrow as "sedition," which was not exactly how the term was juridically described. According to Jogeshchandra Chaudhuri's 1898 treatise on the law of sedition, there was effectively no crime called "sedition" in the Indian Penal Code. At most, an individual could be accused of "seditious intent." This "intent" was that of "overthrowing the authority of the Government as by law established" (Chaudhuri 4-5). Why I emphasize the phrasing of sedition in these terms will be made clear shortly.

During the Mutiny at Kanpur, Horne was captured and taken before Liaquat Ali and his minions by a *sawaar* [horseman] who, she said, had saved her from a burning boat in which Nana Saheb's men had apparently stuffed the survivors of Kanpur by force. Both Dodd (139-40) and Trevelyan (208-09) mention the boat in in almost the same terms that Horne uses. Interestingly, the section in which Horne describes her experiences at the shelter built by Wheeler in the Kanpur barracks, reads like a patchwork of Dodd's and Trevelyan's accounts of the same. Parallels can also be drawn in other sections, such as in Horne's description of the attempts of the women and children to escape from the boat. Sometimes the reader finds Horne more faithful to Dodd e.g. in her listing of the women slaughtered outside the shelter (Dodd 137, 139-40; Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1224). Sometimes there is more of Trevelyan e.g. in Horne's berating of Wheeler's friendship with the Nana—a matter that both Trevelyan and

Horne, coincidentally, attribute to Wheeler's "anility" (Trevelyan 62-63; Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1215).

What Horne consolidates by borrowing from both Dodd and Trevelyan is, I would suggest, a claim to 'Englishness.' These borrowings locate her on a plane of discourse that identifies her as an "English gentlewoman" "of pure English blood" unlike Trevelyan's Eurasian Judith: if, within the cosmology of Horne's memoirs, she cannot be trusted in this claim, nor can Dodd's and Trevelyan's accounts of the Mutiny and of the sexual inviolability of the white *sati*. Indeed, all through her memoir, Horne emphasizes that she was terrified at the thought of rape during the Mutiny precisely because she was 'English.' Never does this point get underscored more than in a statement in which Horne succinctly summarizes her initial encounter with Liaquat Ali: "Here was I, *a young, cultured English girl*…seated crouching on the floor, at the foot of the dais on which the Moulvies sat." The more lascivious of the Maulvis, says Horne, could not suppress their "vulgar curiosity at the sight of *an English 'Missee'* being placed so entirely in their power" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1233-34; emphases mine). As she is captured to be taken to Ali, Horne claims to have crossed paths with Judith who had also been captured. This crossing of paths, Horne indicates through her claims to whiteness, lead the two of them in separate directions—Judith traverses the space of the Eurasian while Horne makes her way to 'Englishness' despite her indubitably Eurasian racial identity (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1232). Ergo, Horne's silence about the two months following her capture—during which time she lived with Ali and the *sawaar*—are rendered inviolable to suspicions of 'concubinage' within the racial parameters Horne sets up for herself in her text (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity (Concluded)* 81).

Thanks to the publicity that the trial of Liaquat Ali received, readers of Horne's text probably knew well in advance that she was Eurasian and had lived with the *sawaar* and Ali (Anderson 124-56). Horne asserts, though, that contrary to popular perception, she had never been raped by either of these two men. This was because she was considered unclean in religious terms before Liaquat Ali converted her to Islam, and was sexually 'cleansed' by her conversion so that she could not be raped by Muslims thereafter (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1233-34). Her silences make her claims difficult to decipher. Was she a sexually inviolable "cultured English girl" despite her biracial status? Horne's answer is simple: "the people of England…hardly seem to realise the brutalities we suffered" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1230). To put it differently, the mid-nineteenth century constituents of 'Englishness' under metropolitan eyes, were incommensurate with the Mutiny's production of the "cultured English girl" and the Eurasian subject. If Horne's reader in the metropole could not comprehend the magnitude of the Mutiny, he could also not understand whether or not the Eurasian was 'English' enough to be beatified as the white *sati*.

If the white *sati* established the Anglo-Indian household as the "fundamental unit" defining the colony, Horne claims that the Anglo-Indian women in the barracks had already forged this unit in 1857: "Our new bungalows near the barracks were soon filled, and we had established quite *a little colony of our own*" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1215; emphasis mine). Even at the height of colonial insurgency, then, the Anglo-Indian woman was sustaining the masculinity of empire. This, though, would demand that she surrender her feminine helplessness before the feet of her white patriarch—which Horne permits, having white men save white women: "The thought of white men surrendering to the blacks were most abhorrent to British [masculine] prestige…These men would rather have died a hundred deaths than have

submitted to…indignities at the hands of the black devils" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1228-29). However, says Horne wistfully in the same passage, "Oh for British pluck and valour that could fight and starve and make no complaint" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1221). This wistfulness is for a brand of "pluck and valour" that expresses itself in terms of lack in 1913, in the administrative unwillingness to grasp the threat of the secret societies. The collapsing of this administrative inefficacy of 1913 with Wheeler's ineptitude of 1857, traces the lack in the masculinity of "British pluck and valour" to the Mutiny itself. If Wheeler led the forces in Kanpur, Horne's sarcastic quotation of his declaration that "British spirit alone remains, but it cannot last forever…We have all lost everything belonging to us, and have not even a change of linen," questions his masculinity—the plea for linen, a commodity that had become a cipher for the woman in the domestic sphere in Victorian England, identifies itself with a deficiency in Wheeler's masculinity (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1224).[42] This linen, says Horne, was ultimately provided by the women in the shelter for the benefit of the injured men:

> We tore every vestige, even to our sleeves, to supply bandages for the wounded [men]…I went into the entrenchment with a dress made up of frills from the waist downwards, as was the fashion in those days, but when I left I had only the body, the entire skirt having been torn up to serve as bandages…*Although we had all been driven to the most horrible straits, still every woman retained her modesty and refinement to the last*. (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1223-24; 1228).

It was, claims Horne, the Anglo-Indian women's ability to strip themselves while sustaining their sexual inviolability, that kept the men alive and deferred threats to their masculinity. But there was more to this deferral. Wheeler's attitude of "All serene" in the face of the Mutiny had threatened the masculinity of the soldiery at Kanpur. It had located this masculinity in a pre-1857

past that was lost (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1213). In short, Horne's text implies on the one hand, that the British are facing the threat of sedition in 1913 precisely because of the lack in their virility. On the other, Horne's statement "Oh for British pluck and valour that could fight and starve and make no complaint" can be read as a question about whether this masculinity was ever in existence. The subjunctive opening makes this statement an expression of what had perhaps never been there to begin with: like Keats' "O, for a draught of vintage!...O for a beaker full of the warm South," it is the stuff that musings are made of (11; 16). What kept this masculinity going in the face of an anti-colonial insurgency was the ability of the "cultured English girl" to save the lives of the soldiery while keeping the brown rapist at bay, her nakedness notwithstanding. In short, the "cultured English girl" of 1857 had effectively appropriated—and perhaps helped forge—this masculinity.

If "British pluck and valour" occupied the space of a lost origin, it concomitantly occupied the space of sedition—the space within which a forthcoming anti-colonial insurgency loomed before this pluck and valour only to be recognized through disavowal. Ironically, then, if this lost masculinity could disavow sedition, it could reduce the Sepoy Mutiny itself to inhabiting a spatiality of fiction within which "[t]he natives will not rise against us…there will be no struggle, no mutual exasperation" (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1212). By extension, the embodiment of sexual degeneracy produced by the Mutiny through racial disavowal—the Eurasian—comes to inhabit this spatiality; Horne's claim to being a sexually inviolable "cultured English girl" can be viewed as a symptom of this very habitus.

Extending the reach of this spatiality, Horne asserts that the fetishization of Salvador Hall as the location of the white *sati*'s rape was itself a fiction. To prove her point, she quotes profusely from the letters of one R. MacCrea, apparently a Roman Catholic priest who had

visited Salvador Hall immediately after the mutineers had vacated it. According to MacCrea, "special attention had been paid [in British accounts of Salvador Hall] to the [two] women tied to the pillars," these two women being "Mrs. Henri Jacobi, the widow of a watchmaker, and Mrs. Williams Probett, the widow of the Dak [postal] Agent." MacCrea implies that these were the only women whose corpses had been found in Salvador Hall, and neither corpse indicated that there had been any act of sexual "outrage" committed upon it. MacCrea's is the viewpoint that Horne endorses (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1227). As the recipient of Judith's testimony at her deathbed, MacCrea states elsewhere that Judith lived a happy life with her Muslim savior—a life untainted by 'concubinage' thanks to her conversion to Islam (Sharpe 72-73).

Ultimately, her silences notwithstanding, whether or not Horne had been raped ceases to matter—she had problematized the masculinity of empire that outlawed these rapes. The lost masculinity of the Anglo-Indian male lived in the face of "seditious intent" while discrediting this intent. In this yawning chasm of loss thus lay a world of administrative make-believe—a make-believe that was also the space of subject-production. That Horne belonged to the "prostitute class of India"—as did the greater number of Eurasian women—was thus the production of the Eurasian via make-believe. This space of illusion had nevertheless to be maintained qua truth-effect because it would help sustain a corresponding gap between "seditious intent" and the completion of this intent i.e. the overthrow of the masculinity of empire. Consequently, this gap of colonial subject-production can be said to be the space of sedition. The Eurasian qua sexually degenerate, produced by and in this space of illusory masculinity to be disavowed by it, can thus be incongruously posited as another of the anti-colonial insurgents. When citing an instance of seditious intent, Chaudhuri speaks of "abduction with intent to marry or defile"—a sexual condition that, according to the prosecution against

Liaquat Ali, Horne had already succumbed to (Chaudhuri 17; Anderson 124-56). Such instances of seditious intent were very often, says, Chaudhuri, the stuff of rumor, leading the law to generate what he calls "legal fictions" (Chaudhuri 17). In the absence of a transcendental yardstick of racial 'Englishness' against which to define the Eurasian race, the Eurasian woman as a member of the "prostitute class of India" can be said to be one such legal fiction. Whether or not there was the "intent to defile"—or to be defiled—was immaterial; that a prostitute, as sexually fallen, was complicit in her own defilement—unlike the white *sati*—was, within the legal fictions of white *satis* and their racio-sexual others, sedition enough. Hence my use of the term 'sexual sedition' to define the habitus of the Eurasian in the aftermath of the Mutiny.

There was, however, the occasional moment when sedition as the space of subject-production was exposed in all its emptiness. In other words, the gap of make-believe occasionally got bridged and collapsed. This was the case with the 1875 performance of *Neeldarpan* by the Great National Theatre in Lucknow. The administration was unwilling to permit the performance of this play about one mutiny in one of the centers of another mutiny; anti-colonial sentiments were still said to be simmering in Lucknow. The performance nevertheless went ahead, having quite a different effect than that apprehended by the administration. The sight of an English indigo-planter trying to rape a peasant woman in the play, only to be physically beaten by Torap, a poor peasant, was too much for the European members of the audience to take. 'Seditious intent' was converted to offense: within the space of fiction, the masculine sexual discipline of the Anglo-Indian colonizer was exposed as a fiction. Worse, this masculinity as colonial power was questioned by the physical violence enacted upon it by an insurgent peasant. That was not the only rub—an actor from among the colonized mimicked the colonizer and his discipline. Part of the mimicry lay in the use of a stylized mock-Bangla that

Anglo-Indian characters spoke in Bangla theater's erstwhile repertory of idioms. This pidgin Bangla was as much an articulation of mimicry as of mockery. The moment when the colonizer's lack of sexual discipline was mimicked was also the moment when his lost masculinity was mocked. The seditious intent of the Indigo Mutiny was enacted to completion, leading enraged Anglo-Indian soldiers in the audience to rush onto the stage with swords (Banerjee 187-88). They could not identify that this was a space of make-believe because they had been living in a world of make-believe all along. A silent spectator of this to-do was the Eurasian, recognizing in the Anglo-Indian colonizer the sexual degeneracy of which she had been accused. Her occupation of the space of sexual sedition found voice in her silent spectatorship of this spectacle of anti-colonial insurgency.

---

[1] Eurasians in India, according to post-1857 colonially-generated juridical definitions, were the interracial offspring—born in or out of wedlock—of British fathers located in India, and Indian mothers. At this point of time the British in India referred to themselves as 'Anglo-Indians' (Mizutani 204). Though Eurasians later demanded to be legally identified as 'Anglo-Indian,' this demand was not officially recognized until 1899. It was only in 1911 that the Census of India extended the term "Anglo-Indian" to Eurasians. The official recognition of this change, though, came about in 1935 (Anthony 5). Because the colonial discourse I discuss in this chapter was almost entirely codified prior to 1935, I will refer to the offspring of part-British parentage as Eurasians, and to the British in India as Anglo-Indians.

[2] To the best of my knowledge, though much had been written in the colonial archives about the Eurasian 'prostitute,' not much material is to be found about the danger that the queer Eurasian male posed to the masculinity of empire. This silence is telling, given the 'fixing' of the Eurasian male into effeminacy and by implication into homosexuality (James 213). E. M.

Forster's short story "The Other Boat" (1957-58) indicates that this danger was perennially part of the sexually 'illicit' practices with which Eurasians were associated: homosexual dalliances between Eurasians and Anglo-Indian colonial officials made the latter liable to court-martial (Forster 259). Perhaps this explains the silence in the archives. It was the silence about he who could not be named i.e. the homosexual Eurasian who dragged the unsuspecting Anglo-Indian colonizer down to his sexually-aberrant depths, thus compromising the masculinity of empire.

This silence is ironic because the homosexual Eurasian would have been the logical limit to locating the Eurasian within sexual degeneracy—the figure of the homosexual Eurasian would 'lack' the masculinity that the British militia would possess in plenty. Simultaneously, because this limit would imply that an imperial officer courting the queer Eurasian was himself an unnamable aberration, a "monster in human form," a male who was not quite/not white/not male enough, it could shake up the 'masculine' foundations of empire in a way the Eurasian prostitute never could (Forster 267). That is why, suggests Forster's story, a studied silence was maintained about this limit. This substantiates my point that disavowal through silence is as integral to the process of 'fixing' a figure as an unspeakable and unnamable anomaly, as is manic re-articulation—one cannot but remain silent about the unspeakable, even as this silence speaks for itself. For a thorough discussion on archival records of homosexuality and their imbrication within the sexual discourses of empire in colonial India, see Anjali Arondekar. *For the Record: On Sexuality and the Colonial Archive in India*.

[3] John Zephania Holwell's *Genuine Narrative* (1758) about the 1756 Black Hole incident of Calcutta, overtly and covertly displays this prejudice toward individuals of Indo-Portuguese descent i.e. the erstwhile 'Eurasians,' also known as Luso-Indians. It also bears marks of this

prejudice against those of Indo-British racial descent, albeit to a lesser extent. See Partha Chatterjee. *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power*.

[4] For the full text of the officer's letter, see Christopher Hawes. *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in India 1773-1833*.

[5] This stacked expression, equating masculinity and 'Englishness,' was used in an assessment made by one De Renzy, Assistant Surgeon of Multan in the early 1860s (Ballhatchet 38).

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] The proceedings of the Gillies case had, incidentally, been conducted under the senior Trevelyan who was the Governor of the Madras Presidency in 1859 (Ballhatchet 108).

[9] To be oxymoronically white but effeminate was to be "unsoldierlike" in opposition to the attitude of a Robert Clive who, according to Macaulay, could become the "founder of the British empire in India" owing to his "manly spirit" ("Clive" 41). It was, states Trevelyan, because Wheeler lacked this "manly spirit" that the forces at Kanpur failed to overpower the mutineers. Complementing this point, Trevelyan correlates Wheeler's 'feminine' "anility" with Macaulay's definition of the 'Bengalee's' biologically deterministic 'effeminacy' in a country among whose inhabitants "men [are] women" i.e. feminine and effete ("Clive" 73).

[10] In 1913, Amelia Horne, the Eurasian stepdaughter of a worker for Kanpur's postal service, wrote a memoir about her experiences during the Mutiny. Her memoir, not unlike Trevelyan's account, is haunted by Lucknow as the utopia of absolution that fails to redeem its promise of military assistance (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity (Concluded)* 82). I will have

occasion in this chapter to discuss the memoir in the context of Horne's precarious and complex racial/sexual position.

Apart from the outbreak of venereal disease, what perhaps delayed the help from Lucknow further was the death of Henry Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of the Lucknow forces. Unluckily for Wheeler, it was to Lawrence that he had written for help. Lauding Lawrence's martyrdom, Trevelyan grabs the opportunity to contrast Wheeler's 'anility' with the heroism of "the man who tried to do his duty" by "preferring the risk of hostile missiles to the confinement of a stifling cellar" (303). Trevelyan's use of the word "man" in this quote is, of course, overdetermined by imperial conceptions of Anglo-Indian masculinity.

[11] Jenny Sharpe conducts a thorough examination of the extant archival documents about Judith, including the dying Judith's testimony before a Roman Catholic priest. Sharpe indicates that there is no proof that Judith was in fact Eurasian (Sharpe 72-73). Her misgivings were preempted by John Kaye's 1892 history of the Mutiny. In the section of his history outlining the events at Kanpur, Kaye, for all his imperialist predilections, is unable to state with any certainty that Wheeler's wife was Indian (254).

[12] See footnote 11.

[13] "Outrage," in almost all Mutiny narratives written by Anglo-Indian authors, is a euphemism for rape. See the novels I discuss in this chapter, particularly James Grant's *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Mutiny* (1863).

[14] Dodd never mentions the credentials of this Mr. Shepherd although he copiously uses the man's testimonies as proof of the events at Kanpur.

[15] It is probably because of these last two version of Judith's 'story,' that Judith came to be known as 'Judith of Cawnpore,' both in Dodd's narrative and in the greater post-1857 Anglo-

Indian administrative imaginary. Judith's rising in the night in the third account, and her cutting off of the sepoys' heads in the fourth, were probably perceived as resonating with the Biblical Judith's rising in the night to cut off Holofernes' head ("Book of Judith" 13: 1-10). It is ironic that the Biblical Judith's familial antecedents are the longest accorded to any female figure in the Old Testament, while the maternal antecedents of Judith of Cawnpore are nebulous ("Book of Judith" 8: 1).

[16] See Jenny Sharpe. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*.

[17] The most famous of these settlements was, of course, McCluskieganj in Bihar, established in 1933. McCluskieganj spanned ten thousand acres of land inhabited solely by *adivasi* communities. While the founder of the scheme, Ernest Timothy McCluskie, intended it to be a means for Eurasians to play at colonization—given their inability to be de facto colonizers like their white forefathers—McCluskieganj actually functioned as a means to keep Eurasians away from the sight of the urban colonized population. It could succeed in this venture thanks to its status as a space that was largely unfrequented by outsiders (Blunt 73-74).

[18] Kenneth Ballhatchet, in his otherwise authoritative study of race, sex, and class in the British empire in India, seems to take it for granted that because almost all the lock hospitals had been reopened after 1857, interracial cohabitation and the birth of Eurasian children were acceptable to the administration until at least the end of the nineteenth century (35). He misses the point about the prohibitions that tacitly prevented this arrangement from working as smoothly as before.

[19] Frank Anthony, in his book *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community* (1969), glosses over the matter of why intermarriage amongst Eurasians began only after 1857. He claims that Eurasians began to intermarry of their own volition. Anthony's use of

the passive voice in sentences like "With the growth of the [Eurasian] Community, especially after the Mutiny…[m]arriage outside the Community was frowned upon" (365), is particularly telling: such sentences—and there are many—leave the matter of agency open to interpretation and claimable by Anglo-Indian and Eurasian alike.

[20] For an examination of how the success of this eugenic project was subverted through the multiple ramifications of 'Eurasian' as a juridical category, see my article "Outside in the Stereotype: Anglo-Indians' Passage from Community to Singularity."

[21] See George Otto Trevelyan. *Cawnpore*.

[22] The imperialist novels published after 1857 to advocate for the importance of white men marrying white women, always bear the shadow of white Judith through references to any one of her many brave exploits from Dodd's *History*. James Grant's *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Mutiny* (1863) is perhaps the best example of this novelistic genre. I discuss Grant's text at length later in this chapter.

[23] Amelia Horne states in her memoirs that rumors of the mutineer-rapists of 1857, while perhaps not entirely untrue, had been considerably exaggerated. Horne quotes at length from the letters that one R. MacCrea had sent her (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1227). Who this R. MacCrea is remains unclear. According to June Wilmshurst, he was probably the Roman Catholic priest who had received Judith Wheeler's testimony on her deathbed. Judith had ostensibly told this priest that the man seen 'leading her away on horseback' had saved her and been good to her (Sharpe 72). MacCrea's letters asserted that no women had been raped by the mutineers in Salvador House—a Kanpur building embedded in the administrative imaginary because scores of Anglo-Indian wives and daughters were said to have been raped and killed there (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1227). If Wilmshurst's conjecture about MacCrea's

identity is correct, MacCrea himself seems to have been driven by the motive of proving that the rapes of 1857 were at best fictitious and at worst exaggerated. After a point, whether a Trevelyan or a MacCrea is to be believed can only be based on historiographic speculation.

[24] The Hindu practice of *sati* or widow-burning was, according to the shaky *vyawastha* or interpretation initially provided by a *pandit* in the employ of the East India Company, "recognised and encouraged by the doctrines of a monolithic Hindoo religion" because "a woman who burns herself, draws her husband out of hell; and she afterwards resides with him in heaven" (qtd. in Mani 33). This interpretation becomes inseparable from two transcendental signifiers that bestow it with authority. The first is marital fidelity, and the second sexual purity. The most significant myth that granted this interpretation transcendental status was that of the eponymous goddess Sati. According to the *Siva-purana*, as a display of unquestionable loyalty toward her husband Siva, Sati burns herself to death in yogically-invoked flames. Angered, Siva follows her to earth where her body has landed in pieces, and embeds his *linga* [penis] in her *yoni* [vagina]. In this way, Sati, through the act of burning herself, comes to signify marital fidelity in a Brahminic theology, as also self-immolation as a means that allows the faithful wife access to oneness with her husband beyond death (Kinsley 39). Marital fidelity and sexual unity become one in this theological interpretation.

Because of the rather random character of the interpretation of *sati* by the *vyawastha*, Rammohan Roy, in his "Abstract of the Arguments Regarding the Burning of Widows Considered as a Religious Rite" (1830), could oppose the *vyawastha* and claim that "Manu in plain terms enjoins a widow to *continue till death* (emphasis in the original)…performing austere duties, *avoiding sensual pleasure*, and practising the incomparable rules of virtue which have been followed by women as were *devoted to only one husband*" (emphases mine; qtd. in Mani

49). Rammohan's claims paradoxically used the same originary scriptural lines as the *vyawastha*. Through these practices of austerity unto death, the widow could apparently regain the *satitva* or "womanly goodness," the loss of which, Rammohan states, were inevitable with the death of her husband; hence the widow's need to "avoid sensual pleasure" to prove the point that she was "devoted to only one husband." By his interpretation, therefore, *sati* was, ironically, inextricable from *satitva*, based as both were on the redemption of a lost 'goodness.' Hence my use of the two terms interchangeably in this chapter.

At any rate, the live widow's dharmic/karmic reunion with her husband in the beyond via her figuration as a *yogini* [ascetic woman] "performing austere duties" and "avoiding sensual pleasure," apparently conferred on her an aura of godhead. This aura was enhanced by her mythic forerunner Sati, married to a god and herself an incarnation of the goddess Parvati (Mani 49).

In my use of the term 'white *sati*,' I utilize partial connotations of both *sati* and *satitva*. The white *sati* preferred death to rape to save the patriarchal and imperial honor of her husband. In the "fundamental unit of civilisation" that was her household extending into the entire colony, she stood for abstinence to the advances of anyone but her husband. She thus attested her "womanly goodness" by proving her sexual devotion to her husband alone, and perennially lived on the brink of a death-in-life epitomized by the sexual advances of the brown rapist.

[25] The Victorian patriarchal ideology of the angel in the house gained cultural currency after Coventry Patmore's poem of the same name was published in 1854. The poem emphasized that the ideal British wife of mid-Victorian England had to be self-sacrificing, passive, helpless, dependent on her husband, and sexually pure, subjecting this purity only to the patriarchal whims of her husband.

[26] See footnote 24.

[27] See the first versions of Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay's 1882 Bangla novel *Anandamath* [*Monastery of Bliss*]. In these versions, the British were said to compromise the chastity of India-as-mother-goddess. In later versions, the colonizers in question were Muslims.

[28] *Neeldarpan* was written in support of the peasants oppressed by Anglo-Indian indigo planters in the Bengal countryside. These planters forced the peasants to grow indigo i.e. synthetic blue dyes, rather than the food crops necessary to the peasants' subsistence (Rahman 53). Dinabandhu Mitra's play was written in 1859, and translated and published in English in 1861, allegedly by James Long. The indigo planters, and the landholders facilitating the planters' exploitation of the peasants, together wrote to the Governor of Bengal about this "foul and malicious libel on indigo planting, evoking sedition and breaches of the peace" (qtd. in Oddie119; emphasis mine). They demanded action against those who had published and circulated the play. Long was sentenced to a month's imprisonment and a fine of one thousand rupees (Oddie 22).

[29] Because Trevelyan had used Long's translation, that is the translation I am using here.

[30] Colonel Williams, Commissioner of Police in the North-Western Provinces, "disprove[d] the unfounded assumption that at first was so frequently made and so currently believed, that personal indignity and dishonour were offered to our poor suffering countrywomen" (qtd. in Blunt 413). Williams was even able to show that the stains of blood on the walls of Salvador Hall were nothing more than patches of red paint. See Alison Blunt. "Embodying War: British Women and Domestic Defilement in the Indian 'Mutiny,' 1857-8."

On the unofficial front, MacCrea claims to have investigated Salvador Hall as soon as the Mutiny was quelled, and states that he had only seen "the bodies of two women gashed tied to pillars, and others lying about the room; also a hook in the wall which showed that a child had been impaled on it." He adds that the matter of rape, if applicable to Salvador Hall, had been blown out of proportion—there had been no more than two women whose corpses had been found, and "special attention" had been lavished upon them in depictions of what could have happened at Salvador Hall (Bennett, *Ten Months' Captivity* 1227). Then again, as I have discussed in footnote 23, MacCrea may have had his own agenda in emphasizing this matter.

[31] Though there are quite a few other novels in this genre, Nancy Paxton identifies four novels that dominantly embedded the rape of the white woman against the backdrop of the Mutiny, into the cosmology of the Anglo-Indian—Grant's *First Love and Last Love*, Philip Meadows Taylor's *Seeta* (1872), G. A. Henty's *Rujub the Juggler* (1893), and Flora Annie Steel's *On the Face of the Waters* (1897). Steel, if the reader will recall, was the Anglo-Indian philanthropist whose handbook for the Anglo-Indian housewife I had referred to. Another major novel bearing the shadow of rape that Paxton does not take into account, is Maud Diver's *Lilamani: A Study in Possibilities* (1911).

[32] These figures include the last Mughal emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar's son Mirza Mughal, Zafar's grandson Mirza Abu Bakr, Nana Saheb and his prime minister Azimullah Khan, and David Ochterlony Dyce Sombre, the adopted son of one Begum Sumroo who was the ruler of the princely state of Sardhana.

[33] For the most comprehensive account of Dyce Sombre's life, see Michael H. Fisher. *The Inordinately Strange Life of Dyce Sombre: Victorian Anglo-Indian MP and Chancery 'Lunatic.'*

[34] The figure of Seeta from the *Ramayana* spills into the emphasis that *satitva* lays on sexual purity in marriage i.e. sexual fidelity to the husband alone. According to the *Ramayana*, after her abduction by the demon Ravana, Seeta, when rescued by her husband Rama, was accused by him of losing her sexual purity because "Assuredly Ravana, beholding thy ravishing and celestial beauty, will not have respected thy person during the time thou didst dwell in his abode" (qtd. in Kinsley 74). Humiliated, Seeta attempts to burn herself in a funeral pyre, but survives the attempt by a dharmic intervention, freeing herself of Rama's allegation in the process (Kinsley 74).

[35] See footnote 24.

[36] The recurrence of the last name "Pande" or "Pandey" for most mutineers of 1857 in Victorian novels, is not very surprising. After the execution of Mangal Pandey who supposedly acted as the final spark for the Mutiny according to popular historiography, the generic mutineer was known to the average Anglo-Indian as a 'Pandy'—a derogatory term profusely used in Grant's *First Love and Last Love*, and in Trevelyan's account of the events at Kanpur.

[37] The mythic Savitri, in a manner reminiscent of Orpheus, enters the realm of the dead to bring her deceased spouse back with her to the world of the living so that she can "reside with him" (Kinsley 72).

[38] Aligning itself with the "worshipful" indoctrination of the Anglo-Indian woman into *satitva*, Steel's contemporary Maud Diver wrote another novel *Lilamani: A Study in Possibilities* (1911). In the novel, Diver uses tropes paralleling those of *Seeta*—a Hindu widow's marriage to an Anglo-Indian man, her imbibing of the myth of Savitri, and her subsequent epiphany that her Eurasian child is best left unconceived and unborn.

[39] See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. "Can the Subaltern Speak?".

[40] Though the Hindu Widows Remarriage Act had been passed in 1856, widow remarriage remained a possibility largely disclaimed in upper-caste Hindu households. For a lucid literary account about the frequency of Hindu widows being forced into prostitution despite the passing of the Act, see Sunil Gangopadhyay's Bangla novel *Sei Samay* [*Those Times*] (1981-82).

[41] *Swarnabai* is a novel emphasizing that it was in a Hindu widow's best interests to abnegate any claims she could harbor toward sexual agency. The authorial voice claims that *Swarnabai* is the 'truthful' autobiographical narrative of a Brahmin widow-turned-prostitute, written for the edification of those Hindu widows who, like the novel's eponymous protagonist, might be 'led astray.' According to this voice:

> Sins are being committed every day…[The Hindu widows'] follies can be brought home to them only through an account from the sinners themselves about the terrible consequences which they have suffered. It is for this reason that we have decided to publish the story of *Swarnabai*. If after reading this even one person shuns the lure of sins we shall consider our task to have been successful. (qtd. in Ratnabali Chatterjee 29)

The autobiographical narrator of *Swarnabai* is one Katyayani, married and widowed as a child in a Brahmin household. Contrary to the average child widow's transition into prostitution, Katyayani herself burns the bridges of *satitva* in her life: after being widowed, she falls in love with a man, and seduces a young male relative with whom she elopes to Calcutta. She is left alone by the relative, and has no option but to become mistress to a rich upper-caste Hindu man in Calcutta. Eventually being reduced to the position of a common cantonment prostitute, she contracts venereal disease and finds herself in a lock hospital. Racked by physical pains that make her body a cage in which she feels trapped, she is laughed at by unsympathetic cantonment doctors, and raped by cantonment clerks. The lock hospital "corresponds to the Hindu mythical

version of hell" in stark opposition to the *sati's* desire to "reside with her husband in heaven" (qtd. in Ratnabali Chatterjee 29). This "mythical version of hell" defines Katyayani almost solely in terms of the lack in her *satitva*. In other words, *satitva* had to be defined in terms of lack if it was to deny the Hindu widow of sexual agency.

[42] The extent to which linen had come to metonymically signify mid-nineteenth century Victorian housewifery can be seen in poems like Lydia Sigourney's "To a Shred of Linen" (1849). In the poem, paper and linen are contrasted in the space of the Victorian household, with the former standing for the Victorian housewife, and the latter for the housewife's efforts to break out of the shackles of domesticity into intellectual activity (Kortsch 182).

CHAPTER TWO: SEXUAL SEDITION AND LEGAL EXCESS: FIGURATIONS OF ANGLO-INDIAN WOMEN AND THEIR CAPITAL FROM THE 1950s TO THE 1980s

To what extent the fixing of the Eurasian in sexual degeneracy succeeded depends on the circulation of this fixing through time, and the additions and alterations that went with this circulation. These additions and alterations are important to sustaining this discourse of degeneracy via wars of manoeuver in multiple bodies of common sense. That this discourse is, subject to such additions and alterations, still in operation decades after decolonization, was made evident in 2012 in Calcutta. In February of that year, 38-year old Suzette Jordan was gang-raped on Park Street—a metropolitan hub of hotels, restaurants, bars, and nightclubs in central Calcutta. Immediately after the rape, Jordan rushed to the Park Street Police Station and tried to file a report against her rapists. The sub-inspectors at the station refused to register her complaint on the grounds that she was apparently a prostitute. The proof was seemingly self-evident. First, Jordan had been returning from a nightclub—an institution associated in a default upper-caste patriarchal male-chauvinist cosmology with anything but *satitva*'s austere abnegation of sexual pleasures. Second, Jordan was in Western garb—a bodily appendage associated with sexual agency in this patriarchal cosmology. Third, Jordan was an Anglo-Indian—the post-1935 nomenclature for the Eurasian—by racial origin, and the Anglo-Indian woman was, by a seemingly self-propulsive inevitability, a prostitute.[1] Fourth, this ostensible inevitability alone would explain why Jordan was a single mother of two and a divorcee, divorce and child-rearing outside wedlock being inconceivable within the pale of *satitva* (Banerjee). The policemen concluded that Jordan was a "call-girl" fabricating allegations because, as they said while

offering her a beer, “things had not gone her way” in her dealings with her ‘client’ (“Suzette Jordan”).

Apart from the colonial perception of the Eurasian prostitute that I have discussed in the previous chapter, one finds in this chain of significations defining Jordan’s racial and sexual position, coordinates that were not previously part of the perception e.g. nightclubs and Western garb. That the perception survived into the post-colonial moment is not surprising—a perception is, I suggest, a space of memory, storing up additions and alterations appended to it within varying sociopolitical moments and spaces. These additions and alterations to the figure of the Eurasian ‘prostitute’ manifested themselves, as I show, within multiple professional figurations of the Anglo-Indian woman e.g. in her avatars as cabaret dancer and office secretary in the 1950s and 1960s. The law’s articulation of this racial/sexual perception was, however, more complicated.

Within the site of law, attempts are often made to effect the recognition of a perception to the point of inevitability. Simultaneously, the law realizes that for a perception to be recognized as inevitable is perhaps detrimental to the law itself. It consequently attempts to stall or prevent this recognition. By playing out this tussle of simultaneous affirmation and negation, the law may, as I show, expose itself as an empty cipher; ergo, both law and the bodies of common sense toward which the perception is directed, remain split. The articulation of a figuration of degeneracy need not consequently be commensurate with an unqualified subscription to the discourse of degeneracy that produced it. As I show in this chapter, when the perception of the sexually-fallen Anglo-Indian woman was at its height in post-colonial India from the 1950s to the 1980s, the law-as-cipher perceived her oversexed body as a site of both sexual license and prohibition. Her body was a trophy because of the racial whiteness and overt sexuality this

perception exaggeratedly attributed to it. This same process of exaggeration, though, attributed racial and sexual reserves to her body—reserves that were beyond the access of the law-as-cipher. In this chapter I describe these reserves as the racial and sexual 'capital' inherent to the Anglo-Indian woman's figurations as cabaret dancer, as trophy office-secretary, and as saleswoman. I discuss this racial and sexual capital through a reading of three Bangla novels—Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay's *Chiriyakhana* [*Menagerie*] (1953) and *Aadeem Ripu* [*Primal Instinct*] (1955), and Narendranath Mitra's *Mahanagar* [*The Big City*] (1965). To add to this discussion, I look at cabaret dancer Miss Shefali's Bangla autobiography *Sandhyaraater Shefali* [*Flower of the Night*] (2014).[2]

Because the site of law gashes the production of discourses of degeneracy, the kernels of truth-effect in these discourses never reach the point of inevitability that would make them visceral to a common sense. A perception situated within these discourses may merely function through exaggeration, and through multiple re-articulations of this exaggeration. The law's need for such exaggeration of a perception as its occasional means to deal with a problematic situation, was made manifest vis-à-vis the Anglo-Indian woman when Madan Mitra, the Minister of Transport for the ruling party of West Bengal—the Trinamool Congress—asked why Jordan's husband had divorced her, who the father of her children was, and why she was outside her house in a nightclub late at night in Western garb. Kakoli Ghosh Dastidar, a Member of Parliament from the Trinamool Congress, went straight to the point of truth-effect when she stated that Jordan's rape was the result of a "dispute between a client and a call-girl" (qtd. in Banerjee). Embellishing this truth-effect, Mitra's emphasis on two metonyms—the nightclub and Western garb—became efforts to exaggerate into infallibility the law's branding of Jordan as an Anglo-Indian prostitute. Inversely, with the temporal continuity of a discourse depending on the

re-articulations of the truth-effects of this discourse over time, Mitra and Ghosh Dastidar's comments indicate a misplaced belief that the 'truth' of the figure of the Anglo-Indian woman-as-prostitute was incontrovertible simply because it had lasted for as long as it had. As I show in this chapter, 1. The professional figurations of the Anglo-Indian woman from the 1950s to the 1980s, emanated, with additions and alterations, from the colonial discourses that had identified her as a prostitute; 2. This emanation often granted racial and sexual reserves to these figurations—reserves that stood in opposition to the emanation itself; 3. These reserves were often paradoxically to the advantage of the law-as-cipher, with the re-articulation of the discourse of prostitution helping justify the systemic upkeep of this advantage.

The discourse of the Anglo-Indian prostitute is, as I show, further complicated in the post-colonial moment by the fact that it got intertwined after the partition of India in 1947, with the Hindu woman's stepping outside her household into modernity and employment. By extension, the constellation of metonyms Mitra spouts borrows from a conservative Bengali Hindu familial cosmology. Because such a cosmology is itself subject to additions and alterations overtime, Mitra simultaneously and strategically excludes other metonyms that have been more impeccably assimilated from the Anglo-Indian woman into the cultural capital of a mainstream Bengali Hindu modernity. Foremost among these metonyms is perhaps the English language, with English-speaking Anglo-Indian women having been inducted from the 1970s as teachers of English literature and language in elite missionary schools. The Anglo-Indian schoolteacher with this cultural capital at her disposal, was a far cry from the "prostitute class of India." I discuss the Anglo-Indian teacher's imparting of her cultural capital—a capital that sprung from her racial position as quite-white—by examining Aparna Sen's 1981 film *36 Chowringhee Lane*. This imparting brings into question the extent to which the Anglo-Indian

woman was an outsider in a post-colonial modernity that was, culturally speaking, Anglo-Indian in that it could never rid itself of the specter of its colonial forefathers. Even as the English language and the racial and cultural prestige associated with it no longer remain the sole capital of an Anglo-Indian schoolteacher, they are essential constituents of cultural prestige in India. This element of prestige emanating from the quite-white Anglo-Indian woman is not considered in the essentialism that would locate a Suzette Jordan as a prostitute.

Ultimately, what the Trinamool Congress unwittingly exposed in its vilification of Jordan was the body of the Anglo-Indian woman as a site of legal capital i.e. of her reserve of rights in a country where she was both 'domiciled' and a citizen. Her unseen homeland cast its shadow upon this position to grant her a legal excess in terms of nationality in what was, after all, an Anglo-India. Articulating this excess, Jordan manifested her legal capital by initially withholding it, allowing the Trinamool Congress to silence her to prove the success of its sexual policing. Finally, she manifested the excess in her legal capital by speaking out against the mandates of law that silenced her into the trap of an anonymous 'call-girl.' This is unsurprising: a monolithic discourse such as that of Anglo-Indian sexual degeneracy can be seen as an effort to balance out an unmanageable sociopolitical excess through the empty excess of governmental re-articulations of this discourse. The figurations of the Anglo-Indian working woman that I run through, function in tandem with these re-articulations. I would suggest that these re-articulations try to use their empty excess to balance out what the law perceives as unmanageable i.e. the Anglo-Indian citizen's sexual, racial, cultural, and legal reserves. The governmental vilification of Jordan can be viewed as an effort—albeit unsuccessful—to effect this balancing act.

Going Anglo: Nationalist Patriarchy and the Anglo-Indian Cabaret Dancer in Post-Colonial Calcutta

In a late nineteenth-century upper-caste Hindu patriarchal cosmology, the *andarmahal* seemed to function through the fixing of the Hindu wife's, daughter's, and widow's *satitva*. This cosmology deemed the fixing a necessity because the 'good' Hindu wife's 'sexual purity' was made to epitomize the nation in the home, with this nation being superficially subject to the patriarch's control, as I have stated in the previous chapter. The mapping of this spatiality of the nation-in-the-home, on the surface, worked through the location of the fallen woman outside the home. The Eurasian prostitute played no small role in this construction of the outside, given her situation as a racial *tnyas*[3] occupying the lowest rungs of the British racial hierarchy in colonial India (Mizutani 128-34). The *andarmahal* simultaneously acknowledged and disavowed this outsider, necessary though she was to transcendentalize *satitva* as the normal by allowing herself to be perceived as an anomaly. However, by that logic, the figure of the Eurasian prostitute was split in that it could not be dissociated from the split marking the patriarch's ostensibly disciplinary sexual control over the *andarmahal*. The patriarch knew only too well that rape, incest, and consensual sex were routine in the *andarmahal*, and that his laying down of *satitva* as the law would never be acknowledged completely. He remained silent about such matters, so long as knowledge of these outlawed sexual practices was limited inside the household (Mukhopadhyay 48).[4] Splitting his recognition as the master of all he surveyed—and ignored or overlooked—in the *andarmahal*, the reduction of the patriarch to a mere cipher of law rendered the spatialization of the household osmotic. This seemed to magnify the feared threat of the biracial *tnyas* waiting in the wings of the *andarmahal*.

Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay's detective figure Byomkesh Bakshi embodied the moralistic voice of this patriarch qua cipher-of-law in the transitory moment between the last decades of colonial and the first decades of post-colonial India. In Bandyopadhyay's novel *Chiriyakhana*,

Byomkesh investigates a case that involves the inhabitants of a colony of socio-legal outcasts. Byomkesh is hired by Nishanath Sen, the supervisor of the colony, to look into a case of blackmail that Nishanath is facing. The valences of the colony as a pseudo-disciplinary formation are laid out at the beginning of the novel, with Nishanath handing Byomkesh a map of the colony. As Byomkesh looks at it, he seems suffused by the sense that his is an "investigative gaze" "penetrating a monastery."[5] At the outset of the investigation, on what seems an absolutely disconnected note, Nishanath asks Byomkesh if he has any idea about the whereabouts of a Bangla-film actress named Sunayana. In Byomkesh's world, film-actresses, courtesans, and prostitutes inhabit an ideological space of sexual and moral deviance: "whether or not they are from respectable households remains a matter open to speculation." As a result, Byomkesh concludes that Sunayana is inevitably connected with the blackmail in some manner. The implications of Byomkesh's reference to a "respectable household" are tautological: Sunayana has evidently become an actress/deviant because she lives outside her household i.e. outside the *andarmahal*. Cause and effect lie entangled in this tautology, and remain unquestioned in Byomkesh's worldview (Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay, *Chiriyakhana* 379-82).

Byomkesh, however, has trouble finding Sunayana because, in her 'deviance' as an actress adept at the use of make-up, Sunayana has disguised herself beyond recognition. Ironically, she lives in the colony itself. The inexorable association in *Chiriyakhana* between being outside the *andarmahal* and possessing dexterity at the use of cosmetics, recalls late-nineteenth century nationalist stereotypes of the Hindu Bengali woman who set aside appendages of 'respectability' and took to the use of Western cosmetics and jewelry, becoming the 'Anglo-Indian *tnyas*' in the process (Chatterjee, *Nation and Its Fragments* 130-32). Yet, one must recollect that the patriarch's was a wisdom split within itself in its relationship with the

andarmahal; in its lip-service as cipher of law, it was incapable of recognizing the sexual outcast. As a result, when Byomkesh saw the disguised Sunayana in the colony, he misidentified her as a "pure homely girl of the *andarmahal*" (Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay, *Chiriyakhana* 389).

At a loss about where Sunayana is to be found, Byomkesh follows the man he suspects to be Sunayana's accomplice into the heart of Dharamtollah Street—a location that, as Byomkesh takes care to state, was the haunt of Anglo-Indian prostitutes. This neighborhood Byomkesh finds himself in makes his morally-outraged face "cringe with abhorrence." Dazed, he later cogitates on his foray into the neighborhood: "When the gods sleep, their day begins;/ When the gods awake, they are in darkness./ Their doors are the doors of hell on earth/ Their lamps of worship set the night on fire" (Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay, *Chiriyakhana* 432). By contrasting the Anglo-Indian prostitutes' lighting of their lamps with the Hindu wife's burning of the evening lamps for *arati* [religious worship of the household gods], Byomkesh tries to separate the "pure homely girl of the *andarmahal*" from the Anglo-Indian prostitute, and the *andarmahal* itself from the brothel. This, though, is also the patriarch's moment of recognition that he is a cipher for a non-existent law, and that the brothel haunts the *andarmahal* in ways that are beyond simplistic binaries: the clue that Byomkesh hunts out in the red-light area Sunayana's accomplice enters, leads him to the conclusion that Sunayana has had plastic surgery conducted upon her face, and wears a set of false teeth to alter her appearance. This was why she had seemed beyond recognition.

Much as Byomkesh condemns Sunayana, his foray into the red-light area reveals the skewed common sense of his moral universe: he refuses to recognize that the space for *arati* is also the space of rape, incest, consensual sex, and expulsion into prostitution.[6] Law and morality are inextricably entangled in Byomkesh's universe, but the *andarmahal* is the space of the

patriarch's failure not only as cipher of law but also as embodiment of sexual morality. This is in many ways a reenactment of the failed moral professions of sexual discipline among the nineteenth-century British militia in India, played out in the microcosmic limits of the Hindu Bengali household. Byomkesh expresses his awareness of the patriarch's fall in the novel *Aadeem Ripu* [*Primal Instinct*] (1955). In this novel, Byomkesh investigates the murder of one Anadi Haldar, living with his mistress Nanibala Devi and his son Prabhat whom he has begotten out of wedlock with Nanibala. Prabhat, who does not know that Anadi is his father, is in love with Damini, a singer, and is about to marry her. Unfortunately, Anadi takes a liking to Damini and wants to marry her himself. To prevent this from happening, Prabhat murders Anadi. Finding out that Prabhat is the murderer, Byomkesh also realizes that Anadi was in fact Prabhat's biological father—a fact that he reveals to Prabhat at the end of the novel (Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay, *Aadeem Ripu* 93-94). The moral guilt of having murdered his father out of his primal instinct of sexual covetousness, proves too much for Prabhat to handle. However, the status quo of the household seems to have been superficially restored: shortly before his death, Anadi had adopted Prabhat and had legally bequeathed his property to him since Prabhat was, after all, his son. Prabhat is exalted from illegitimate son to succeeding patriarch, and Nanibala is promoted from the previous patriarch's mistress to the present patriarch's legitimately-acknowledged mother. That Prabhat was conceived out of wedlock does not matter to Byomkesh since the laws of sexual morality governing the *andarmahal* were superficially restored as the empty ciphers that they were. Byomkesh's recognition of these ciphers' emptiness leads him to hide Prabhat's crime from the police and grant him full and free forgiveness: "Who among men has not sinned? Do not forget that man has the blood of animals running through his veins. It is only after a prolonged regime of discipline that he has to some extent been able to overcome his

animality; he has become civilized, he has become genteel, he has become human" (Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay, *Aadeem Ripu* 101-02).

Instead of *Chiriyakhana*'s transcendentalization of the virtues of *satitva*, what one has here is an exposure—and a cover-up—of the patriarch's sexual failings, living as Anadi does with his mistress out of wedlock, father to an illegitimate son whose prospective wife he covets. This prospective wife, Damini, as a site upon whose body sexual fall is enacted, proves an interesting figure in her marginalization in the novel. Anjan Dutta's cinematic version of *Aadeem Ripu*, *Byomkesh Bakshi* (2010) pays greater attention to this figure. In the film, Dutta transforms Damini into Shiuli, an Anglo-Indian singer and cabaret dancer at a hotel in Park Street. Much as Shiuli flourishes in her profession because of her sexual allure, her power lies specifically in withholding the fulfilment of this allure from "prospective clients," refusing the sexual advances of all—Anadi included—and condensing this withheld sexuality into her performances in the hotel. Initially thinking of his visit to the hotel to view the 'fallen' Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer as a piece of "amusing entertainment," Byomkesh, much to his surprise, finds that he has to struggle to make his way into Shiuli's dressing room. Having made it there, he finds Shiuli unapproachable and cold. Even as he initially pretends to be a "client," he finds himself rebuffed by Shiuli (*Byomkesh Bakshi*). As the voice of the patriarch, he finds his perception about the easily-accessible fallen Anglo-Indian woman fractured, in turn fracturing his articulation of law: the hotel in Park Street was no "monastery" that Byomkesh's "investigative gaze" could pretend to seamlessly penetrate and construct clear-cut binaries out of.[7]

What makes Dutta's depiction of Shiuli extremely interesting is the emphasis on the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer's withholding of her sexuality before 'clients.' More importantly, this withholding was, as the film makes amply clear, so charged that a detective was reduced to

powerlessness in his efforts to interrogate the dancer. Shiuli was not perhaps an exception in her withholding of what I call her 'sexual capital' i.e. the sexual labor of her quasi-white body that she expends sparingly, and only in the hotel lounge she performs in. Attempts at tracing a continuity in the truth-effect that was the "prostitute class of India," can prove more interrupted than otherwise. Shiuli's sexual capital at the Park Street hotel proved its value by locating itself beyond the reach of the law-as-cipher, while Jordan's legal status was brought into question to append value to the law-as-cipher. Apparent continuities can nevertheless be noted between the figurations of Shiuli and Jordan via certain paradigms e.g. 1. the question of the worth of the sexualized subject proved in terms of her sexual reserves, and 2. the law trying to convert these reserves into confessions of guilt that it could use to attain a semblance of plenitude.

The fractures in such a continuity were augmented by another territorial fracture—the partition of India in 1947. The fears about the Hindu woman setting aside her sexual 'respectability' within the cosmology Byomkesh represented, were essentially the fears of the Hindu woman's submission to the allure of Anglicization-in-the-world. These fears, set in *Chiriyakhana* and *Aadeem Ripu* in the years following decolonization, were unsettled by the *andarmahal*'s gradual disappearance as a spatial organization in post-partition Hindu Bengali households. The Byomkesh novels seem almost oblivious to this disappearance.

With the partition, what was erstwhile Bengal was split into the predominantly Muslim-populated East Pakistan—at present the independent nation-state of Bangladesh—and the Indian state of West Bengal. Hindu refugees migrated in millions to West Bengal with minimal financial resources. These resources largely disallowed the luxury of spatially replicating the previous organization of the upper-caste Hindu household with a separate inner sanctum for the womenfolk.[8] Arati Das aka Miss Shefali, the first Hindu Bengali woman to become famous in

the 1960s in the Park Street cabaret scene dominated by Anglo-Indian women, was one of the refugees to West Bengal. In her autobiography *Sandhyaraater Shefali*, she states that her family and she lived in a "tiny excuse for a room" in a warehouse in Ahiritola (7). To make ends meet for her family, Shefali initially decided to work as a servant to an Anglo-Indian family. Shefali devotes an entire chapter to describing her decision to work, and her subsequent step out into the world for the purpose. The chapter ascribes a momentousness to this step, the unwitting irony being that there was in fact no 'home' from which Shefali was stepping out into the world (8-9).[9]

As a result of her exposure to cabaret in the Anglo-Indian family, Shefali decided to become a cabaret dancer at the Firpo's Hotel and Restaurant in Chowringhee. In doing so, Shefali was perceived by her parents and siblings to have reduced herself to the position of a prostitute. Her father decided that they would move out of the warehouse away from all their relatives and acquaintances to save themselves the humiliation of being branded "untouchable outcastes" (Miss Shefali 35). The sense of the 'untouchable' and the 'outcaste' in the context of cabaret is as much inseparable from associations of prostitution, as it is from the perception that Shefali was heading for sexual fall by 'going Anglo.' Indeed, Shefali is herself prone to belittling Anglo-Indians when speaking of her sexual purity vis-à-vis the Anglo-Indian family she worked for. In the chapter that she devotes to describing her stint with this family, she underscores her disgust with the "animalistic" practices of its members. She says, "Violent arguments and partying, that's all there was to this Anglo-Indian family." The members of the family also smoked and drank "as the typical Anglo-Indian does. This is very normal of them."[10] Shefali adds that "Once all of us female servants had finished our work for the night and gone to sleep,…at midnight, a hand would touch my body. It would traverse the length and breadth of

my body like a hungry animal" (Miss Shefali 10-11). The implication seems to be that this was the hand of a male member of the family.

Shefali tacitly suggests that she was only able to stay on as a servant to the family because she was able to fight off sexual violation. A causality seems to be subsequently established between her ability to fight off sexual predators while "dancing ill-clad in front of a roomful of people every night" (Miss Shefali 35). As she learns from the manager of Firpo's, the trick to becoming successful as a cabaret dancer was "not to make yourself cheap. Never make your audience believe that you are of the sort whose body can be enjoyed by merely extending their hands." The body of the "fallen" 'Anglo-Indian' cabaret dancer, as Shefali subsequently discovers, could in fact become a storehouse of sexual power—overtly performing its sexuality as a kaleidoscope of attractions, it could use this very sexuality as a source of power by deliberately never satiating its audiences' desires (Miss Shefali 73).[11] Shefali finds that she can, like Shiuli, sustain her professional success through the sexual reserves innate to her body. Unlike with Byomkesh, though, the law has more material than moral interests when investing in the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer, as Shefali finds out.

Much like the prostitute registering with the cantonment *lal bazaar* as per the 1868 Contagious Diseases Act's dicta, Shefali had to get a license from the Lalbazaar Police Headquarters to perform in Park Street's hotels as a cabaret dancer.[12] At Lalbazaar, a dumbfounded police officer asked Shefali, "You're a Bengali girl and you're going to dance at a hotel?". Bengali is here, of course, a synonym for Hindu, and Hindu a synonym for the sexual inviolability inherent to the discourse of *satitva*. In other words, Shefali, as a "Bengali girl," is at least discursively expected to be everything that her Anglo-Indian counterpart is not. Shefali successfully counters the officer by asking him if he can make alternative arrangements for her

'respectability' and her family's well-being. Another police officer tells the first, "Can't you see? She's already become a veteran in the tricks of her trade. Bitch!." No more words are exchanged because by handing Shefali the license, the patriarchal spine of the law proves itself an empty signifier, not professing what it preaches: the Government of West Bengal received taxes on the licenses handed to the cabaret dancers at Lalbazaar. These licenses were doled out with the excuse that the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer was a fallen woman whose movements needed to be kept track of (Miss Shefali 20). The hollowness of the legal signifier resonates with a caustic description of the linkage between the colonial Government of Bengal and the Anglo-Indian barmaid in Shankar's 1962 Bangla novel *Chowringhee*. Talking about the prohibition on barmaids in hotels in the aftermath of decolonization, a customer at the hotel Shahjahan where the protagonist works, sarcastically reflects,

> Ah! Had [the Anglo-Indian barmaid] been here today, she would fill the wine glasses of thirsty guests with her beautiful honey-dewed smile…Had she been here today…the bar in the hotel could augment its fortunes tenfold. A lot more stools would have to be laid out at the bar. A lot more soda-bottles would be ordered each day, a lot of receipts would be printed, a lot more money would be deposited in the hotel proprietor's bank account. And since the Government has increased taxes, fuel could be added to the fire by shooting up the prices of alcohol. What a delightful arrangement that would make for! (Shankar 140)

The setting of *Chowringhee*—the hotel Shahjahan—becomes the centrifuge of nighttime Calcutta because of the entertainments it offers, central to which are cabaret performances. As the hub of Calcutta's nighttime sexual longings, the hotel *becomes* Calcutta, according to the protagonist (Shankar 149). This resonates with a point that Shefali makes in her autobiography:

"To satiate the hunger of nighttime Calcutta, I had to maintain my body like that of a nymph." At the height of her fame as a cabaret dancer at the Oberoi Grand, the "violent motion" of the body of Shefali as the "naked *mem-saheb*" *was* the Oberoi Grand itself, central to its kaleidoscope of attractions and, by extension, its profits. The whole idea, says Shefali, was that like any object, her body too was "put up for sale at an auction." The exception in the arrangement was that Shefali's withholding of her sexual attractions beyond the space of performance increased the price of her body (and the hotel's profits) manifold (73). With this rise in the sexual capital of the body gone Anglo, more hotels and restaurants featuring Anglo-Indian cabaret dancers began to open on Park Street in the 1960s, and along with the taxes being raked into Lalbazaar via the licenses, the performances themselves eventually began to be taxed. In the event that a restaurant or hotel failed to pay the taxes to the Government—then headed by the Communist Party of India (Marxist)—the police had instructions to heckle the managers and break up the performances until the taxes were paid up (Shirsho Bandyopadhyay xiii).

This would explain why the cabaret dancer, as a professional figuration of the fallen Anglo-Indian woman in 1950s and 1960s Calcutta, was tolerated—the Government had all to gain by treating the cabaret dancer as sexual capital. The workings of the system are in fact reminiscent of the sexual policing to which red-light areas in Calcutta are subjected. Keeping track of the fallen woman was an excuse to extract profits from the cabaret dancer's sexual reserves.[13] Simultaneously, one should remember that the fallen woman under discussion here is a Hindu woman who had stepped out into the world. If this mattered to Byomkesh's patriarchal cosmology (and to Shefali's parents qua "untouchable outcastes"), it certainly did not matter in the larger governmental scheme of things—the gaze of the Government was not and had no pretensions to proving itself disciplinary. Nor, however, did the law-as-cipher disclaim the

Anglo-Indian woman as a "veteran in the tricks of her trade," that being the excuse that kept the licensing system running.

The system of licensing had in fact outlived its original intention by then, having been inaugurated to keep track of the movements of cabaret dancers of non-Indian citizenship in early twentieth-century India.[14] The empty investment of the letter of the law in the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer, it can be assumed, served as pretext for this system to outlast its utility. Because, by a complementary paradox, the successful cabaret dancer's withholding of her sexual capital kept the system going, the demand for her body increased, as did the deposits in the Government's coffers. Contradicting the apparent continuity between a Shiuli and a Jordan, the law did not try to translate this withheld sexual capital into confessions of guilt—the law's systematic re-articulation of this guilt helped it translate the sexual capital into monetary terms to its benefit.

Concomitant with this withheld sexual capital of the oversexed Anglo-Indian woman's body, was the racial capital of this body. This was, after all, a body that, though not white enough, was the closest to whiteness one could get in the immediate aftermath of decolonization. The value of this body's quite-white skin, coupled with its sexual capital, were inextricable from the heralding of the Hindu woman into world and work.

"Our Ex-Rulers" as Trophy: The Racial Capital of the Oversexed Anglo-Indian Office Employee

Almost all the secretaries that the protagonist of *Chowringhee* comes across in the Shahjahan—including the receptionist—are young Anglo-Indian women. Almost all the prostitutes and cabaret dancers in the novel are also Anglo-Indian. The protagonist emerges from Byomkesh's *dharmic* world where his first encounter with an Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer's

display of sensuality evokes the fall of the law of the *andarmahal*. In its welcome of the patriarch to a "carnivorous Calcutta," this encounter rings "the death-knell of civilization" for the protagonist, leaving him crying for the loss of his self-proclaimed sexual innocence. Elated that the protagonist has been able to hold on to his "innocence" even after such a show of "the unspeakable," the assistant manager of the Shahjahan asks him to retain this sexual 'incorruptibility' all through his life (Shankar 250). Yet, this same protagonist had started his professional life living in an Anglo-Indian brothel as a seller of wooden wastepaper baskets, with the prostitutes in the brothel making the baskets. Equally significantly, for his first successful sale of wastepaper baskets at an office, he had to seek the auspices of the office proprietor's female Anglo-Indian secretary. This secretary almost wielded a power of patronage over the other employees in the office, so that anyone who sought the proprietor's favors had first to curry her favor. The proprietor, as is evident, has himself set up this hierarchy of power in his office. Within this hierarchy, a doorkeeper who tries to help the protagonist out, has to convince the secretary into endorsing the purchase of three wastepaper baskets. Both the doorkeeper and the protagonist have to address the secretary as "madam" while, very interestingly, the protagonist discusses her racial status as a "*mem-saheb*" for the benefit of the reader (Shankar 23). The latter designation bears within it not only the connotation of the Anglo-Indian woman, but also of her white foremothers of the colonial era, and of the prestige accorded to these foremothers as members of the ruling class. Simultaneously, even as the protagonist finds the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancers at the Shahjahan abhorrent, both the assistant manager and he, when talking with each other, refer to them as "*mem-sahebs*" (Shankar 240-41). In this latter context, the designation connotes a degree of sarcasm, even as the sense of hierarchy and deference it commands is never completely lost: as with Shefali in the Oberoi Grand, these women command

the Shahjahan through their sexual capital of exposing (and withholding) white skin—or what is left of white skin in the aftermath of miscegenation.

As the prize secretary in Calcutta offices in the 1960s and 1970s, the Anglo-Indian woman's sexual capital rested to a considerable extent on her quite-white skin. By extension, this skin heightened the prestige of an Indian office-proprietor who could employ "the race created by our ex-rulers:" in the act of employing this race, the proprietor vicariously ruled the "ex-rulers" themselves (*Mahanagar*). Hence my reference to the Anglo-Indian woman's racial capital—the capital of a body that was the closest to whiteness one could get after the decolonization of India.

The sense of hierarchy that this almost-white white body proliferated in the average 1960s and 1970s Calcutta office, is amply captured by sociologist Sudarshana Sen: "The older generation of mainstream Bengalis would remember Anglo-Indian secretaries they had met, perhaps when sitting in an interview room. Her efficiency, her accented English, her diction and moreover her fair skin, her frilled frock, her red lipstick made her 'sensuous and beautiful'[15]—different and distinct from the other women of India." The secretary's "accented English" and "diction," as cultural signifiers of the "ex-rulers," made her a trophy, as did her "fair skin" that made her racially "different and distinct from other women in India." Because of the intertwinement of sexual capital with her quasi-white body, though, the stereotype of the oversexed Anglo-Indian woman is never quite lost in this figuration. Perhaps the best substantiation of this intertwinement can be found in Bombay-based cartoonist Mario Miranda's 1960s creation for *The Illustrated Weekly of India*, Miss Fonseca. Secretary to an irascible office boss whom she can always sooth into complacency and submission thanks to her rotund breasts and standard polka-dotted miniskirt, Miss Fonseca recalls Sen's "sensuous and beautiful" Anglo-

Indian secretary. It would perhaps not be a stretch to suggest that the secretary's "fair skin," as a fundamental constituent of her sensuality and beauty, manifests itself in Miss Fonseca by being displaced onto her pronouncedly large breasts. This, I would suggest, is where a racial attribute is displaced to resurface as a sexual attribute. Racial and sexual capital are rolled into one: Miss Fonseca is both quasi-white mistress and sensual secretary, with her boss perpetually ogling her breasts.[16] Miss Fonseca wields her racial capital by simultaneously withholding her sexual capital. In one panel, she tells her boss, "I will look after my shorthand, Boss…if you will look after your long arms" (Ashokbhatia). The boss nevertheless perpetually looks on at her breasts, grinning. She takes away his grin on one occasion when she uses her command over the English language and expresses it in terms of sexual capital: when taking notes, she tells her boss, "It's ungrammatical to end every sentence with a proposition, Boss" (Ashokbhatia).

The disenchanted *andarmahal* enters the space of Miss Fonseca's desk on multiple occasions. In one panel, for instance, the boss' wife makes her way to the office to take a look at Miss Fonseca, telling her, "I always wanted to meet you…You see, my husband has told me so little about you" (Ashokbhatia). Miss Fonseca matters even more to the *andarmahal*, though, because she is training a Hindu woman who has started working in the office. The woman is at a loss about what to make of the dynamics of work and of sex that she sees in the office. Expressing her awareness of her status as a sexual trophy, Miss Fonseca tells the new employee in one panel that "The work is not bad here, once you learn to ignore it" (Ashokbhatia). In other words, the Hindu woman, like her Anglo-Indian counterpart, must be aware of her status as a signifier of sexuality and use it calculatedly. However, the difference between Miss Fonseca and this new employee in terms of their sensual signifiers is too pronounced to miss. Miss Fonseca's claims to sexual reserves rest on her status as a racial trophy. The Hindu woman, with her sari,

her huge glasses, and her hair done up in a bun, looks almost desexualized in comparison with her. Ultimately, the panel showing this exchange between the two women articulates the Hindu woman's stepping out of the home into the world, and her being trained into work and modernity by the Anglo-Indian woman. Simultaneously, the difference in the dynamic of work between the two in terms of their racial and sexual reserves is spelled out: the boss is shocked to find Miss Fonseca influencing her Hindu counterpart's sexual ethic, but he does nothing about it because Miss Fonseca is his prize employee in a way that the Hindu woman can never be.

A similar dynamic can be seen in Narendranath Mitra's Bangla novel *Mahanagar* [*The Big City*]. The initial version of the novel, published as the short-story "Abataranika" ["Descent"] in 1949, was made into a film by Satyajit Ray in 1964. The year following the release of the film, Mitra expanded the story into a full-length novel and published it under the name of the film, *Mahanagar* [*The Big City*]. The year of the short story's publication—immediately following the partition of India—recalls the moment when the *andarmahal* was collapsing as a spatially-enunciated institution. The absence of the *andarmahal* as space in the plots of both novel and film is noteworthy, as is the training of the Hindu wife into modernity under the auspices of an Anglo-Indian colleague. As part of my discussion of the Anglo-Indian woman's racial and sexual capital, I will be examining the novel in conjunction with the film. As I show, a pointed difference lies between the climaxes of the two. The film tries to gloss over a jagged edge in its treatment of Mitra's climax, missing a significant point in the process.

The protagonist of the novel is a Hindu Bengali wife named Arati Majumdar, married to Subrata, a bank-employee. The Majumdars lived in present-day Bangladesh prior to the partition, with Subrata's father Priyagopal working as clerk to a rich *zamindar* [landlord] in Mitra's novel. Given the huge amounts of money Mitra's Priyagopal earned as *nazrana* [lit. greeting money],

the family made a comfortable living. In addition, they possessed considerable property courtesy of the *zamindar*'s beneficence. The need for members of the family to work was never felt prior to the partition.

The novel opens with the family living after the partition in a tiny house in Calcutta on the pittance that Subrata earns from his job as a bank-employee. Given the need to augment the family income, Subrata encourages Arati to take up a job. Arati eventually finds employment as a saleswoman in a firm named Mukherjee and Mukherjee. Her job involves going to upper-middle class and elite households in Calcutta to canvass a brand of sewing machine, and to demonstrate to the customers how the machine works. In this process, she gets exposed to the space of the city that her confinement within the Majumdars' non-existent *andarmahal* had not allowed her. Arati's insular in-laws object as much to this exposure as to her rubbing shoulders with her Anglo-Indian colleague Edith Simmons. The big city's seductive wiles become epitomized in their conservative imaginaries by Edith who is, according to them, obviously a prostitute, given her racial background, and who will inevitably influence Arati in the same direction. That Arati is working outside the house late into the night seems proof enough of this influence beginning to work (Mitra 61).

Subrata begins to be swayed by Priyagopal's misogynistic harangues against Edith. Under the influence of Priyagopal's endless patriarchal platitudes, Subrata is shocked to find that Arati has taken to the use of make-up, courtesy of Edith who is characterized by her ability to "talk with her eyes," with some help from her cosmeticized face (Mitra 22). Himangshu Mukherjee, the director of Mukherjee and Mukherjee, is himself of Subrata's conservative patriarchal bent, and not very kindly disposed toward Edith. He nevertheless tellingly hires her. Ray's cinematic version makes the irony of this hiring clear by emphasizing that all the others

hired as saleswomen at Mukherjee and Mukherjee were, unlike Edith, Hindu Bengalis with hardly any idea of the big city and its workings. Edith is the only one among them who, with her knowledge of the English language, can visit prospective white buyers without flinching. The one time Ray's Arati tries to reach out to a potential British customer living in a rich white neighborhood, the sight of the customer scares her away. There was essentially nothing threatening about the man who, opening the door of his house, kindly asked her, "Yes?". In response to the question, Arati smiles, turns sheepishly around, and says, "No." She cannot find it in her to look the man straight in the eye, and her lack of knowledge of the English language does not help her confidence (*Mahanagar*).

In contrast to Arati, the more worldly-wise Edith, wearing a skirt and a polka-dotted shirt reminiscent of Miss Fonseca, has sunglasses on her eyes. She need not bother about her buyers' eyes; her buyers have, on the contrary, to make an effort to look at her eyes beyond her sunglasses. Ray's Edith, played by Anglo-Indian actress Vicky Redwood, exudes confidence in her very manner of walking. She coaxes Arati into using make-up—particularly lipstick[17]—because, as Edith tells her, "It's good for business" (*Mahanagar*). Mitra's novel puts this across more explicitly, having Edith tell Arati that the application of make-up will "please the eye" of her customers (7). Edith's decision to take Arati under her wing to educate her in these matters, emerges not only from her knowledge of the necessity of using her sexual capital to her advantage, but also from the edge she possesses among the saleswomen because of her racial capital. This edge is perhaps what had led Himangshu Mukherjee to hire Edith, notwithstanding his reluctance to do so.

In Mitra's novel more than in Ray's film, Subrata is unable to come to terms with Edith's use of her racial and sexual reserves to provoke a man no less than Himangshu himself.

Discontent was brewing in both novel and film about the saleswomen receiving no commission on their sales of the sewing machines, unlike in other firms. Edith extracts this commission for herself and her colleagues from Himangshu, who finds his prize saleswoman's worldly wisdom putting him at a disadvantage. The success of Edith's endeavor seems to be the quintessential moment of Subrata's epiphany that Arati will apparently go the route of the Anglo-Indian 'prostitute.' The words "commission" and "per cent" bear a "commercial odour" that unsettle him when Arati utters them. To be paid commission on a monetary valuation of the labor of the female body is nothing short of prostitution in his conservative worldview, with the novel opening to give a peek at Arati working away in the Majumdars' absent *andarmahal*. The valuation of this labor in the *andarmahal* is conceptually inconceivable to Subrata, and the work outside the *andarmahal* even more so, given Priyagopal's binaristic thinking of home and world in terms of *andarmahal* and brothel (Mitra 22-25).[18] Himangshu's payment of commission suddenly reduces Arati's body to an object that is, in Subrata's eyes, "commonplace and unrefined," "lacking in delicacy" through its "slow burial, day by day, under a stack of rupees" (Mitra 7). Himangshu seems to endanger Subrata's position as Arati's husband, having ostensibly "purchased the greater portion of Arati's labour and energy" to reduce Subrata to being an insignificant "shareholder in his wife's labour" (Mitra 53). Still under the spell of the feudalist dispensation Priyagopal stood for, Subrata refuses to understand that the *zamindari* hierarchy has been replaced by another hierarchy of race and gender in offices and firms, with commission acting at cross currents with *nazrana* in this new dispensation. In a moment of anger and desperation, he asks Arati, "How long before you start smoking cigarettes?" (Mitra 64). The reference is, of course, to the tried-and-tested figure of the Anglo-Indian woman who smoked and drank.[19] Satyajit Ray's cinematic version alters Subrata's question to highlight the

conservative Hindu Bengali linkage between prostitution and wearing Western cosmetics: Ray has Subrata ask Arati as she leaves for work one day, "Aren't you going to paint your face today?" (*Mahanagar*). The Bangla idiom about "painting the face" refers pejoratively to the use of make-up by prostitutes to attract customers. The references to prostitution multiply with each passing conversation between Subrata and Arati in the novel. The essence of the big city, according to Arati, is that everyone is "engaged in a race with everyone else...to see who was the most urbane of all city dwellers" (Mitra 33). Constant motion, it seems to her, is the soul of the urban. Versus this motion, comments Subrata sarcastically, is a fleeting moment captured in a restaurant or hotel "where you love, and cherish, and promise to obey" (Mitra 35).

As Subrata finds out on meeting Himangshu, though, both are kindred souls with a patronizing and protective attitude toward Arati. In addition, in Ray's film, Himangshu lays the blame for Arati's marital discord at Edith's door. He says that because Edith had fallen ill, the bulk of her work had fallen upon Arati's shoulders, making it impossible for Arati to leave for home early. He laughs mockingly as he comments to Subrata, "Our ex-rulers have created quite a race, huh?" (*Mahanagar*). Himangshu, who links Edith's sexuality in the novel with her race, never fires her though he is not able to use her racial/sexual capital-as-saleswoman for days on end, owing to her illness.

Much as Mitra's Arati wants to visit the ailing Edith, Subrata forbids her from doing so because "*those* people" can "lead [Arati] astray in *other ways*" (89-90; emphases mine). The "other ways" find enunciation in Himangshu's vituperations against Edith, as Edith's illness magnifies and she fails to come to work more frequently than before. On a day when Himangshu's firm is facing a crisis and he needs all the saleswomen present, Edith is absent because she is unable to "get up from bed." In a fit of rage, Himangshu expostulates, "How can

you expect her to get up today, after entertaining guests all night, earning extra money?" (Mitra 94). Like Subrata, he was a shareholder in Arati's bodily labor, as also in the labor of the other saleswomen. Edith's professional capital was, however, far in excess of those of the other saleswomen—she had reserves that, Himangshu indicates, were being expended and wasted upon prostitution as an additional profession, putting him at a monetary disadvantage.

Himangshu's tirade against Edith's "loose morals" leaves Arati furious. In a fit of rage, Arati quits her job as an act of protest against Himangshu's racial parochialism (Mitra 94). The novel is unable to posit a sufficient reason as to why Arati resigns. After all, Edith had not been fired and her position as a saleswoman at Mukherjee and Mukherjee was not in any jeopardy. Subrata himself is unable to find a rational explanation for the matter. Even if Edith had been humiliated through insinuations of prostitution, the insults were hurled in her absence, and she was now "probably sitting at the office…swearing and pulling away at a cigarette" (Mitra 95). Ray tries to gloss over this fissure—in his cinematic version he has Himangshu officially dispense with Edith's services before Arati can be made to feel indignant enough to hand in her own resignation letter. Indeed, Ray's Himangshu goes so far as to tell Arati that "it is for the sake of a Bengali woman like you that I had decided long back to fire Edith" (*Mahanagar*). As with Shefali at Lalbazaar, "Bengali" and "Hindu" become synonymous in this statement. Against the backdrop of the *andarmahal*-brothel binary, Ray's Edith had to leave Arati's world—her racial and sexual reserves were considered a threat to the purity of the virtuous Hindu wife.

My reading of the gap in Mitra's novel moves in a direction contrary to Ray's gloss. I suggest that Edith was not fired precisely because of her racial and sexual reserves. She would be allowed to swear and pull away at a cigarette in the office because her racial and sexual capital located her professional reserves rungs above her colleagues'. Unlike in the film, Mitra's Arati

was not a particularly efficacious saleswoman, while Edith's reserves made her far and away a more competent counterpart, channelizing these reserves as she seemingly did in "other ways" "good for business" in Himangshu's firm. On the one hand, the location of Edith in these "other ways" of the world made her the object of aspersion for her "loose morals;" on the other, this location was what made her position in the firm secure in a way that Arati's was not. In this sense, Himangshu Mukherjee was not very different from Miss Fonseca's nameless boss. The latter boss was, for his part, perhaps nameless because he was the everyman/every-boss employing Anglo-Indian women as trophies good for business. The trophy's smoking, her swearing, her polka-dotted miniskirts, her sunglasses, her cosmetics, her oversexed body, her awareness of her racial and sexual capital, and her passing on of her capital to the Hindu working woman—all these complicate the figuration of the Anglo-Indian working woman far more than the legal ciphers of the Trinamool Congress would binaristically have it.

The complexity of these significations is heightened by metonyms that patriarchal attempts to 'fix' the Anglo-Indian woman into fallenness exclude—metonyms fundamental to constructions of prestige in a post-colonial Indian cultural modernity, the most important of these being the English language.

The Land of Her Birth: The Stripping of the Anglo-Indian's Cultural Capital

Through the 1970s, more and more Anglo-Indian women began to take up jobs as teachers at schools in India. Matters changed in the second half of the eighties, and even more so in the nineties, with a large number of Anglo-Indian teachers finding themselves out of work. Non-Christian teachers trained in the use of the English language eventually began to supplant them (Brown 110).[20] The protagonist of Aparna Sen's 1981 film *36 Chowringhee Lane* is Violet Stoneham, one such Anglo-Indian teacher who used to head the English Department at a

renowned school in Calcutta—renowned because "English is the medium of instruction." Indeed, the matter of the "medium of instruction" is so paramount in the film's early-1980s setting, that a meeting of the teachers in the school begins with the principal addressing this matter. The gathering in the meeting consists of a set of older Anglo-Indian teachers dressed in skirts, shirts, and waistcoats, with a sprinkling of younger non-Christian colleagues in saris. Addressing the matter of the medium of instruction, the principal suddenly announces that one of the non-Christian teachers, one Miss Mazumdar, is "the only one among us with a special degree in teaching English literature classes. I trust that all of us will agree that her academic accomplishment qualifies her to head the English Department *even though she is junior to most of us*" (*36 Chowringhee Lane*; emphasis mine). The said Miss Mazumdar squirms in a sari, having become unpopular by supplanting the disdainful and indignant Anglo-Indian teachers in their workplace. What was an emphasis on age in the principal's announcement was in fact an emphasis on race, with many Anglo-Indian colleagues raising eyebrows at the fact that they had not been considered for the position. Prior to that moment, these women's racial background was qualification enough for them to teach English literature classes. The principal's emphasis that Miss Mazumdar was qualified to teach the classes despite her youth, was in fact a statement to the effect that though Miss Mazumdar was not quite-white, she could teach English literature.[21]

The intertwinement of English literature and the English language as the "medium of instruction" has always been a sticking point in the codification of an "English Department," be it in schools, colleges, or universities, with the teaching of English literature being perhaps considered superior to the teaching of the language itself. The two components can never, though, be separated. In light of this perceived pedagogic hierarchy, the principal unsurprisingly continues, "Miss Stoneham, we think, would like to take up *English grammar with the junior*

classes, instead of Shakespeare in classes eight, nine, and ten…We must show some consideration for her advancing years and failing health" (*36 Chowringhee Lane*; emphasis mine).[22] Through the years, as becomes obvious, Violent has imparted the cultural capital of English literature—intertwined with the English language as "medium of instruction"—to the school. She has concomitantly been foundational to establishing the school's prestige, given her status as a quite-white teacher spouting the literature (and language) of her British forefathers. Having imparted this capital as much through her pedagogical methods as through her skin-color, Violet is now demoted to teaching the English language—a superfluous and thankless task. The question of teaching "junior" classes—recalling Miss Mazumdar's status as "junior" in age—is tied back to the question of race: now that the school has achieved its coat of whiteness, it can discard this coat without losing the affixed prestige. In what way teaching Shakespeare can be less strenuous and intellectually taxing to an aging teacher remains unstated. This trend of demotions continues, as the classes taught by Anglo-Indian teachers are cut down with each passing school term, leading them to comment on "being superseded" (*36 Chowringhee Lane*). Colonialism is over, and what is left of white skin has been largely sucked of its cultural capital. The remainders of whiteness are now being discarded.

The film's opening sequence would say otherwise. In this sequence, Violet explains Act 1 Scene 1 of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night* to her class. She tries to emphasize Duke Orsino's need to be surfeited by the food of love. Violet seems ineffectual as a teacher. She merely teaches by spouting the lines of the scene by rote. Her cultural capital had so far consisted in her quite-white body imparting the linguistic plenitude of her colonial forefathers to the school. Speech, that was so far apparently enough, was increasingly found lacking. The class is inattentive, with students throwing paper balls at each other. Amidst the pandemonium, one

student points to an American comic-book panel featuring a man passionately kissing a woman, and whispers to a friend that this must be what Duke Orsino's surfeit of love would physically feel like (*36 Chowringhee Lane*). Taking off from this comic-book panel, I would suggest that Violet's uttering of Orsino's monologue by rote can be traced to her need to bowdlerize her explanations of Shakespeare—a watered-down explanation of sexual surfeit lies written on the blackboard, unheeded by this young and "innocent" batch of students. As her seemingly deliberate bowdlerization seems to prove, there was more to her cultural capital than merely her skin. Even as this capital no longer matters to the school, then, there may be unexposed reserves of it.

That these reserves have, over the years, been appropriated by Violet's students is proved in the scene that follows, with Violet's former student Nandita Roy speaking uninhibitedly about the 'food of love.' When Nandita's fiancé Samaresh Roy asks her what they will glut on—"champagne or caviar"—given that he does not have a job, she replies, "We'll glut on kisses." She lives up to her promise—when Samaresh and she meet Violet who, in a fit of kindness, offers them free access to her house, both end up continually using the house for sexual intercourse in Violet's absence. Their sexual surfeit finds free rein in this house in Chowringhee which—as they themselves admit—they have begun to treat like a hotel.[23] The sexual surfeit in this makeshift hotel finds cultural expression in the school: Miss Mazumdar sets aside all thoughts of bowdlerization, making the sexual innuendos clear and sustaining her students' titillated attention. Violet's withheld cultural reserves lose their value further and further. Samaresh and Nandita rob her of the remains of these reserves, wheedling her of her precious gramophone and her 78 RPM records, only to decorate them as antiques/trophies of their "ex-rulers" in their house after their marriage (*36 Chowringhee Lane*). The Anglo-Indian woman's

racial and cultural capital qua prestige find their clear enunciation increasingly difficult in a post-colonial modernity that memorializes colonial artifacts as relics, Violet being reduced to one of these relics.

Violet always considered herself an 'outsider,' in the wrong nation at the wrong time, alienated from "Indians" because according to her Anglo-Indian colleagues, "There's no future in this country." In the company of Samaresh and Nandita, though, Violet finds herself feeling more at home in India than she has in years, with the duo continually and convivially dropping into her apartment. Having baked a Christmas cake for them, she celebrates Christmas with them. The next Christmas, Violet again bakes a Christmas cake and looks forward to meeting Samaresh and Nandita. The two are now married and live in Samaresh's ancestral house. Standing outside the shut door of the house, Violet finds that Samaresh and Nandita are hosting a Christmas party with their friends, brandishing the gramophone and the records they have obtained from "that old hag" (*36 Chowringhee Lane*). Even as Samaresh, Nandita, and their friends laugh at the sexual innuendos in the names of the songs on the gramophone records, they are alarmed to find that one of the ladies in the party knows the songs inside out. She sings the swinging tunes and sets the others in the party dancing.[24] As the lady belts out these numbers and her audience keeps laughing, Samaresh places a record on the gramophone, and "Silent Night" starts playing. An awed hush descends on the party, and Violet gradually walks away from the door. The festival of Christmas is now a moment of secularized jouissance for the Bengalis in the party, who are moved by the song in a way that Violet is not. Witness to this cultural appropriation of Christmas at her expense, Violet feels alienated from her own cultural identity. She keeps looking down at the cake in her hand as a worthless piece of expended labor. The

unkindest cut is that this incident happens just when Violet was beginning to feel that "If we mix closely with the Indians, they also behave nicely with us" (*36 Chowringhee Lane*).

At a loss, Violet goes to the Victoria Memorial and sits at the foot of the statue of Queen Victoria. As if in her class, she begins reciting lines from Act 4 Scene 7 of Shakespeare's *King Lear*—the lines with which Lear expresses his recognition of his lunacy: "Pray, do not mock me./ I am a very foolish fond old man,/ Fourscore and upward, not an hour more nor less;/ And, to deal plainly,/ I fear I am not in my perfect mind" (4.7. 58-62). Bearing out Lear's moment of self-recognition, these lines simultaneously become Lear's recognition of the loss of his royal prestige at the hands of his daughters, Goneril and Regan. As Violet sits at the foot of the statue, she realizes that like Lear, Queen Victoria's biracial daughters were being alienated from the racial prestige that their not-quite royal skin once affixed to them. Racially "superseded," they find themselves paradoxically domiciled in the country of their birth—a realization not too far from juridical articulation (*36 Chowringhee Lane*).

An examination of the Indian Constitution reveals that the Anglo-Indian as a racial figure is at least partially always already located in a spatio-temporal outside: she is described as "a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent but who is domiciled within the territory of India" (qtd. in Andrews 122). The word 'domiciled' carries the connotation of a person who lives in a nation that is not her home, finding herself in an anachronistic timeframe after her European forefathers have left India. As a descendant of Queen Victoria, born outside the wedlock of colonialism her forefathers had participated in, Violet is a post-colonial exile as an Indian national. She ultimately reconciles herself to this prison of exile as she begins eloquently reciting Lear's lines to his daughter Cordelia in Act 5 Scene 3 of *King Lear*. At this point, Edmund, illegitimate son of the Earl of

Gloucester, has captured both Lear and Cordelia as prisoners. As they are being carried off, the mad Lear says: "Come, let's away to prison/…So we'll live,/…and hear poor rogues/…Talk of court news, and we'll talk with them too—/ Who loses and who wins, who's in, who's out…" (Shakespeare, *King Lear* 5.3. 9-16). Both Cordelia and Lear have been "superseded"—as have Violet and Queen Victoria—but the question of "who's in, who's out" sticks, their captor being an illegitimate son of royalty. If post-colonial India is an illegitimate child of decolonization—an Anglo-India imparted a cultural legacy by the white and the almost-white via institutions like Violet's school—it perhaps recognizes its awareness of this illegitimacy. In an effort to distance itself from the specter of white colonialism, it delegitimizes the almost-white Violet outside-within citizenship. In this game of legitimacy and lack, whether post-colonial India or Violet is "in" or "out" of court, remains an open-ended matter—India itself is, despite decolonization, an Anglo-India that is not Indian enough to extort itself from the specter of exile/domicile.[25] Violet, alone in the silence and darkness, feels like a pariah, with this feeling literally externalized in the form of a stray dog as the only audience for her eloquent execution of Lear's lines. Sitting below the statue, she gives some thought to taking up her niece's offer to go and live in England, her "homeland" that she has ironically never seen. Eventually, she gives up the idea and decides to continue in imprisonment in Anglo-India. With her colonial prestige stripped and memorialized in the relic that is the gramophone playing away in Samaresh and Nandita's house, the cultural prestige of Anglo-Indian skin is reduced to an anachronism lost in the darkness of the night into which Violet walks off (*36 Chowringhee Lane*). What remains for Violet is her position as an Indian citizen oxymoronically in exile. What capital does this legal position leave Violet with?

What Remains: The Legal Capital of the Anglo-Indian Citizen

To return to the figure with whom this discussion began, Jordan could be forced into a confession of her status as a 'call-girl' despite her studied silence, because the statutes of Section 228A of the Indian Penal Code were forced upon her. According to Section 228A, a victim of rape would have her identity rendered anonymous after she filed a case against her rapists. That way, conservative elements could not attribute her the status of a fallen woman and vilify her accordingly. Though the sub-inspectors at the Park Street Police Station refused to register Jordan's case, the anonymity of the rape-victim demanded by Section 228A was thrust upon her. Her legal identity compromised, the law-as-cipher could use the figure of the Anglo-Indian woman-as-prostitute to pass the rape off as a "dispute between a client and a call-girl" (qtd. in Basu and Singh). Jordan's silencing outside-within Section 228A can be considered an extension of her exile outside-within the Indian nation. The Trinamool Congress could consequently speak for her, using multiple articulations to exaggerate her into the inevitably 'fallen women.' However, the capital available to Jordan all along was that of the legal citizen whose nationhood was de jure in excess of the nation's limits precisely because she was, as an Anglo-Indian, born as a 'domiciled' citizen. Parallelly, she had a legal excess over the Trinamool Congress in that she could afford to speak out whenever she chose to do so, setting aside considerations of anonymity. After all, she did not have to follow the legal mandates of Section 228A because, to begin with, she had not been able to file a report, and the Trinamool Congress could consequently take no action against her for breaking her anonymity. This was Jordan's legal capital.

Jordan stated that with her silencing, her legal identity itself had been substituted by a metonym. Identified in her anonymity as the "Park Street rape victim," Jordan said, "Everywhere I went…I would hear people say…"The Park Street rape victim is going"…"Park Street, Park

Street"…I'd like people to know my name is not…Park Street…I am a person" ("Satyameva Jayate"). This same "Park Street," as I have stated, filled Lalbazaar's coffers through the nightclubs that the law-as-cipher simultaneously maligned as signifiers of fallenness. Madan Mitra, it is to be remembered, had used "Park Street" as a signifier to self-evidently prove that Jordan was a call-girl ("Suzette Jordan"). What manifests itself here, then, is a negation of the law, given the contradiction between the letter of the law and legal practice. This exposes the emptiness of the cipher of law. This emptiness can be said to simultaneously grant a legal excess to the citizen located both within and beyond the spatio-temporal limits of the post-colonial Indian nation-state. The Anglo-Indian citizen can, then, perhaps be said to possess legal capital beyond conceptual elucidation in the Indian Penal Code, just as the emptiness of the law-as-cipher lies unexplained in the Code. This legal excess is a fruitful means to define the status of the Anglo-Indian citizen-subject. It is an excess that a mainstream governmental ideology is not conceptually able to cope with; hence perhaps the need to try and fix it within controllable parameters via the re-articulation of long-standing but empty discourses. The Trinamool Congress' manic re-articulations of the Anglo-Indian woman qua prostitute can be viewed as an effort to balance out this excess. The figurations of Anglo-Indian women I have discussed play out this tussle for balance through the interplay between their capital and its stripping. The Trinamool, ultimately, could not perfect this balancing act, given the empty excess of tautology that is re-articulation. Sexual sedition and the Anglo-Indian woman are forcibly made one and the same in this instance in that sedition is the empty interpretation of signs of excess as threats to a governmental body: in the absence of any other pretext to silence Jordan's questioning of the Park Street sub-inspectors and by extension of policing methods prevalent in Calcutta, Chief Minister of West Bengal Mamata Banerjee accused Jordan of "maligning her governance" (qtd.

in Banerjee). The rubric of sedition becomes intertwined in this political configuration as an attempt to fix a welling excess and disgruntlement within limits. For as long as excess in legal capital such as the Anglo-Indian citizen's cannot be translated into praxis, the tussle between sexual sedition and legal excess will continue.

---

[1] Recall Andrew and Bushnell's reference to Eurasian women as the "prostitute class of India" (52).

[2] The translations from the original Bangla texts that I use in this chapter are all mine, except those from the 1965 novelistic version of *Mahanagar*. I have not been able to locate this novelistic version in the original Bangla. For this reason, I am having to use an English translation that can be considered authoritative in that it was endorsed by Mitra himself.

[3] *Tnyas* in Bangla roughly refers to a figure who is in-between in terms of culture and class. She is simultaneously viewed as Westernized and common/vulgar. This in-betweenness can be said to magnify when it manifests itself in racial terms, as in the case of the Eurasian prostitute.

[4] In Sunil Gangopadhyay's Bangla novel *Sei Samay* [*Those Times*] (1981-82), *zamindar* Ramkamal Simha knew only too well that his son Nabinkumar's biological father was in fact his best friend Bidhushekhar who had been entangled in a long-standing affair with Ramkamal's wife Bimbabati. Yet he remained silent about the affair, as did the rest of his household. As he lay dying, Ramkamal asked Bidhushekhar if there was a chance that Nabinkumar could have been his own son and not Bidhushekhar's. In short, Ramkamal deferred—and perhaps denied—his recognition of his emasculation as the head of the *andarmahal* until the instant of his death.

[5] The sexual valences of a 'monastery' should be noted in this context.

[6] Bengal Inspector-General of Registration Henry Beverley tried to list the number of prostitutes in Bengal in 1872. These prostitutes, as Beverley had correctly surmised in his report on the 1872 census, were for the greater part Hindu Bengali widows who had been expelled from their households to be prevented a share in their husbands' property (686-89). These expulsions were largely effected by the male members of the household who wanted to appropriate the property the widows could have inherited from their dead husbands (Mani 59).

[7] A number of hotels and taverns were set up in the vicinity of Park Street for the European inhabitants of Calcutta to live in. This introduction of the hotel as an institution was largely effected with the 1869 opening of the Suez Canal connecting Britain and India. European traders subsequently availed of the hotels because Calcutta was the erstwhile capital of colonial India. 1901, at the very latest, is the year to which one can trace the proliferation of Anglo-Indian barmaids in the hotels, that being the year in which the registration of these barmaids under the dictates of the Contagious Diseases Act was temporarily halted. At any rate, the barmaid was evidently perceived as an incarnation of the Anglo-Indian prostitute, which is why she had to be 'registered' as per the Contagious Diseases Act. This registration can be assumed to have been intended to keep track of her movements (Ballhatchet 137-38).

Once the moment of decolonization was at hand, and the Anglo-Indian barmaid resurfaced as the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer in the hotels of Park Street, the continuity between the two figures was sustained by the concomitant reconfiguration of the Contagious Diseases Act. This continuity can be noted in the naming of the police headquarters in Calcutta as "Lalbazaar," recalling the *lal bazaars* affixed to the British military cantonments in nineteenth-century India. In addition, the Anglo-Indian cabaret dancer had to register with Lalbazaar, as the barmaid would have to do with the Bengal Government as per the Contagious Diseases Act, and

the cantonment prostitute would have to do in the nineteenth-century *lal bazaars*. The cabaret dancer would be handed a license that would grant her the permission to dance at a hotel or restaurant. This license would help track the dancers' whereabouts (Miss Shefali 20). A superficial effort at controlling the Anglo-Indian 'prostitute' by law has, as can be seen, never been halted, and has paradoxically allowed her to be fruitful and multiply into many incarnations and articulations.

[8] In her autobiography *Purantoni* [*She Who Epitomizes the Bygone*], written in the late-1930s within discursive parameters set by her husband Satyendranath Tagore, Jnanadanandini Devi says she epitomizes the bygone in that she clings to the mores of sexual austerity and sanctity she imbibed at the Tagores' *andarmahal*. These mores, Jnanadanandini suggests, are being lost with the gradual disappearance of the *andarmahal* as an institution, coupled with women's exposure to Western cultural influences. *Puratoni* ultimately becomes an act of mourning this loss (28-33). The irony of course is that Jnanadanandini had been to and lived in England for a time, and learned the English language and worn European dress while there.

[9] In its emphasis on the magnitude of this step outside her home, the chapter recalls Satyajit Ray's portrayal of the Hindu wife Bimala's first steps outside the *andarmahal* in the 1985 cinematic version of Rabindranath Tagore's Bangla novel *Ghare Baire* [*The Home and the World*] (1916). Depicted in slow motion, Bimala's steps bring home the point that in the early part of the twentieth century, what was a small step for Bimala was in fact a giant step for the upper-caste Hindu wife.

[10] Set against this perception of the Anglo-Indian 'prostitute' as "untouchable outcaste," Shefali's first appearance in cinema, in Satyajit Ray's *Pratidwandi* [*The Competitor*] (1970) posits an incommensurable contradiction. In the film, Shefali plays the role of a nurse and

prostitute. The scene in the film that introduces her, voyeuristically pans her body as she first takes off her nurse's uniform to reveal her body waist-up in a bra. She is then shown smoking a cigarette (*Pratidwandi*).

The signification of nursing in this scene cannot be dissociated from an important professional figuration of the Anglo-Indian woman. If hypersexual proclivities were indeed associated with popular perceptions of Anglo-Indian women, these perceptions actually worked in the women's favor by allowing them entry into the nursing profession: unlike their Hindu counterparts, Anglo-Indian women would not flinch from bodily contact with male patients. If they were required to give baths or massages to male patients, they would do so without squeamishness. This, according to a 1937 article in *The Anglo-Indian Review*, gave them the "special kind of aptitude for the kind of work the profession involves" (qtd. in Blunt 61).

The Anglo-Indian nurse was intrinsic to the expansion of the medical profession in post-colonial India. According to Frank Anthony's 1969 history of the Anglo-Indian community, as many as 80% of the nurses were drawn from among Anglo-Indians in the decade following decolonization, so that "India can never adequately express or repay her debt to the womanhood of the [Anglo-Indian] Community for their wonderful and unequalled record of service in the different departments of nursing" (x-xi). If the figuration of the Anglo-Indian woman as oversexed had indeed allowed nursing as a profession to flourish in India, the truth-effect of the "prostitute class of India" had, in this instance, served a very different kind of purpose from the prejudicial one expected to emanate from it.

[11] Shefali says that her fellow Anglo-Indian dancers taught her the art of make-up as part of their advice to her about the necessity of enhancing the sexual attractions of her body. This recalls the prejudice against the Anglo-Indian *tnyas*'s use of Western cosmetics. As one of the

metonyms constituting patriarchal perceptions of the Anglo-Indian *tnyas*, Western cosmetics can, through a process of additions and alterations over time, be said to have morphed into Western garb vis-à-vis Jordan. In this connection, one can also mention the nightclub as a reconfiguration of the hotel.

Park Street, as the metropolitan hub of spaces of sexual license e.g. hotels, bars, and nightclubs, can be said to be another of the metonyms innate to the perception, given its long association with figures like Anglo-Indian barmaids and cabaret dancers. I discuss Park Street as a metonym later in the chapter.

[12] See footnote 7.

[13] Clients and sex-workers in locations like Bow Bazar or Sonagachhi—the most patronized red-light area in Calcutta—are, in the present day, largely ignored by the police, so long as the sex-workers and their supervisors and patrons bribe the local police station on a weekly basis (Kotiswaran 176).

[14] These dancers of international origin were, according to Shefali, largely from England, Australia, and New Zealand (20).

[15] The intertwinement of Western cosmetics and bodily sensuality is to be noted.

[16] Miranda received hundreds of letters requesting that Miss Fonseca be made "a little less sexy." The letters said that "I made Ms Fonseca too buxom. We got a lot of letters complaining about the size of her boobs and her miniskirts" (qtd. in Balakrishnan).

[17] Recall Sen's Anglo-Indian secretary, made "sensuous and beautiful" by, among other appendages, red lipstick.

[18] In his essay "Prachina Ebang Nabina" ["The Old-Fashioned Woman and the New Woman"] (1870s), Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay, in conceptualizing the English-educated

upper-caste Hindu Bengali woman, sees her refined by her brush with the West. Simultaneously, though, he berates this refinement because, according to him, it makes a woman lose interest in doing her duty to her family i.e. her housework. Refinement and housework are the two antinomies Bankim sets up for the Hindu wife emancipated by English education, with the two needing to be reconciled. He locates both antinomies, though, inside the household, and more specifically, inside the *andarmahal*. By this logic, once a wife steps outside Bankim's *andarmahal*, she steps outside refinement into vulgarity and commonness. That she ostensibly takes to the other antinomy i.e. work, would seem to be of no consequence because it is not work inside the house, though it may contribute to the family's financial well-being. Bankim's conceptualization would locate this work beyond the reach of the other antinomy i.e. refinement in that the upper-caste Hindu woman's meeting of her husband's insatiable sexual needs is "routine" and not shorn of the configuration of 'housework.' By implication, it does not count as sexual labor. The brothel—unmentioned in Bankim's essay—is the world where sexual labor counts as labor in that unlike in the household, the husband need not be the "breadwinner" there, and the prostitute's labor is translatable into monetary terms. In this sense, if the *andarmahal*, with its projected synthesis of housework and refinement, is the home where the *nabina* ['modern'/Western-educated woman] is perceived to some extent as a threat, the brothel is the world where this threat finds its limit ("Prachina Ebang Nabina").

[19] Bollywood films from the fifties to the seventies are full of villainous Anglo-Indian seductresses. Enhancing their image of being everything that the 'good' Hindu heroine is not, these figures smoke cigarettes and drink alcohol. This figure launched itself into prominence with the character that actress Nadira played in Raj Kapoor's 1955 film *Shree 420* [*Mr. 420*].

Also recall Miss Shefali's sweeping remark that smoking and drinking are "very normal" activities for Anglo-Indians.

[20] I deliberately use the term non-Christian as a religious designator in opposition to Anglo-Indian as a racial designator. This is because after 1857, almost the entire Anglo-Indian community was, by default, Christian. Prior to 1857, Anglo-Indians, given the disparities between their parents' religious affiliations, would often identify themselves as "Hindu Christians" (or "Christian Hindus"), or "Muslim Christians" (or "Christian Muslims"). This created problems in legal cases involving Anglo-Indians, it being unclear whether they were to be judged according to English law, Hindu law, or Sharia law (Mallampalli 215). Hence the Anglo-Indians' eventual conversion to Christianity as their default religion. Consequently, "non-Christian" can perhaps function successfully in this context as an umbrella term to signify a person who is racially not Anglo-Indian.

[21] Perhaps the lineage of the cultural capital of the white/quasi-white teacher of English language and literature in India can be traced back to the female English missionaries who came to India in the immediate aftermath of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. Their initial intention was to help women in the 'zenanas' care for their children and do their housework, learn arts such as embroidery and, most importantly, learn the English language. The eventual intention of all these endeavors was to convert these 'pure heathens' to Christianity, the post-1857 missionaries' belief being that "the Christian faith and Christian attitudes and habits (actually Western attitudes and habits) could never be firmly established in India until the women had been touched," as historian Geraldine Forbes puts it (WS2).

The Indian menfolk's considerable resistance toward, if not violent disavowal of these female missionaries' imparting of Western cultural capital to their womenfolk, was a feature

traceable to the beginnings of missionary activity in India. This resistance became particularly pronounced at the turn of the century, when the Indian independence movement began to take flight. In his novel *Ghare Baire* [*The Home and the World*] (1916), Rabindranath Tagore shows missionary women leaving India as anti-colonial insurgence becomes more pronounced in response to the 1905 partition of Bengal by Viceroy Lord Curzon. In Satyajit Ray's 1985 cinematic take on Tagore's novel, the English missionary woman who teaches the heroine Bimala the English language, embroidery, and music, leaves after she is struck on the head with stones, given the increase in hostility toward members of the British race at the time. Colonial narratives often reconfigured the stripping of a British missionary woman's racial and cultural prestige into acts of interracial rape, when these acts assumed the form of physical violence (Forbes). The quintessential instance of this reconfiguration was the case of Miss Marcella Sherwood.

On April 10, 1919, a crowd was heading toward the residence of the Deputy Commissioner of Amritsar, Punjab, to have the order for the imprisonment of two prominent advocates of Gandhian civil disobedience, Dr. Satyapal and Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew, revoked (Chadha 237). On the way, the crowd came across Miss Sherwood and, because she was a member of the ruling race, took their wrath out upon her, apparently knocking her off her bicycle and subjecting her to blows on the head with sticks. She was said to have been left in a critical condition, though prompt medical attention was also said to have saved her life—a fact that the administratively-circulated version of the incident left out (Sharpe 147). By the third day after the assault on Miss Sherwood, with all of Amritsar under martial law, Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer marched with his troops upon Jallianwala Bagh, a large unused piece of land on which some 15,000 to 20,000 Indians had congregated for a political meeting to oppose the

official order barring public gatherings. Dyer had the only entrance to Jallianwala Bagh closed off, and ordered his troops to start firing upon the congregation. About 400 members of the congregation were, at a conservative estimate, killed. The resurrection of the 1857 trope of the rape of the white woman may, to some extent, have spurred Dyer's self-righteous fury. This trope was, though, definitely central to Dyer's orders of April 19 mandating that any Indian passing through the street on which Miss Sherwood had been beaten, had to crawl his way through it "on all fours." The slightest failure to do so resulted in the tres/passer being lashed on a flogging post on the street. About fifty Indians found themselves flogged as a result (Lal 35-60).

[22] This hierarchy can be traced back to Thomas Babington Macaulay's 1835 Minute on Indian Education. In the minute, Macaulay counters an 1813 Act of British Parliament which stipulated that a sum of one lakh rupees was to be set aside "for the revival and promotion of literature, and the encouragement of the learned natives of India." According to Macaulay, "It is argued, or rather taken for granted, that by literature the Parliament can have meant only Arabic and Sanscrit literature" ("Minute"). This position, he claims, is incorrect:

> I have no knowledge of either Sanscrit or Arabic. But I have done what I could to form a correct estimate of their value… I am quite ready to take the oriental learning at the valuation of the orientalists themselves. I have never found one among them who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is indeed fully admitted by those members of the committee who support the oriental plan of education. ("Minute")

Ergo, the literature to be taught to the learned natives was English literature, because "It may safely be said that the literature now extant in that language is of greater value than all the literature which three hundred years ago was extant in all the languages of the world together" ("Minute"). It was its published literature, then, that imparted the English language with its weight i.e. with its cultural capital. The teaching of "English" connoted the teaching of "English literature," for which purpose the English language would, of course, have to be taught first. This was Macaulay's anachronistic formulation of what was later to become the "English department." The ostensible superiority of a body of literature that brings its cultural weight to bear upon the language in which it is written, manifests itself in this scene from *36 Chowringhee Lane*, as will be seen.

[23] Given the references to the hotel, at this point it becomes hard to disentangle Violet from the inspiration for her character, the Anglo-Indian Violet Smith who was the owner of the Fairlawn Hotel in Sudder Street. Incidentally, Geoffrey and Laura Kendall—the parents of Jennifer Kendall who plays Violet Stoneham—met for the first time at the Fairlawn Hotel ("The Duchess of Sudder Street").

[24] The actress playing this part was Gopa Ghosh, a singer at multiple Park Street restaurants. Ghosh became famous by joining Anglo-Indian singer Pam Crane in introducing Calcutta audiences to Ella Fitzgerald's swing-jazz numbers (Brown 62).

[25] Through the course of the nineteenth century, since at least James Mill's 1812 *History of British India*, India's history was assimilated within the history of Great Britain. This latter history was used as a yardstick against which the 'progress' of India was measured and always found lacking, thus serving as pretext for colonialism (Guha 2-3). This paradigm continued into the twentieth century: with the normalization of the nation-state through the League of Nations,

the League Covenant stated that those territories "inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves" would have their tutelage entrusted to "advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility" (qtd. in Chatterjee, *Black Hole* 274). Needless to say, colonization found yet another excuse to perpetuate itself. The post-colonial Indian nation-state, as the child of British colonialism defined by lack, could not but be always already an Anglo-India.

CHAPTER THREE: "I AM NOT, MYSELF, A BRAHMIN:" TOWARD AN ANGLO-INDIAN AUTHORIAL SUBJECTIVITY

The prestige attached to Violet Stoneham's cultural capital emanates, in *36 Chowringhee Lane* (1981), from the colonial discourse that a single shelf of English literary output has greater value than all the literature extant in all the languages of the world together—the discourse Thomas Babington Macaulay had formulated in his 1835 Minute on Indian Education. Macaulay's initial formulation of this Minute in 1828 was about the East India Company's ensuring of "stability and security to landed property in…British India" via the employment of "natives of unmixed blood and half-caste" (qtd. in Stokes 147). The teaching of English literature was, said Macaulay, a means to this end (Stokes 147). By 1835, the "half-caste" was replaced in the Minute by subjects solely "Indian in blood and colour" ("Minute"). If Violet's access to her cultural capital remained incomplete after the prestige of her quite-white skin was stripped, it can also be suggested that the English literary canon by which Violet groped toward a subjectivity of her own,[1] remained perennially alienated from self-recognition. After all, contrary to what English missionary Alexander Duff would claim, there never was a formulation of a sacrosanct English literary tradition qua "complete course of sound knowledge free of error in every branch of inquiry, literary, scientific, and theological" (qtd. in Viswanathan 109).

As I have stated in the previous chapter, the teaching of English literature was inseparable from the formulation of the English Department as suggestively conceived in anachronistic fashion in Macaulay's Minute—a department that would, in Duff's words, teach the English language "classically" (qtd. in Viswanathan 46). This emphasis on the classical hints at the teaching of the English language in a manner paralleling the teaching of Greek and Latin in the metropolis. Extending this point, it can be said that the teaching of Greek and Latin was

intertwined with metropolitan notions of apparently given Greek and Latin literary traditions, these 'given' canons being in fact cobbled together of what survived of Greek and Roman literary output.[2] Macaulay's Minute can consequently be interpreted as indicating that there was some sort of preformed consensus about an accepted English literary tradition. Hence the cultural prestige that British colonialism derived from this 'tradition' as a political arrangement apparently 'given.' In light of Macaulay's initial formulation of the Minute, I propose that if a Eurasian was to find her subjectivity past the occupation of the lowest rung of the British racial hierarchy in nineteenth- and early-twentieth century India, a possible means by which she could do so was by traversing the twists and turns of an English literary 'tradition.' The paradox is that such a 'tradition' depends on a literary canon that is continually made and unmade.

Inseparable from this canon in colonial India is what I would term the 'Eurasian text'—a fictional or historiographic text set in colonial India, written by a British author who had lived in India and/or been involved in some capacity in Britain's colonial endeavors in India. A series of such texts was being written and published compulsively after 1857 well into the middle of the twentieth century, for British readers in the colony and the metropolis alike. This Eurasian canon consisted of, among other texts, those of the sort I have discussed in the first chapter, with British male protagonists epitomizing the glory and heroism of all the Queen's men in India. These texts were intrinsic to the literary construction of a colonial British identity, defining as they did a racial 'masculinity' for the colonizer—a masculinity contrasted with the sexual 'depravity' of the Indian mutineer-rapist. These texts also located this masculinity in opposition to a sexual degradation and impotence that the Eurasian ostensibly displayed, as I have discussed in the first chapter.[3] This series of texts could perhaps be set aside in an assessment of the workings of British colonialism in India, given the fact that in multiple colonial situations, 'good' white men

and women were almost inevitably writing about the burden of civilizing their colonized others.[4] The importance of this series of texts lies in that, among other elements, it brings together a number of the colonial discourses constituting the 'depraved' racial and sexual identity of the Eurasian. In this sense, the Eurasian text can be claimed to detour the Eurasian subject from reaching a possible telos of self-recognition.[5]

The Eurasian text qua colonial product is inseparable from the English literary 'tradition' that was born de facto in colonial India. Ergo, an emergent post-colonial Anglo-Indian authorial subjectivity would perhaps find itself in collision against a metropolitan literary tradition, a part of which located the Anglo-Indian's colonial ancestors in an outside.[6] Simultaneously, this collision may assist the Anglo-Indian author carve a way out of the self-alienation effected upon her colonial ancestors by the Eurasian text. This point of collision is evidently a fraught and interesting space for examination. I begin this chapter by examining this collision at work through a reading of Anglo-Indian author Ruskin Bond's novels *The Room on the Roof* (1956) and *Vagrants in the Valley* (1981), and his short story "The Man Who Was Kipling" (c. early 1960s), in conjunction/collision with two 'Eurasian' short stories—Rudyard Kipling's "Namgay Doola" (1890) and "To Be Filed for Reference" (1888). As I show through my readings, this point of collision may become the space where the dis-location of the Eurasian subject is brought into question by rendering the fetishization of an 'English' literary 'tradition' circumspect. This fetishization of an apparently 'given' tradition is, I believe, thought-provoking because texts excluded from conceptions of literary tradition in-sist in such conceptions. Indeed, the excluded texts too are subject to fetishization through their evocation as loss. I conclude that the splitting of a colonial Eurasian's subjectivity through her location in a not-quite/not-white racial outside, parallels the splitting of an English literary canon into both a sacralized formation, and a

formation that consistently evokes the ‘profane’ text excluded from it. Consequently, the problem of this split in subjectivity can, I suggest, perhaps be addressed by deconstructing the concept of a monolithic English literary tradition. This deconstruction may, as I show, be effected through the collision of a sacralized text with its ‘profane’/‘obscene’ counterpart. I examine such a profanation of a metropolitan literary tradition through a reading of Anglo-Indian author Aubrey Menen’s 1956 novel *The Abode of Love*. Menen questions the sacralization of a metropolitan literary tradition by upholding the ‘obscene’ metropolitan English text governmentally excluded from canonical considerations. The concept of sexual sedition can here be said to assume a new configuration in the form of the ‘obscene’ text excluded from the canon. The figuration of the sexually ‘obscene’ English book in the present chapter involves a concept of colonial and post-colonial law according to which “writing, speech or signs, or visible representations” are often interpreted as acts of sedition i.e. as threats against governance. The rubric of sedition often uses its randomly-cobbled interpretations of such apparent threats, to exclude the book in question. As I argue in my reading of *The Abode of Love*, the figuration of the Eurasian as sexually seditious is thus peculiarly displaced upon the English text excluded from canonical considerations out of the fear that such a text might incite anti-governmental sentiments. This parallels a British colonial masculinity’s perception of the Eurasian as a sexually ‘obscene’ threat to colonial governance in India. Additionally, paralleling this sexual othering of the Eurasian, Section 292 of the law of sedition in colonial India reductively perceives the ‘seditious’ text as that which is deemed sexually ‘obscene’ in its content. Considerations of anti-colonial insurgence initially used to formulate the law of sedition, are here inexplicably sutured over through this reductive reasoning.

Menen, I suggest, can be said to have responded to this suturing of the element of insurgence by using his 1954 rewriting of the Sanskrit *kavya*, the *Ramayana,* as insurgence conducted qua an act of literary profanation. His brand of obscenity was insurgent in that it questioned sanctimonious considerations of religious tradition by rendering the sanctity of the *Ramayana* circumspect. Menen 'desanctified' this *kavya* by portraying the Hindu god Rama as a human being subject to base bodily and emotional instincts. According to my reading of his text, Menen's rewriting ultimately explicates that the art of hunting out his authorial subjectivity as an Anglo-Indian 'outsider,' is inextricable from the question of ensuring the survival of his authorial voice. If Menen's Rama, as a human figure, submitted to a basic instinct for survival, thus reducing human life and the search for power to a de facto art of survival, the authorial voice in post-colonial India had to escape charges of 'sedition' and censorship if it had to survive[7]-- Menen's *Ramayana* emerged as the first high-profile book of English fiction to be banned in post-colonial India. The category of sedition was found, in this instance, to possess the ability to expand under the excuse of protecting considerations of 'tradition:' the banning of the book was justified through the asserted need to protect 'hurt religious sentiments.'

This silencing demonstrated that the rubric of sedition, as the empty letter of the law, could magnify strategically, using ways and means beyond tabulation. This expansion was perhaps effected to its limits during the Emergency of 1975-77, when the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act of 1976 was preemptively applied to Bond's novella *The Sensualist* (1974). Bond's novella was charged with sexual obscenity. As if to escape further charges along these lines, Bond imbued his next novel *A Flight of Pigeons* (1975)—published at the height of the Emergency—with what I view as an excess that would escape censorship. He plagiarized the entire storyline and, sometimes, entire chapters, of *A Flight of Pigeons* from a

Eurasian text—Joseph Francis Fanthome's *Mariam: A Story of the Indian Mutiny of 1857* (1896)—adding only one paragraph as his original authorial contribution. This paragraph dealt with a Eurasian woman's expression of sexual desire for an 1857 mutineer.[8] A relationship between a mutineer and a Eurasian was tacitly outlawed by the British in the immediate aftermath of 1857. I would read this expression of the sexually outlawed in *A Flight of Pigeons*, as a proscribed authorial voice escaping the legal interdiction that could be used to silence it. Bond's articulation of authorial mutiny, split between plagiarism and original content, survived censorship, leading *A Flight of Pigeons* to successfully carve a literary 'obscenity' as a political monstrosity—a monstrosity that functioned as a 'seditious' statement against the draconian rubric of sedition. This was also a novel that snubbed the sanctity of a 'given' colonial literary tradition—a matter that I discuss at length. Escaping both post-colonial censorship and the shadow of the colonial English canon, the self-splitting of the mutinous *A Flight of Pigeons* allowed the Eurasian's post-colonial authorial heir to bear the possibility of having her voice emerge whole. This is where an Anglo-Indian authorial subjectivity may find its search for itself coming to an end.

Ultimately, a Eurasian text may try to streamline the fragmentary discourses othering the Eurasian, but this othering has to face its inherent contradictions, splits, and interruptions that question these discourses themselves. Kipling's "To Be Filed for Reference" may censure a Eurasian author whose text lacks linearity, but these discourses qua prejudices are themselves fragments, always already lacking in linearity and curving against themselves, as a climactic moment in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) shows.

Tradition and the English Literary Canon

According to T. S. Eliot's 1921 essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent," an English literary tradition consists in its crystallization of "the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of [English] literature" in "a simultaneous existence." While Eliot concedes that "the past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past," what is disturbing is that his conception of tradition may work in a converse direction vis-à-vis this concession. The notion of tradition is, for him, that of a historically timeless "ideal order" of "existing monuments," a "whole" added to and altered by new authors in a temporal continuum that works in conjunction with the timelessness of the "ideal" order. This temporal continuum was one within which a present-day author wrote a new text in English while imbued with the feeling that "the whole of the literature of Europe…and within it the whole of [English] literature…has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order" (Eliot). Such a continuum, though, could not necessarily be effected in a colonial setting in that Indian authors writing in English would, in all probability, be excluded from the continuum.[9] In a colonial setting, then, this "whole" can be perceived only as an "ideal order" of English literary monuments i.e. as a metropolitan English literary tradition frozen in historical timelessness, a holistic given in that it is quite literally 'given' to the colony by the metropole. Such a conception of an English literary tradition is not commensurate with the fact that this tradition was only perhaps first conceptualized as an "ideal order" in the context of British colonialism in India—a conceptualization that was only rendered possible when English literature began to be framed as a disciplinary formation for study. The first documents discussing the inauguration of a department that would study English literature, are traceable to 1816 in the minutes of the Hindoo College in Calcutta. These minutes were proposed a good 19 years before Macaulay's Minute on Indian Education (Edwards 99). Over the course of the nineteenth century, the

consecration of an English literary tradition-in-the-making in the colony came to be effected in linkage with prohibitions on the publication and import of pornographic English texts to metropolis and colony alike. Eventually, the Customs Consolidation Act was passed in 1853 as "the first express prohibition intended to ban the importation of pornography" to England. This was followed by Sir John Campbell's 1857 Obscene Publications Act (qtd. in Arondekar 107). The acts failed to prevent the proliferation of pornographic texts in England which included popular anonymously-written novels like *Venus in India* (1889) and *The Story of a Dildoe* (1891), and widely-circulated pornographic journals like *Pearl* and *Boudoir*. Nor can it be ignored that *Venus in India* had a circulation in India which was only rivalled by that of the Bible (Arondekar 106-08). The British Government despaired at the thought of "English-educated Indians" reading texts like *The Lustful Turk* and *Venus in India* (qtd. in Arondekar 108). In other words, an English literary tradition was in fact a vulnerable canon that had to take stock of texts excluded from it. Then and only then could it recognize itself as a holistic body in "simultaneous existence." Its formulation qua tradition could never be monolithic as such a formulated canon was in a continuous process of expansion and contraction, subject to what metropolis and/or colony perceived as political exigency.[10]

The cultural capital of an English literary 'tradition' in colonial India thus consisted in efforts to exclude more 'profane' texts in favor of more 'disciplined' ones. As for the overtly sexual texts that had hallowed their way into Macaulay's "single shelf of a good European library" over the centuries, their profanity was consecrated by the "ideal order" of a historically-timeless 'tradition' (10). Indeed, the sacralization of this tradition—or, should we say, canon—in colonial India, can be said to have been performed not only through the exclusion of the pornographic text but also through a fetishization of the English book itself. By this logic, the

text excluded from the canon was more likely to be fetishized and thus, unwittingly or otherwise, to be located outside-within the canon. To discuss this fetishization of the English book, I look at Anglo-Indian author Ruskin Bond's novel *The Room on the Roof* (1956) and its sequel *Vagrants in the Valley* (1981). These novels follow the adventures of Bond's semi-autobiographical authorial persona Rusty. The two novels, I argue, portray the fetishization of the English book as the post-colonial Anglo-Indian author's attempted passage to England and into the prestige of a consecrated metropolitan literary tradition.

The Room on the Roof is ostensibly set in the Dehra of early-1950s India. The almost adolescent Rusty of this novel is a character of part-English parentage. He had been "kept, fed and paid for, and sent to an expensive school run on 'exclusively European lines'." While Rusty is said to be an orphan born of an English father, *Vagrants in the Valley* overtly insinuates that his mother, ostensibly a Garhwali woman living in the hills, is still alive (160).

Rusty's guardian is one John Harrison, an English missionary who secludes Rusty from "a real India not far away"—a bazaar. Harrison forbids Rusty from venturing into the bazaar that he, for his part, "chooses not to think of" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 9-10). Finding his guardian's grip over his life and movements claustrophobic, Rusty gets out of Harrison's disciplinarian clutches through a "newly-acquired bazaar-instinct." He fights Harrison's attempts to physically chastise this instinct out of him. Getting into a physical tussle with Harrison, Rusty claims that whether or not he is 'English' enough—a matter about which Harrison articulates overt doubts—he is, thanks to this 'bazaar-instinct,' at least at par with the subject-position of "anyone else" in India. Having conducted this miniature rebellion and left Harrison's house, Rusty finds that "he was a man…there was a power in his body—a devil or a god—and he gained confidence in his power; and he was a man" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 29-30). He

now makes his way into a decolonized India—the bazaar—where he befriends the "vagrants" frequenting it. However, he finds himself haunted by the specter of his part-English racial identity. In search of a metropolitan English subjectivity, he longs to go to England, hoping that the British Government will pay for his passage. He aligns this desire for an English subjectivity with his desire for literary creation in the English language, intending as he does to write an English novel. His friends from the bazaar consolidate this alignment, convincing Rusty that thanks to the fact that he—unlike them—has a sound grasp over the English language, "One day [he will] write poems" and "one day, [he will] be king" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 84).

Rusty's planned passage to England is interrupted by his realization that he has no birth certificate, rendering the British Government unable to pay for his passage because "you are not born…You are not alive! You do not happen to be in this world!" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 94). This interruption comes, as the novel tacitly suggests, by Rusty's having been born out of wedlock. The colonial discourse about a Eurasian being invariably born outside wedlock hounds Rusty beyond the moment of decolonization. As if to compensate for this interruption to his plans, Rusty doubles his efforts to be inducted into his beloved literary tradition—finding himself a "refugee from the world," he frenetically begins work upon an English novel in an effort to make himself a "somebody" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 117; 101). This is the point at which *Vagrants in the Valley* picks up, with Rusty stuck in the world of the bazaar, facing writer's block, and unable to get beyond the second chapter of his novel (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 148).

At this point, Rusty comes across one Mr. Pettigrew, an English forest officer with a pronounced literary bent. Pettigrew, it turns out, had been familiar with Rusty's father. That, coupled with Pettigrew's "shelf of some thirty volumes" which included texts by Dickens,

Wodehouse, M. R. James, George Eliot, Maugham and Barrie, draws Rusty to him. Rusty "soaks up" the volumes that, as a collection, are "catholic in their contents" (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 151). This "catholic" character of Pettigrew's collection embodies an English literary canon, while becoming a statement about how a canon accumulates through a bricolage of the blessed 'canonical,' and of that which may be deemed subject to exclusion. A collection of literary texts can in fact be said to inevitably function in a "catholic" manner: the methods of a collector of invaluable antiquities and curiosities are, to cite Walter Benjamin, much the same as that of the ragpicker who "picks up the…rubbish in the capital,...collects and catalogues everything…cast off…everything…lost and discarded and broken" (349). There is, then, no sacrosanct literary tradition that can free itself of the lost, the discarded, and the broken.

Subsequently, Pettigrew directs Rusty on a journey to his Garhwali mother. Rusty's intention is to collect his father's books that are in his mother's keeping. These books, in their bric-a-brac character, are even more "catholic" than Pettigrew's collection. Rusty's mother tells him that among the books, his father had particularly wanted him to have Lewis Carroll's *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland* (1865). Rusty leaves disappointed, having looked forward not only to the collection of books but also—and perhaps even more—to some kind of monetary legacy that his father might have left in his mother's keeping (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 196). He feels trapped in India; like Rudyard Kipling's Mowgli, he finds himself unable to return to "his own people" (qtd. in Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 214). The only way he can conceptualize the possibility of returning to a 'home' he has never seen, is to "have books to read, and books to write" (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 215). 'Having' a book to read, in this quote, seems to suddenly equate itself with that which Rusty does not yet 'have'—an English book that he will write to its completion.

Rusty takes his father's books to Pettigrew who realizes that the *Alice* is in fact extremely valuable—it is a first edition copy, there being, Pettigrew believes, only two or three known copies in the rest of the world. What was initially the discarded suddenly turns out to be cultural capital that translates into a monetary legacy (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 216-17). The fetishization of the edition of *Alice* in Rusty's possession leads Rusty into a fortune large enough for him to be able to make his own way to England. If this proposed journey toward a seemingly utopic metropolitan subjectivity is aligned with Rusty's 'having' an English book, Rusty can be said to have begun clawing his way into a seemingly consecrated literary tradition via the fetishization of this book. Whether or not he will complete writing his novel to articulate an authorial subjectivity—an act by which he can create and/or re-create his beloved 'tradition'—remains an open-ended question at the end of *Vagrants in the Valley*. His worship of his edition of *Alice* seems to nullify all his authorial ambitions in one swift stroke.

As if to continue the narrative of Rusty's hunt for metropolitan subjectivity in conjunction with an English literary tradition, Bond writes the short story "The Man Who Was Kipling" (c. 1980s). In the story, Rusty, having arrived in London, goes to the Victoria and Albert Museum, and runs into an unheimlich figure—unheimlich in that his face seems both "familiar and disturbing." The man seeks recognition from Rusty—he says that "The trouble these days is that people don't *know* me anymore" (Bond, "The Man;" emphasis in the original). He asks Rusty which authors Rusty loves reading. Rusty replies, "Maugham, Priestley, Thurber. And among the older lot, Bennett and Wells." This list from the canon that is simultaneously a "lot" that Rusty the collector-ragpicker has waded through, makes the man's face fall until Rusty declares, "I read a lot of Kipling." Delighted, the man identifies himself as the ghost of Kipling. This leads Rusty to expostulate that Kipling's literary output suffered because he had been "too

militant…too much of an Empire man…too patriotic for [his] own good." Kipling longs for Rusty to identify him not as an "Empire man" but, in a comically synonymous fashion, as a politically-disinterested Orientalist who romanticized spaces like the Grand Trunk Road in *Kim* (1901) for their "colour and movement and poetry" (Bond, "The Man"). He asks Rusty about present-day India in general and the Grand Trunk Road in particular, only to be told that "Times *have* changed" in an India that is "not *your* India" (Bond, "The Man;" emphasis in the original). While Rusty is haunted by his part-English identity in India, here he is hounded by his bazaar instinct—as he now realizes, this bazaar is not the centrifuge of color and movement and poetry that the specter of the Eurasian text may have rendered it. With this realization, Rusty seems to partially shed his 'English' skin, leaving his subjectivity dangling on the fringes of the canon to which Kipling was so integral.

The text that assumes centrality in Rusty's conversation with the specter of the "Empire man" is, of course, *Kim*. Contrary to popular perception, Kim is, I would suggest, a Eurasian. He had been born as a domiciled individual of European descent in India, and to be born in India rendered the white man juridically 'Eurasian' by default (Andrews 122). With an Irish father, Kim is, like the biracial Rusty who feels himself domiciled in India, the bearer of a "double inheritance" with a "division of loyalties in himself." Kim's, however, is a double inheritance with valences that Kim is himself not fully able to grasp, given his unfamiliarity with Ireland's colonial status (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 133).

In search of the need to be born into life and subjectivity via recognition, Rusty notes the last words that the ghost of Kipling wistfully utters to himself before disappearing into a mist: "the true smell of the Himalayas…if once it creeps into the blood of a man, that man will at the last, forgetting all else, return to the hills to die" (qtd. in Bond, "The Man"). The quote is from

Kipling's story "Namgay Doola" (1890) in which the eponymous protagonist is a Eurasian of Irish descent, born in domicile. As the ghost's words ring in Rusty's ears and creep into his Anglo-Indian blood, the boom of London's traffic and the boom of the Sutlej River become inseparable in his horizon (Bond, "The Man"). Rusty cannot identify himself shorn of a double inheritance, but nor can he recognize Kipling as a novelist shorn of a colonialist baggage, the specter's protestations to the contrary notwithstanding. The prospective novelist and the specter of the colonially-formulated canon collide in the mist, leaving 'tradition' as a nebulous monolith behind in the dusty catalogues of the Victoria and Albert Museum. The collision between the two, splits Rusty's misted vision back to the Himalayas—to the frontiers of India, and thus to a schizophrenic subjectivity effected neither through birth nor life, but, via Kipling's quote, through death on India's fringes. If he is not 'Indian enough,' India's territorial frontiers, outside-within the country, may leave him split, but they will parallel his position on the fringes of the canon. Kim's search for subjectivity, split between his British allegiances and his affection for the Lama, finally moves in favor of the Lama and of the enlightenment the Lama has achieved. This is an enlightenment heading away from colonial India's scheme of things, in a metaphysical direction aligned with Tibet. The road from the Himalayas to Tibet is where "Namgay Doola" is set. Where Rusty's search for authorial recognition in a revered colonial tradition ends in deferral, Kipling's exploration into a Eurasian character of part-Irish blood begins—a character grappling with the problem of self-recognition.

"Namgay Doola" is set ostensibly in the early-twentieth century, on a chunk of road leading from the Himalayas into Tibet. This chunk of road is ruled by an Indian king who functions as "tributary to the Indian Government." The king, then, is a sinecure under the complete control of the British Government, possessing merely the outward regalia of kingship.

Indeed, the king's cavalry consists only of one old elephant, and his court merely has two official members—a Prime Minister and a Director General of Public Education. The uniforms of both these members are in tatters for the lack of funds from the British Government of India.

As with many other princely states, the 'state' in question—the patch of road that is an in-between—is effectively under the supervision of a representative of the British Government, this representative being the narrator of "Namgay Doola." As for the sinecure, his only function in his state sans territory is to ensure the upkeep of the piece of road, using the taxes he garners from his handful of subjects living in a nearby village. One of these subjects, the eponymous Namgay Doola, is increasingly proving a gadfly, refusing to pay revenues and successfully inciting the other villagers to follow his example. Doola is the de facto ruler of the village, though he is an "outlander," "no man of *his own people*" (qtd. in Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 325; emphasis mine).[11] Red-haired and with a Lepcha accent beyond identification, Doola brings forth a "poisonous spawn of babes" innately prone to rebellion. His family and he commit continuous acts of insurrection against which the sinecure is powerless. External regalia of kingship do not make the road a state, which is why Doola can embody a split, establishing himself as both rebel and as almost-king of the village. If he helps the members of the 'court' clear log-jams on a nearby river, he does so of his own accord and not because he can be forced to it as a subject of the sinecure (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 326-27).

The narrator tries to lecture Doola on "the sin of conspiracy, and the certainty of punishment" (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 329-30). His treatise on guilt has no effect on Doola who, as the narrator realizes shortly, "comes of a race that will not pay revenue" because "A red flame is in his blood which comes out at the top of his head in that glowing [red] hair." As a Eurasian born of an Irish father, Doola compulsively commits minuscule acts of rebellion against

the king and thus against the British Government, without himself knowing why. Prone to rebellion in his being, he does not know what guilt is. His family and he have inherited his father's racial legacy, epitomized by the shamrock as their familial insignia, and "The Wearing o' the Green" as their song of prayer (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 332-34).[12] Doola and his family, unaware of his racial inheritance, fetishize these signifiers that embody a colonized Irish in-between, an outside-within that is British but not 'English enough.' Both the shamrock and the song were intrinsic to the rebellion of the United Irishmen against British colonial rule in 1798. The United Irishmen's official color was green; the green shamrock was the insignia of St. Patrick, patron saint of Ireland; and "The Wearing o' the Green" was a street ballad about the outlawing of the wearing of the shamrock on hats during the rebellion (Singer).

Doola's final act of insurrection against authority is to lock his family and himself up in his hut, and fire indiscriminately at the king's minions, laughing at the narrator's efforts to play at colonialism outside-within India in an indistinctly-demarcated terra firma. The narrator eventually writhes his way into the hut in secret, sees the shamrock and hears "The Wearing o' the Green"—a song whose words he is at first unable to understand because of the Lepcha inflection with which Doola and his family sing it (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 330-32). Shocked as he eventually comprehends the words of the song, he asks Doola—whose name, sans the Lepcha inflection, is Patrick Doolan—"By what road didst thou attain knowledge to make these devilries?" (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 333). The road is, of course, that of Doolan's double inheritance, pulled by his ancestral subjection to the British Empire on the one hand, and living away from Empire and imperial guilt on the other. Refusing to be fixed in either direction, Doolan is, like Kim toward the end of Kipling's novel, in search of his subjectivity—he repeats "The Wearing o' the Green" and prayers to St. Patrick as manically as Kim repeats the

incantation "I am Kim" whenever faced with a crisis. The crucial point in Kim's last repetition of the incantation is that it halts with the question, "And what is Kim?". The incantation suddenly turns into a realization that Kim has to bring his identity into question, disregarding his deification of his leather amulet-case which contains the birth certificate that fixes him as being born and "of this world" (Kipling, *Kim* 254). Doolan's worship of the shamrock and the song is the worship of that which, unlike Kim's birth certificate, is outlawed by British colonization, leading him to hunt for his identity through his incessant acts of rebellion. In his final rebellion, as he tries to overcome his desire to rebel, Doolan prays before the shamrock and sings "The Wearing o' the Green," only to find himself more prone than ever to fire at the king's minions. Why he rebels, he does not know, but his worship of shamrock and song is evidently the chunk of road traversing which he has attained some kind of self-knowledge toward "making these devilries."

Trying to tackle Doolan's rebellion, the narrator finds two options open before him. He ideally wants Doolan to be hanged with his children "till there remains no hair that is red within this land." He instead chooses a more sinister option—he garlands this man-who-would-be-king with the guilt of becoming a subject of the British Empire. His advice to the sinecure is as follows: "Make [Doolan] chief of the Army. Give him honour as may befall, and full allowance of work, but look to it…that neither he nor his hold a foot of earth from thee henceforward…Feed him with words and favour…and he will be a bulwark of defence. But deny him a tuft of grass for his own." Fixed accordingly as a Eurasian subject of the British Government in India, all Doolan's rebellious energies vanish in an instant. He no longer sees himself as king of the village; the guilt of subject-formation thrust upon him by the British Government takes the sting out of him. He "hurries in an agony of contrition from temple to

temple," making amends for his "sins" (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 330-35). His seemingly self-emancipatory worship of the shamrock is now replaced with the worship of that which is entrenched in colonial India, and before which he manically confesses guilt. His road to subjectivity seems to stand blocked.

Why the narrator does not have Doolan killed remains a mystery, especially when he could have done so with impunity. The answer, perhaps, lies in the text itself, in the passage that the ghost of Kipling quotes to Rusty. Subject-formation can be said to consist in the granting by the Government of the "mere license to live," while dying on the road perhaps grants subjectivity.[13] The possession of a "tuft of grass" from the road is perhaps tantamount to the possession of a tuft of subjectivity, though this possession be deferred until Doolan sublates his subject-formation by "return[ing] to the hills to die" (Kipling, "Namgay Doola" 323). Then again, as "Namgay Doola" demonstrates, though the Eurasian text would render the Eurasian a racial outsider, the colonized Eurasian's subject-formation rests on her being located by the British Government *inside* the political structures of colonial India. The specter of Kipling may locate Rusty outside "his India," but his collision with Rusty leaves the latter on the frontiers of the English canon—a position from which Rusty can critique Kipling's imperialist leanings. The possibility of such a collision between Doolan and the British narrator of "Namgay Doola" is nullified once Doolan is fixed within the seemingly-linear road of colonial governmental structures.

The linearization that the Eurasian text would lay claim to in its discursive othering of the Eurasian is, of course, a construct. Each Eurasian text attains this linearization through its expurgation of some of the manifold and often fragmentary sexual and eugenic discourses imposed upon the Eurasian, and the retention and highlighting of others among these

discourses.[14] Paralleling this trajectory, Kipling's short story "To Be Filed for Reference" (1888) portrays a British scholar trying to extricate the imprint of a dying Eurasian's claim to authorial subjectivity—a project he executes by attempting to forcibly linearize the Eurasian's autobiography. Kipling's story begins with this Eurasian handing the manuscript of his autobiography to the British scholar. The Eurasian says that the publication of the autobiography will immortalize the scholar in the English literary tradition for having facilitated the publication process. After the Eurasian dies, the scholar, leafing through the manuscript of the autobiography, adjudges it incomprehensible, a mere bunch of "papers…in a hopeless muddle," lacking in a linear arrangement of figures and events. This linearity, he deems, can only be attained through the subjection of the "muddle" to "much expurgation." The Eurasian's claim to authorial subjectivity is not understood by the scholar because it does not square with a Western notion of enlightenment qua temporal linearity. It is of interest that this autobiography "expurgated" from the English literary tradition is, as the name of the story would have it, fixed by being filed away for reference at some future date. Though the "muddle" of papers consists of much that is "lost and discarded and broken," it is not destroyed and will be stored away in some corner of the canon, to be recovered at some future moment. At the time of recovery that may never arrive, the dead Eurasian's claim to authorship may be recognized "in simultaneous existence" with the historically-timeless literary canon that had initially excluded the autobiography as a "muddle" (Kipling, "For Reference" 287).

To view this moment of recovery as one when the fetishization of the canon will be rendered circumspect, though, would be an idealistic thought. The formation and sacralization of an English literary canon in the colony subsists through that which is in print, as also through the evocation of that which may never have been authored. This phenomenon can be seen at work

with another "Empire man" Sir Richard Burton's lost English translation of *The Scented Garden*. Burton had apparently begun this sexual treatise as a report commissioned by General Charles Napier. The report was said to have been a description of the inner workings of brothels in mid-nineteenth century Karachi—brothels apparently inhabited by Indian and Eurasian eunuchs and male 'concubines' whom members of the British militia would frequent. Burton's report was claimed to have been lost, but was also said to have burgeoned into *The Scented Garden* as a transcreation. *The Scented Garden* was supposedly a treatise on homosexuality in India, with 882 pages of text and footnotes and a 100-page preface. Whether or not the report Napier commissioned was lost—or at all written—remains a matter open to speculation. As for *The Scented Garden*, Burton's wife Isabel claims in an 1891 letter to the *Morning Post* that she had burned the manuscript in 1890 because it was about a "certain passion" described in the Karachi report i.e. homosexuality (qtd. in Arondekar 28). Regardless, the British Government continually evoked Burton's report to highlight the need to rescue the masculinity of the British militia from the outlawed sexual predilections of 'effeminate' Indians and Eurasians. The Government was able to emphasize the infallibility of the report's supposed findings precisely through the continuous evocation of this report as lost (Arondekar 28). As for *The Scented Garden*, though Burton's widow may not have burned it—and, more importantly, though it may not have been authored at all—it assisted in the fetishization of the report. Most importantly, *The Scented Garden* drew its authority to this end solely from the fact that it would itself be located outside canonical considerations, given its controversial subject matter. This governmental fetishization-cum-exclusion of the text parallels the split in Rusty's authorial desires, left dangling at the borders of the canon even as he once fetishized the English book. With Rusty's wish to "find a place for himself" in his sacred literary tradition left unfulfilled, his abandoned novel too can, a

la *The Scented Garden*, be evoked as the discarded that is inextricable from the canon (Bond, *Vagrants in the Valley* 194). If that is so, a foray into the profane/expurgated/excluded text could provide interesting insights into sexual guilt insofar as it may be present in a sterilized English canon. Such an exploration may help question the guilt used to sanitize a Patrick Doolan's rebellious predilections and "expurgate" the dead Eurasian author's work. The profane text that is expurgated or banned can, as the following section discusses, be summed up under the signpost of the 'obscene.' This signpost, using which the post-colonial Government of India occasionally pulls the reins on the publication of a text, was a nineteenth-century colonial creation retained after decolonization, in Section 124A of the Indian Penal Code i.e. in the law of sedition.

Desacralizing an English Literary Canon: Sex, Guilt, and the Profane Text

Aubrey Menen, homosexual author of British citizenship and of part-Irish and part-Indian racial heritage, had, in the greater part of his literary oeuvre, labored to hunt for the expurgated in texts fetishized by conceptions of tradition. Menen always insisted on identifying his position of critique as that of a biracial Anglo-Indian, locating himself simultaneously outside his British citizenship and his Indian racial heritage. He suggested that it was only as such a bi-positional outsider that he could attempt to deconstruct tradition (*Ramayana* 3-5).[15]

Perhaps Menen's most successful endeavor in deconstructing sanctified conceptions of 'tradition' was his 1956 picaresque novel *The Abode of Love*. The novel begins with a description of a religious cult named Agapemone or The Abode of Love. The cult, with its premises located in mid-nineteenth century Charlinch, Somerset, is headed by a young man named Henry James Prince, with assistance from his wife Julia. Prince proclaims himself the reincarnation of Jesus. He tells the thousands he has converted overtime to the cult, that the Day

of Judgment is at hand, and that these converts can redeem themselves of sin only because they are affiliated with the cult.

Prince establishes The Abode of Love after having, as a student of theology, found it impossible to come to terms with his teachers' outlawing of sexuality qua guilt. Having established this cult, he unsurprisingly uses the Song of Solomon as the text that will direct the lives of his congregation. By sanctifying sexual pleasure in his cult's practices, he decriminalizes sexual intercourse altogether. This decriminalization applies particularly to the sexual pleasure that he himself might garner from young female members of his congregation. He emphasizes that given the meeting of spirit and flesh in his body as Christ reincarnate, for a member of the cult to give herself over to him would consummate in an act not of fleshly but of spiritual union: "The flesh would be absorbed in the spirit" (Menen, *Abode of Love* 115). This justification Prince uses for his 'fleshly' ends and, more foundationally, to declare himself the Messiah, is evidently drawn from the Gospel of John in the New Testament which states tautologically of the second coming of Christ that "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come [back] in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God" (4: 2-3). The declaration that Jesus has returned in the flesh, and that this flesh is the incarnation of the holy spirit, would ironically open every individual claiming to be the Messiah to be acknowledged accordingly. Furthermore, if spirit and flesh are inseparable, spiritual union and fleshly union are indeed, as Prince's biblical exegesis claims, inseparable. Foundational tenets from the Old Testament like "Thou shalt not commit adultery" and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife" are thrown to the winds in Prince's cult, even as the Song of Solomon itself derives from the Old Testament (Exodus 20:14; 20:17). Making the contradictions in the Old and New Testaments collide within and collude against each other, Prince establishes The

Abode of Love as a subversive space where sexual pleasure and religious practice can be professed to be one and the same.

Apart from his much larger congregation, Prince more overtly directs the lives of five young men—collectively called the Lampeter brethren—who live with him. He marries off these men to five sisters, with all the sisters available to Prince for his own sexual pleasure, their services being claimed to be a means to save their souls through their union with the Messiah. With the funds he gathers from his ever-growing congregation, Prince is unsurprisingly able to live the life of a landed gentleman with an "English harem" at his disposal (Menen, *Abode of Love* 161). The spaces of the Oriental sexual outlaw and of Western organized religion i.e. of outlawed colony and outlawing metropolis, get entangled in this harem. Consequently, even as all England is aware that The Abode of Love is a ruse, it cannot find a means to question this ruse.

Once Menen's novel has touched upon Prince's biblical exegeses and sexual practices, it suddenly veers into an extended allusion to what is largely considered the first novel in the English literary canon—Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719).[16] In a picaresque turn of events, the reader is introduced to the character of Sergeant Matthew Bunt, Prince's foremost minion and partner in crime, initially a member of the British marines. When a ship on which he was sailing sank, Bunt was stranded on an island for two years. He was subsequently rescued by one Captain Overton who was obsessed with the fantasy of colonialism as portrayed in *Robinson Crusoe*. According to Overton, the Protestant work ethic in *Robinson Crusoe* "shows what a man can do with his own two hands to overcome the most adverse fate, provided he is serious minded and energetic." Overton asks Bunt to show him around Bunt's "little kingdom." Much to Overton's disappointment and shock, Bunt has, unlike Crusoe, constructed no stockade hut, no

wheat patch, and no goat pen to boast of. He has, instead, a dead wife and a harem of prostitutes—a series of cloth bundles "shaped very roughly into the shape of a female body." Bunt had played at sexual intercourse with these cloth-dolls. The first of the dolls that he had made was that of his 'wife,' who, in his fantasies, had given him companionship, but of whose sexual allures he soon got tired enough to create a mannequin of a prostitute he named Lola. When his 'wife' instilled guilt into him for frequenting Lola's company, he strangled her to death, buried her 'corpse,' and began living with Lola (Menen, *Abode of Love* 12-29).

Hearing about "things [that] could never happen aboard his ship" with its sexual discipline, Overton is shocked beyond belief. "Summoning his last recollections of his favourite book," Overton asks if Bunt had grown a kitchen garden or flowers, or tamed animals, or taught a parrot to talk in order to give him the semblance of human company. Bunt says that he had instead created a 'red-light area' of cloth-dolls in a cave, replete with the red lantern that he was supposed to have used to signal ships in the night to rescue him. When Overton reprimands Bunt's "mutinous behavior," Bunt simply says that more than thoughts of 'colonizing' the island impelled by some work ethic, the feelings that occupied him at the end of the day were those of loneliness and sexual desire (Menen, *Abode of Love* 12-41). His colonization of the island was consequently limited to his poesis of his 'English harem.'

Overton finally spares Bunt the fate of hanging for his "mutinous" activities, there being no legal precedent for punishing a recruit of the Navy involved in sexually-outlawed practices on an island outside the juridical ambit of Britain. Relieved by his reprieve, Bunt hunts out Prince and requests that he be allowed to join The Abode of Love. When Prince asks him why he wants to join the cult, he replies that unlike that "very English religion"—Christianity—which Overton continually evoked to make Bunt feel remorse for his bodily longings, Prince's cult will absolve

him of guilt for his sexual mutinies, both past and to come (Menen, *Abode of Love* 24-38). Organized religion and British colonization are continually yoked together along these lines in Menen's text. In one chapter, Martin Larkspur, an investor in the "Railway Age" of Britain's Industrial Revolution, expounds to Prince how the jungles of Africa had a "spiritual darkness," a "darkness so deep that, with no kindly light…it seemed inevitable [a traveler] should be lost." The "Christian possibilities" that the railways would bring to the jungles would, in their wake, dispel this spiritual darkness: "a railway train *is* a Christian" (Menen, *Abode of Love* 97-98; emphasis in the original). The textual allusion in the chapter is obviously to Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899) in which, at the outset, the narrator Marlow sees diseased and dying Africans constructing railways in a "place of darkness"—the Ivory Coast—under the supervision of a British ivory-trading company (59). Unlike Larkspur, though, the character of Kurtz in Conrad's novel, commissioned to write a report on "savage" African customs, ends up the bearer of the "profound darkness of [the forest's] heart." Pushed to the brink of madness, Kurtz's mental state becomes reflective of the "many powers of darkness" that had "claimed him for their own" (Conrad 132). The foremost of these powers was perhaps colonization itself—the chaos of the ivory trade in Africa—with Kurtz's report linearizing this chaos into an organized form that ends with the exclamation "Exterminate all the brutes!" (Conrad 135). On the other end of the spectrum was the darkness of Kurtz's "complete knowledge" of the colonial process, including knowledge of his guilt at having participated in this process (Conrad 169). Under the aegis of Larkspur's statement that "a railway train *is* a Christian," this guilt was roused by colonization which, via a religious lens, rendered itself an imperative akin to a work ethic. Prince's and Bunt's English harems questioned that "very English religion"—colonization—conducting "mutinous" acts not only against it but also against a colonial literary 'tradition.' This

tradition was a canon that often expurgated its texts of matters relating to overt sexuality, with Menen's novel exposing this "darkness" in print, as in the extended allusion to *Robinson Crusoe*. The second chapter of Menen's novel, alluding to Jane Austen's 1813 novel *Pride and Prejudice*, questions a point fundamental to the novel. In *Pride and Prejudice*, Lydia Bennett's status was that of a woman on the verge of sexual 'fall' in that unlike her four sisters, she had decided to flout morality and elope with a philanderer, George Wickham. Menen's novel suggests that contrary to the way *Pride and Prejudice* would have it, this tendency to elope was the rule and not the exception: according to Prince, if there was an English family with five daughters, "the chances that one of them would be, as the phrase went, "ruined," were plainly large" (Menen, *Abode of Love* 105). The four daughters of a rich and wily trader Josiah Nottidge, find the youngest of them, Cornelia—a parallel to Lydia Bennett—eloping with a rich and handsome Irish horse-breeder. Contradicting the cool rationality of a Jane or Elizabeth Bennett, the remaining sisters in Menen's novel are infuriated with jealousy against the sexual possibilities opened up to Cornelia by her elopement. Desperate for sexual intercourse, the sisters gladly join The Abode of Love, flouting their father's emphasis on abstinence. They marry the Lampeter Brethren, and are only too happy to be inducted into Prince's English harem.

To say that *The Abode of Love* questions the sexual sanctity of Macaulay's single shelf of 'good' English literary output is to belittle its achievement: Menen's novel also ties canonical text with the text expurgated on grounds of sexual obscenity. A careful hunt reveals that Menen's novel to a large extent replicates the contents of a book excluded from canonical considerations since its publication. The book in question is English historian and travelogue-writer William Hepworth Dixon's *Spiritual Wives* (1868). Dixon's book outlines the sexual liberties allowed to followers of certain revivalist religious cults in England and the United States. A legal suit had

been filed against *Spiritual Wives* as per the dictates of Lord Colin Campbell's Obscene Publications Act of 1857.[17] Having anticipated the possibility that his book would be outlawed by the Act—as indeed it initially was—Dixon had begun *Spiritual Wives* with the disclaimer that "these scraps of information, *even if they were true*, would [not] leave a reader very much at fault" (227; emphasis mine). At any rate, though Dixon won the suit filed against his book, the verdict accused him of moral "damages." The publication of the book was permitted, but it could not be sacralized into canonical status out of considerations of 'decency' (Mullin 24-25).

Spiritual Wives closes with a series of lengthy chapters dedicated to The Abode of Love and its sexual practices, and the life of Henry James Prince. These chapters suggest that the cult and its founder were not fictional creations. Dixon's book in fact discusses the cult and its founder along much the same lines as those Menen uses in his novel. What Menen leaves unwritten in *The Abode of Love* is the story of Prince's childhood—a story laid out in Dixon's book. Prince's foster mother, according to *Spiritual Wives*, was one Martha Freeman, a biracial woman whose father was the British owner of sugar plantations that ran on slave labor in the West Indies. Freeman's not inconsiderable source of wealth was the monetary legacy her father had garnered from the plantations. Her father had come with her to England after the slave uprisings conducted in 1790 in the West Indies.[18] As Prince gradually fell in love with her, she made him see the guilt inherent to organized religion, and eventually became his first wife, the first and greatest source of funds for the establishment of The Abode of Love, and the first member of the "English harem."

The West Indian slave uprisings of 1790, had, by most accounts, been responsible for British General Charles Cornwallis' decision to lay the foundations for outlawing Indo-British miscegenation in India after 1791. Cornwallis' intent was impelled, according to these accounts,

by the worry that the biracial offspring of Indo-British marital and non-marital unions, would also bear the rebellious tendencies of the West Indian plantation workers' biracial children.[19] This unofficially began the framing of a 'Eurasian' community in India, as opposed to a community of biracial figures hitherto looked down upon but not considered 'un-British' enough.[20] If this piece of information is taken into account in the present discussion, the gradual location of the Eurasian beyond considerations of Britishness, and the exclusion of the 'obscene' text from an English literary canon, prove to be threaded into a common bond in Menen's text.

The view that the Eurasian was innately rebellious was formulated in 1791 by the Company in general and Cornwallis in particular, the formation of the Eurasian community was not formalized until 1858, and the necessity to posit an English literary 'tradition' in India seems not to have been felt until at least 1816. Menen's interrogation of the canon, however, ties these disparate moments through their vertical alignment by the fear of sedition—the fear of the overthrow of the British Government in India ("Law of Sedition" li).[21] The figuration of the Eurasian as sexually seditious is, in this linkage, peculiarly displaceable upon the English text excluded from the canon for fear that it will incite anti-governmental/anti-colonial sentiments. The irony is that sexuality—or, as the British Government would have it, sexual 'obscenity'—was formalized as the essence of sedition in 1898, in Section 292 of the Indian Penal Code.[22] Sedition qua sexual morality seems, then, to be that which retroactively dictated what should be excluded from the canon. Judging by Menen's interrogation of the canon in *The Abode of Love*, however, the 'obscene' text reveals that 1791 dictated the beginnings of sedition as the fear of organized Eurasian-led rebellion against British governance in India. Perhaps this should be linked to the fact that just as the Eurasian's subjectivity was split by her position as a sexual/racial outsider in India, sedition became a legal category split between anti-colonial

rebellion and sexual morality—a split that the sedition law of 1898 sutured, reducing the rubric of sedition to matters of sexual morality in Section 292 of the Indian Penal Code.[23] By a strange anomaly, the law of sedition, notwithstanding this suturing, loomed large over the Eurasian's post-colonial authorial descendants—Menen's rewriting of the *Ramayana* was one of the first books of English fiction banned in post-colonial India, and Bond was the first author whose book was banned as per the dictates of the Emergency declared in 1975. Evidently, the specter of Section 292 loomed large even after decolonization. Declarations of 'sedition' after decolonization could be said to range from that which was claimed to desacralize tradition, to matters of sexual 'obscenity'—in short, to anything of which it could be said that 'someone was offended' by it.[24] Menen's *Ramayana* (1954), by my reading, questioned sedition as a sutured-over colonial rubric by making itself an act of insurgence—an insurgence conducted via the literary profanation of a revered *kavya*. In addition, the book provided a very simple but insightful answer about what determines an authorial subjectivity—the survival of the authorial voice against threats of censorship.

Sedition and a Profaning Authorial Voice in Decolonized India

Frank Anthony, in his book *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community* (1969), speaks at length of why, at the moment of decolonization, he feared that Anglo-Indians would not be considered part of the mainstream in India. He rather simplistically tied this fear to suspicions that India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru apparently harbored against Anglo-Indians.[25]

To safeguard the well-being of Anglo-Indians in decolonized India, Anthony claims to have opposed the 1963 Official Languages Bill Act's declaration of Hindi as the official language of India. The Act denied Anthony's proposal that English, as the language of the

Anglo-Indian community, be used as the country's "associate/alternate official language." Possibly because it is a lingua franca ensuring tenable induction into an Indian mainstream, Anthony makes not race but language the marker of the Anglo-Indian citizen. He says that he feels "a stab of pain shoot through him" at being told by his fellow-countrymen that "his language is foreign" (294-97). He nevertheless accepted the statutes of the Official Languages Bill Act because, he claims, he wanted to safeguard Anglo-Indians against alienation: by his assessment, the Hindu majority suspected the average Anglo-Indian of "espionage and cowardice," and of harboring an "aloofness," "mistrust and unfriendliness" toward Hindus (Anthony 176; 388). Accordingly, Anthony says, when he indicted Pakistan's position during the Indo-Pakistan war over Kashmir in a 1965 speech delivered at New Delhi's Ramlila Maidan, he started with a disclaimer: "The mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indian Community…is English…but as you perhaps desire that I should address you in Hindustani, I shall speak in Hindustani" (462). Anthony's gesture toward the English language being the equivalent of a racial marker of the post-colonial Anglo-Indian subject, and his concomitant performance of this politics of language in the Ramlila Maidan can, in the context of *Britain's Betrayal in India*, be said to locate the Anglo-Indian outside-within the Indian nation-state—a nation-state whose political field is overdetermined by the *Ramayana* as a marker of tradition. While seeming reductive, this to some degree parallels the position that Menen's authorial persona occupies in his rewriting of the *Ramayana*.

Anthony's speech was, it is to be noted, situated against the backdrop of the 1965 war over Kashmir—a site that, in its political linkage with India, can be said to be a "territory of the imagination," to quote Nehru's niece Nayantara Sahgal. The irony that Sahgal's succinct location of Kashmir intends to highlight is that the Nehru-Gandhi family originated from this territory of

the imagination i.e. from an outside. This was the outside from which post-colonial subject-formation in India, Sahgal suggests, was dictated (*Rich Like Us* 56).[26] Anachronistically paralleling Sahgal, when Menen wrote his take on the *Ramayana* in 1954, he began it with a long discussion of the tribal instinct for survival that he said was inherent to Brahmins in India. By "Brahmins," he was referring to the Nehru-Gandhi family (Raman), of whom Sahgal's novel *Rich Like Us* (1985) says, "all Kashmiri Hindus being Brahmins…survival knit them tightly together, made profit and loss terms of power and position, and gave one of the world's oldest aristocracies its air of regal condescension toward the inhabitants of the Indian plains" (56). Menen stated that he, for his part, was in a position to rewrite the *Ramayana* because "I am not, myself, a Brahmin" (*Ramayana* 4-5). In other words, in straddling multiple spaces as a racially Anglo-Indian author writing from England, Menen was, akin to the Kashmiri Brahmin in India, an 'outsider.' Thus, if, by his estimation, the Nehru-Gandhi family determined realpolitik in India (Raman), Menen suggests that his own multi-positionality enabled him to question the *Ramayana* as a text which lays out a post-colonial 'Indian' conception of realpolitik.

Menen asserts his right to rewrite the *Ramayana* using Valmiki as his authorial alter ego because, when measured against the yardstick of a sacrosanct/bowdlerized *Ramayana* that "took [its] morals from the best moralists," Valmiki would, like him, be adjudged a perennial outsider. A monolithic originary "Brahmin" morality, states Menen, would not consider Valmiki 'Brahmin' enough. According to Menen, this morality had in fact been used to rewrite—and to purge—the original version of the *Ramayana* which may have been, indicates Menen, a secular text of realpolitik as opposed to a text associated with religious tradition. In addition, this morality, Menen suggests, may have been utilized to reconfigure biographical accounts of Valmiki (3):

> The Brahmins said (and their views have survived down to our own times) that [Valmiki] was a brigand in his youth, and in his maturity he became an assassin. This may mean that when he was young he stole other people's property and, when he was older, killed someone.[27] On the other hand it may mean only that his verses scanned better than anything the Brahmins could write themselves...[G]enerations of Brahmins have re-written his poem so that in parts it says the opposite of what Valmiki plainly intended. (Menen, *Ramayana* 4)

What Menen gestures toward recovering through his emphasis on realpolitik is perhaps the sutured-over element of anti-governmental insurgence, articulated in his *Ramayana* in terms of a politically-insurgent authorial voice. Hence his "restoration" of Valmiki's 'lost' text in opposition to its 'traditional' version overdetermined and sanitized—at least from his vantage point—by a theistic morality (3).

In Menen's *Ramayana*, Rama is not a god but a human being, the heir apparent to the tribal kingdom of Ayodhya. He gets expelled from Ayodhya not in fulfillment of any promise that Dasaratha had made to his stepmother Kaikeyi, as the popular version of the *kavya*'s plot has it. Dasaratha is portrayed machinating Rama's expulsion himself by using this allegedly-made promise as an excuse. Menen's Dasaratha takes to this plan as an element of realpolitik, frightened as he is of Rama's political clout and popularity among the masses. He worries night and day that Rama's usurpation of the throne of Ayodhya is imminent.

Bringing Dasaratha's 'promise' to fruition, Rama submits to his command of expulsion because the Brahmin priests at court intensify the legal affect inherent to the 'promise' by evoking a theistic morality. That this morality is not law is beside the point: Rama does not know "the first principles of theology; but [he] knew one of its leading conclusions, which is that it is a

very bad thing to contradict a priest… because [a priest] was a god and a god cannot do wrong by definition" (Menen, *Ramayana* 175-76). The theology inherent to Ayodhyan politics is founded on the emptiness of the letter of the law, and on the censorship exercised upon the exposure of this emptiness.

To further ensure Dasartha's security, the Brahmin priests convince the expelled Rama to follow the path of a sage who has renounced the world. Renunciation of base emotional instincts and physical pleasures, Rama is brought to believe, will help him attain self-knowledge (Menen, *Ramayana* 105). In his search for a sage who can impart this knowledge to him, Rama comes across Valmiki who makes him realize bit by bit that knowledge is not to know what the priests spout, but a matter of thinking for oneself. Valmiki helps Rama conclude that what the Brahmins dictate as morally 'good' is in fact what functions in their best monetary and political interests. The Brahmin class of Ayodhya had constructed a political monotheism infused with the apparent unquestionability of religion, to ensure that decisions be made in their interests. Knowledge of the moral hypocrisy innate to this monotheism was censored by an emphasis on a chimerical exercise in self-renunciation. Dasaratha is well aware of this monotheism and its means of functioning, and uses it to fulfill his own designs by expelling Rama. To counter this monotheism involves doing that which "the best moralists" term "evil" (Menen, *Ramayana* 14). This 'evil,' says Valmiki, consists in giving in to the very mental and bodily desires whose repression is loftily termed 'renunciation.' 'Renunciation,' as the novel suggests, is de facto tantamount to the act of doing nothing—it is an exercise in self-negation rather than self-recognition.

According to Menen's Valmiki, the instinct to do 'evil,' founded on a pragmatism inherent to a will to live, includes within it the apparently base desire to avenge any damage done

to one's status and privilege, be this damage perpetrated by a Dasaratha or a Ravan. It is because Sita gives in to her 'evil' instinct for sexual fulfillment that, in Menen's *Ramayana*, she elopes with Ravan, a tribal chieftain and not a 'demon' as the 'traditional' version of the *kavya* has it. Sita elopes to Lanka of her own volition because she is frustrated with Rama's efforts at ascetic sexual repression. Seized with anger and consequent physical aggression at this elopement, Rama's brother Lakshman almost single-handedly helps him win the war waged to bring Sita back (Menen, *Ramayana* 226-27). Also, because Rama allows himself to be overwhelmed by jealousy when Ravan and Sita elope, he is, despite his negation into lethargy, able to bring himself to wage the war against Lanka. Given this turn of events, Rama attains the only self-knowledge that, according to Valmiki, is worthy of attainment: "I am not a philosopher: I am a warring prince. I am not a hermit: I am living in a palace; and I am not chaste as the sages say one should be, but I am on fire with jealousy. I think continually night and day of what [Sita] may be doing, what I fear she must be doing, in Ravan's bed" (Menen, *Ramayana* 167). Valmiki teaches Rama that to recognize and acquiesce before these emotional and physical instincts is be beyond the deceit of the theistic-moral lens that would dictate matters of 'good' and 'bad' vis-à-vis selfhood. This "art of being…a successful politician" that Valmiki guides Rama toward proves, in the end, to be inextricable from "the art of good writing in a book." "Good writing," for Valmiki, is evidently that which is free of theistic-moral dicta inscribed in empty legalese. This legalese, as Menen's book explicates in a digression, is not open to public view precisely because it is empty (*Ramayana* 68; 148). Ensuring the survival of a book of "good writing" about political disenchantment, Menen's *Ramayana* suggests, involves an "art of war" which is, in the final reckoning, an art of ensuring the survival of a disenchanting authorial voice beyond engulfment by the law (Menen, Ramayana 96; 234). Rama's recognition of the necessity to

survive as a political being whose views are subject to physical and emotional instincts, proves his moment of self-recognition—a self-recognition sans the guilt impelled by Ayodhyan subject-formation upon such instincts. The Kashmiri Brahmin's "tribal suspicion of the 'outsider'," proves, in the end, to be this same art of the instinctually-impelled self's survival at work. This is simultaneously the moment the reader recognizes the need for Valmiki's authorial voice, dictating an art of survival, to be "restored" beyond moral and administrative bowdlerization. Menen's asserted occupation of a position akin to that of the Nehru-Gandhis is, in effect, his claim to the survival of his authorial voice beyond the letter of the law, even as this letter would declare Menen's "restoration" of the *kavya* seditious for its having questioned sacrosanct rubrics of religious 'tradition' and concomitantly offended 'someone' (Raman).[28]

As the subsequent ban on Menen's *Ramayana* proved, sedition as a legal rubric could expand itself endlessly precisely because it was empty. In addition, as a rubric founded on 'seditious intent,' sedition was inextricable from a juridical view that the authorial offense in question was deliberate.[29] That the disjunction between seditious intent and sedition was in fact the retroactively-interpreted disjunction between cause and effect, and that the author, from this point of view, could be said not to have harbored seditious intent, seemed beside the point. Menen's *Ramayana*, as perhaps the first book of English fiction to be banned by the laws of sedition in post-colonial India, saw the authorial survival of Menen-as-Valmiki nullified. Simultaneously, the loss of Menen's voice signified an Indo-Anglian canon[30] in evolution: the silenced/excluded voice of the dead Eurasian autobiographer's post-colonial successor ensured that an 'Indian' English literary canon was emergent, canon-formation being always already split between texts included and texts excluded.

What is of interest is that the category of sedition is evidently imbued, for all its emptiness, with an excess that can inflate itself to fit governmental purposes. 'Sedition' had exposed a weakness in its 1898 linguistic reduction to the rubric of the sexually 'obscene.'[31] Perhaps an exploration of such a sexually 'obscene' text may expose an excess in the text—an excess that would locate the text beyond the clutches of sedition.

The rubric of sedition exposed its limits when it was reformulated during the Emergency that erstwhile Prime Minister Indira Gandhi declared in 1975. This was only apt, the Emergency itself being an expression of the limits that Indira's tribal instinct for survival could lead her to.[32] The first text that was banned during the Emergency on grounds of sedition—or, to be more precise, sexual obscenity—was Bond's novella *The Sensualist* (1974). An examination of this novella, and of the novel with which Bond followed it—published at the height of the Emergency—may help search for a textual excess that survives the excesses of sedition.

Sedition and the 'Obscene' Text

In *The Sensualist* (1974), Bond addressed the late-nineteenth century British discourse that situated Eurasian children and adolescents living in the hills under the care of Indian ayahs, as hypersexual figures who would eventually be led into impotence.[33] The framing narrator of *The Sensualist* is a traveler through the Himalayas who comes across a "hermit," a "recluse" who has been meditating there. In his inability to "savour the delights of the senses to the full," the recluse wants to indulge in renunciation and do 'nothing'—or at least to have nothing to do with the material world (Bond, *The Sensualist* 88). This recluse has, in fact, been driven to such a path of renunciation after having spent his youth chasing sexual prey. His ayah Mulia had trained him into becoming a perennial seducer through the course of his childhood spent in the Himalayas—a seducer always in search of satisfying his sexual needs. By the time he was an adolescent, he had

gained the power to "almost uncannily" hypnotize his prey into giving in to his seductions. Having seduced his prey, he would "feed on [them] like a vampire, until [they] had nothing to give and [were] completely destroyed" (Bond, *The Sensualist* 91-92).

While relentlessly pursuing this predilection, the recluse one day came across a boy who had lost his way home. He brought the boy back to the boy's Garhwali mother who lived in the Himalayas. This mother proved another version of Mulia, with the "same strange and powerful matriarchal passion." The only difference was that whereas Mulia initiated the recluse into sexuality, this Garhwali woman drained him of it.[34] Feeding upon him sexually as he had done with his own prey, the woman reduced the recluse to realizing that "[w]hereas once I imposed my will on others, I now found myself squirming under another's will…She was a *rakshasni* [demoness] prepared to reduce me to skin and bone, to suck me dry" (Bond, *The Sensualist* 133). Now twenty, the recluse, once hypersexual, has been ground into sexual impotence by the woman. He is unable to recover the instinct for sexual pleasure that had constituted his subjectivity. The ensuing frustration leads him to turn the recluse he has become, hidden away from the sexual pleasures he can no longer enjoy. As the framing narrator realizes, "Renunciation? He has not renounced the world, he has hidden from it. And I wonder how many thousands there are like him—men who have run, not simply from the world but from themselves; men who, hating themselves, cannot bear to see their own reflections." But the narrator also concludes that to have succumbed to impotence, the recluse had first to have found his sexualized subjectivity. This is why, as he leaves the recluse at the novella's close, he asks where the Garhwali woman can be found: he wants to be seduced by the woman to "regain my manhood. *Or rather…to discover it*. And only a woman who can give so much of herself can vivify true passion in a man" (Bond, *The Sensualist* 142-43; emphasis mine). The statement

suggests that the narrator has already arrived at Rama's stage of self-recognition in that there is, by his assessment, a pre-existent subjectivity founded on physical instincts—a subjectivity that he wants to discover though it be simultaneously split into survival and destruction i.e. he may only be able to gain it by running the full risk of losing it. Bond's authorial voice faced this risk of loss in the string of events that followed the publication of *The Sensualist*.

On June 26, 1975, Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, declared the first Emergency in post-colonial India to hold onto her Prime Ministership when it stood jeopardized.[35] Among the events following the declaration of the Emergency was the passage of the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act in February 1976. The Act had, to lesser or greater extents, already been put into action ever since the Emergency had been declared. Under the auspices of this Act, Bond was arrested in 1975 for the publication of *The Sensualist* which had been adjudged 'sexually obscene.' The Government of India's litigation against Bond dragged on for two years, with authors like Nissim Ezekiel, Vijay Tendulkar, and Mulk Raj Anand speaking up in Bond's favor (Mehta 86). Bond was finally acquitted of the charges.[36] He did not, however, muster the courage to permit the republication of *The Sensualist* until 19 years after the Emergency had ended. The introduction to the new edition of the novella opened with the disclaimer, "Let it be said at the outset that this book is not intended for the school classroom" although it is certainly not "a plateful of porn" (Bond, Introduction ix).

A thorough examination of the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act reveals that the Act's contents were not exclusive to the Emergency, drawing as they extensively did upon the nineteenth-century laws of sedition.[37] At best, some of the material banned from publication during the Emergency were novel in the manner their contents were deemed to harbor 'seditious intent.'[38] Given the events surrounding the publication of *The Sensualist*, it

might be a fruitful exercise to locate Bond's following novel, *A Flight of Pigeons* (1975), as an exercise in an authorial voice trying to get past the hurdle of censorship during the Emergency. Such an examination may help understand how a literary text can imbue itself with an excess putting into question the capricious and apparently limitless expurgating powers of the rubric of 'sedition.'

For *A Flight of Pigeons* Bond drew upon the contents of a late-nineteenth century Eurasian text. This text was Joseph Francis Fanthome's novel *Mariam: A Story of the Indian Mutiny of 1857* (1896). Indeed, it would not be an overstatement to say that Bond's novel plagiarized one of the two parallel storylines of *Mariam*, sometimes chapter for chapter, even including insignificant and marginal characters from Fanthome's novel. In addition, *A Flight of Pigeons* retained the names of almost all the characters as they stood in Fanthome's novel.

As its subtitle suggests, *Mariam* is set against the backdrop of the Mutiny. It begins with a framing British scribe who claims to faithfully replicate the narrative of one Miss Lavater, a survivor of the Mutiny and daughter of the novel's eponymous Eurasian protagonist, Mariam Lavater. Miss Lavater narrates to the scribe how Mariam and she survived the ravages of the Mutiny. Mariam was married to Robert Lavater, British physician in the regiment stationed at the Shahjahanpur district of Uttar Pradesh i.e. where the Mutiny first broke out. Robert Lavater, ascribed a low position in the regimental hierarchy for having married a Eurasian woman, was killed by the mutineers when the Mutiny broke out. Mariam, Miss Lavater, and a few of their relatives were able to save themselves. After days of absconding, Mariam and Miss Lavater found themselves captured by one of the mutineers, Mangal Khan, in whose house they were forced to stay in a paradoxically congenial state of captivity. Mangal Khan promised them immunity on the condition that he could have Miss Lavater's hand in marriage. Mariam for her

part promised him her daughter's hand only if the British failed to quell the Mutiny. Once the British reoccupied Delhi, Mangal Khan himself took to a life of absconding, Mariam and Miss Lavater found refuge with a relative at Bharatpur, and "[t]he country was soon after restored to order, and peace and plenty again blessed the land" (Fanthome 508).

In replicating the contents of this storyline, *A Flight of Pigeons* can be read as mutedly referring to the Emergency which was inversely a political mutiny staged from the top. Additionally, if censorship threatened Bond's authorial voice, Miss Lavater's voice in *Mariam* is also threatened with engulfment by that of the British scribe who conveys her narrative to the reader only after her death, as if by sheer accident: "Though dead she yet speaketh" (Fanthome i). But the voice of Fanthome's Miss Lavater is simultaneously threatened with loss and engulfment by the Orientalist narrative that runs parallel to her account in the novel. This Orientalist narrative requires some explication.

In *Mariam*, within the sanctum sanctorum of Mangal's household, Mariam ingratiates herself to Mangal's fellow-mutineers, and begins participating in their discussions about two lovers—Farhat and Zinat—who elope together from their feuding families under the cover of the Mutiny. As the lovers are fleeing, Farhat suddenly and inexplicably finds Zinat missing. Zinat's disappearance is fodder for the mutineers' discussion. A repository of folklore, Mariam starts a yarn about how genii may have possessed Zinat and kidnapped her. Mariam's yarn begins to take over Miss Lavater's narrative, so that the novel slowly but surely takes the story of Farhat and Zinat as its focal point. Even as the two storylines initially run in tandem with each other, every return to Miss Lavater's narrative finds Mariam contributing more and more tales about genii possessing humans. The tales hold the mutineers spellbound as if they are themselves possessed by Mariam as the "presiding genius of the place;" Mariam's voice becomes the voice that

commands the genii to "be"—the voice that prevents the mutineers from thoughts of harming her daughter or her by possessing either of them in body (Fanthome 406-08). Her strategic use of this yarn-without-end is overtly reminiscent of the ploy that Scheherazade uses to prolong her lifespan in *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night* which Burton had translated and published in 1885, a little more than a decade before the publication of *Mariam*. Simultaneously, *Mariam* combines elements from Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet*, transplanting them onto an Orientalist setting. The borrowings from *Romeo and Juliet* include, among other elements, two famous feuding families whose children i.e. Farhat and Zinat are in love; a balcony scene in the course of which the lovers meet; a faithful nurse who assists Zinat in her rendezvouses with Farhat; and a Mercutio figure whom Farhat accidentally kills in a feud. In short, this parallel storyline locates *Mariam* in the span of an English literary canon. The canon spans both the playwright who singlehandedly stood for English literature among the elite members of the Indian colonized—William Shakespeare[39]--and the author trying to elbow his work into canonical considerations i.e. Burton.[40] In other words, this canon, like others, is also founded on both inclusion and exclusion.

By the end of the novel, though, this yarn is no longer being narrated by Mariam. Both the yarn and Miss Lavater's narrative reveal themselves as being under the scribe's control (Fanthome ii).[41] The yarn continues until the final chapter, long after Miss Lavater's narrative has ended. At the exact moment when the cannons in the Mughals' palace in Delhi are fired to signal that the British have recaptured the city, the genii vanish and the yarn comes to an end, swallowed whole by the reestablishment of British power in India. What had at first seemed Scheherazade's attempts to keep death at bay, is decimated by this firing of the cannon; it is brought to a screeching halt by the racially-inflected power of the scribe.

In excluding this Orientalist narrative in its entirety, *A Flight of Pigeons* excludes the canon that this narrative spans, the irony being—to reiterate a much-repeated point—that canons themselves function through exclusion. In addition, though plagiarizing *Mariam*, Bond makes one original addition to *A Flight of Pigeons* in terms of its content—the final paragraph of the closing chapter. *A Flight of Pigeons* starts in much the same way as *Mariam*, with a framing scribe outlining the events of the Mutiny at Shahjahanpur and referring to the misfortunes of the Lavater family. Suddenly, with no forewarning this scribe says, "I will let [Miss] Ruth [Lavater] take up the story…" (Bond, *Flight of Pigeons* 5). The ellipsis with which this sentence closes, seems to threaten Ruth's—and Bond's—authorial voice with silencing, just as the scribe in *Mariam* swallows Miss Lavater's voice while it lies buried in her grave. This ellipsis is instead reconfigured to a space of narrative excess, the ramifications of which the novel's final paragraph clarifies. Instead of a gesture toward the restoration of peace and plenty in the country, this final paragraph turns to Miss Lavater's obsequious and bowdlerized expression of a heretofore unstated desire she harbored toward Mangal Khan: "Secretly, I have always hoped that he succeeded in escaping. Looking back on those months when we were his prisoners, I cannot help feeling a sneaking admiration for him. He was very wild and muddle-headed, and often cruel, but he was also very handsome and gallant" (Bond, *Flight of Pigeons* 133). Far from being unable to speak from beyond her grave, Miss Lavater, then, turns to an expression of what would, according to Mutiny narratives, be unthinkable in the aftermath of the Mutiny. Eurasian women having themselves been ostensibly threatened with rape by mutineers,[42] a Eurasian woman's expression of sexual desire for a mutineer would not necessarily square with the average administratively-acceptable Mutiny narrative.[43] In *A Flight of Pigeons*, this narrative excess spills from beyond Ruth's grave, against the power of the scribe. This spillage is, at the

extra-textual level, co-existent with Bond's articulation of his authorial voice through his exclusion of the English canon that *Mariam* spans. Simultaneously, the muted sexual anomaly of this last paragraph escapes identification as 'obscene,' reconfiguring sexual and narrative 'obscenity' as 'excess.'

A Flight of Pigeons splits itself, then, into original content and overtly plagiarized material. Its overt plagiarism would have enabled its expression of sexual anomaly/monstrosity to escape censorship. Simultaneously, its original material can be said to have allowed Miss Lavater's voice to emerge beyond the shadows of Fanthome's text. Furthermore, Bond's excision of the English canon can be argued to have allowed his Indo-Anglian authorial voice expression beyond Macaulay's shelf of books. It would, in this light, not be an understatement to say that *A Flight of Pigeons* snubs considerations of literary tradition, allowing a post-colonial Anglo-Indian authorial subjectivity to reconfigure the specter of the Eurasian text that shadows Kipling's dead Eurasian author. The voice of this Anglo-Indian authorial subjectivity is also that of Miss Lavater which, in its escaping expurgation, gestures toward a recovery of that which was politically silenced. The importance of Bond's novel thus lies in its status as a political statement against sanctimonious fetishizations of a literary canon, against governmental dictates of sexual morality, and against the rubric of sedition. In splitting itself, it creates the possibility for an authorial voice to emerge whole, almost as if survival and anti-governmental resistance become one in the sound of this voice. This was a matter of some importance in 1975 when post-colonial realpolitik was attempting to silence such resistance. In making this gesture, *A Flight of Pigeons*, if only at the level of possibility, takes up from where Menen was forced to leave off once his *Ramayana* was banned.

Afterword: Beyond the Eurasian Text

The alleged threats of interracial rape during the 1857 Mutiny had been, as I have discussed in the first chapter, one of the factors leading to the eventual formulation of the 'Eurasian community.' When contending at court against the backdrop of an early-twentieth century India that she had faced this same threat at the hands of Dr. Aziz, Adela Quested, the female protagonist of E. M. Forster's novel *A Passage to India* (1924), sees an "almost naked, splendidly formed" untouchable punkah-wallah at the back of the courtroom. The sight leads her to ask herself, "In virtue of what had she collected this roomful of people together?". The answer, as she herself realizes, lies in the prejudices built into "Her particular brand of opinions" as a "girl from middle-class England"—prejudices against, among other figurations, brown rapists prowling after white *satis*. The "vision" of the punkah-wallah proves itself "divine" by facilitating this revelation. The "strength and beauty" of the man undoes Adela's pose of "seeing India" through racial prejudice "as a form of ruling India." "The airs from the punkah behind her waft on," and Adela, contradicting her previous testimony, suddenly declares that she had not been sexually molested. Arriving at this moment of self-recognition in the current of sexual energy driven by the punkah, she unfortunately ends up finding herself jilted by the brown man. A question "fell from nowhere, from the ceiling perhaps." The question, put by one of those present at court is, would Aziz molest a white woman "[e]ven when the lady is so uglier than the gentleman?". The jilt is simultaneously an expression of the colonized male subject's sexual desire, and of a simultaneous refusal to make this white *sati* the object of that desire. "[Adela's] body resented being called ugly, and trembled" as, according to one of the figures present, "she gets no air." This question from nowhere proves the "first interruption" in the flow of energy from the punkah, simultaneously interrupting the Eurasian text's othering of the Eurasian via projected fears of interracial rape. Now questioned in no less than a court of law, this interrupted

discourse unsettles the presiding British magistrate so much that he "felt bound" to "censure" the question (Forster, *Passage to India*). But this censuring/censoring of the interruption cannot undo the fact that the discourse is no longer linear, having curved against itself. The profanation of the colonized divine "nearing the dust" becomes one with the profanation of the fragmentary discourse of interracial rape that had been variously linearized into rendering the colonized Eurasian a not quite/not white outsider. This is a point at which the court perhaps "feels bound to censure" the genre of the Eurasian text if it leaves its lens of prejudice behind—which meta-fictionally, *A Passage to India* does in this climax. While tradition would locate this interruption of prejudice "not now, not here, not to be apprehended except when it is attainable," this self-interruption can perhaps always already anticipate itself in the Eurasian text, if Forster's novel be considered a representative instance (*Passage to India*). This is the excess that the Eurasian text cannot contain within itself; it enables the Eurasian subject to always already bear the possibility of emerging "from nowhere" beyond charges of profanity as his compatriots encourage him by crying out, "one day you'll be king" (Bond, *The Room on the Roof* 84).

---

[1] Recall Violet's recital of the lines from *King Lear* in the last scene of *36 Chowringhee Lane*. The recital suggests that Violet identifies her loss of prestige and self-assurance as an Anglo-Indian, with Lear's loss of regal prestige at the hands of his two older daughters, Goneril and Regan.

[2] Well into 1915, American classicist David Moore Robinson was speaking of the necessity for English departments in the United States of America, to emulate British pedagogical models and have students conduct "a survey of the whole field" of Greek and Latin literature, if only to understand, in its entirety, "the Greek mind" (154).

[3] To call this group of texts 'Eurasian' sounds simplistic, indicating as it does that the only element holding the texts together is their location of the Eurasian as the colonized other. I would have preferred to group the texts under the nomenclature of 'Anglo-Indian' because the British authors who wrote them were referred to in both colony and metropolis as 'Anglo-Indian,' for as long as they lived and/or worked in colonial India. However, this nomenclature would create confusion in that the Anglo-Indian identity I speak of in the context of a Violet Stoneham, alludes to Eurasians living in India after 1935, in which year Eurasians had successfully laid claim to legal identification as 'Anglo-Indian' i.e. as racially British, at least in name. My apparently reductive nomenclature of this set of texts is an effort to avoid confusion that may arise along these lines.

In keeping with the post-1935 'Anglo-Indian,' I refer later in the chapter to Aubrey Menen and Ruskin Bond as 'Anglo-Indian authors,' given Menen and Bond's status as post-colonial authors of British racial descent.

[4] As a fundamental instance, one can take what is today often argued to be the first novel in the English language—Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko, or the Royal Slave: A True History* (1688). The novel takes as its protagonist the grandson of an African king. This grandson, Oroonoko, is sold off into slavery in a British plantation in the West Indies. While the novel seems to critique the slavery to which Oroonoko is subjected, it takes as its foundation the tried and tested European literary trope of the noble savage. The sympathetic 'good' British first-person narrator of the novel suggests that Oroonoko is, in his nobility, an anomaly produced in a race where royalty lay in kings raping their grandsons' prospective wives. The wife in this case is Imoinda, Oroonoko's beloved, raped by the aforementioned African king and sold into slavery to hide the rape from Oroonoko. In the end, the British narrator does not spare Oroonoko's nobility from question,

consisting as this nobility does in, among other things, killing Imoinda to 'purify' her of the taint of rape.

[5] The novels I have discussed in the first chapter are, of course, central to this Eurasian canon. However, the lifespan of this canon continued longer than the decades immediately following the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. The Eurasian was at the very least present in these texts as part of the British racial hierarchy: she counted precisely because she was located lowest in the hierarchy, or outside the hierarchy altogether. See Maud Diver's novel *Candles in the Wind* (1931) where the Eurasian is made to count through passing references, though these references emphasize her racial insignificance, *Candles in the Wind* being a novel that focuses on British characters living in India in the early-twentieth century.

In addition, to locate the Eurasian subject lowest in the hierarchy, the Eurasian text did not always need to possess the shrill dogmatic voice of Grant's *First Love and Last Love* (1863) or Meadows Taylor's *Seeta* (1872). An overview of two later Eurasian novels may help prove my point.

Decades after the threat of 1857 and the topicality of the discourse of the white *sati* has largely abated, Maud Diver's novel *Lilamani: A Study in Possibilities* (1911) chooses as its plot a marriage between landed English nobleman Nevil Sinclair, and Lilamani, a Rajput woman unusually inclined toward committing *sati*. Toward the beginning of the novel, Sinclair saves Lilamani from marriage to a dying Brahmin. He then marries her himself, and takes her to England where she gets pregnant with Sinclair's child. Unlike Meadows Taylor's Seeta, Lilamani need not worry about her biracial child's legitimacy and right to primogeniture. Lilamani is, however, unable to acclimatize to the English weather after her pregnancy. This inability leads her toward gradual disorientation and, in a disjunction between cause and effect,

toward an increasing sense of a necessity to prove her *satitva* vis-à-vis Sinclair. At the end of the novel, her will to live shrivels pointedly, and she is left feeling that it is in Sinclair's best interests that her child remains unborn. On a side note, Lilamani's disorientation in the face of the English climate is strongly redolent of Mrs. Moore's and Adela Quested's inverse inability to adjust to the tropical climate of India in E. M. Forster's 1924 novel *A Passage to India*.

Lilamani's closing, locating the yet-to-be-born Eurasian child outside-within the metropolis, recalls the intertwinement of the Eurasian race with the colonial discourse of acclimatization inaugurated by anthropologist James Hunt in 1863. According to Hunt, wherever European colonization spread, a quantity of blood from the natives needed to be injected into the colonizers to help them acclimate to the tropical climates. However, Hunt's findings apparently indicated that these colonizers' bodies, with their blood diluted, racially degenerated into Eurasians in their lethargy and loss of moral/sexual discipline (Mizutani 60). 'Acclimatization' was in fact a colonial discourse, very much a product of Hunt's discourse of 'ethno-climatology' according to which biracial figures—be they inhabitants of the West Indies or India—would be gradually rendered unable to reproduce, and would die out after the third generation (Dover 31).

To take a novel that, on the surface, fights the dis-location of the Eurasian in India, English missionary Aleph Bey's rags-to-riches novel *That Eurasian* (1895) chooses as its protagonist Charles Japhet, a Eurasian orphan born out of wedlock and othered by the British as '*that* Eurasian.' Japhet overcomes the financial penury of his 'Eurasian' situation and becomes a philanthropist obsessed with alleviating the poverty of the greater Eurasian community in Calcutta. While financial power could, for all practical purposes, enable the induction of a Eurasian into the upper-class of the British in India—as demonstrated by the case of Henry Gidney, leader of the All-India Anglo-Indian Association from 1919 to 1941 (Gist and Dean

Wright 98)—Japhet is portrayed in the novel as the exception and not the rule. In his rise to monetary capital and racial prestige, he was proving himself 'not Eurasian.' By extension the novel suggests that he can only rescue a few Eurasians from the poverty and fallenness claimed to hound members of the Eurasian community since birth. The closing indication of the novel is clear: many are called, but of the approximately 22,000 Eurasians in erstwhile Calcutta, only a handful are chosen to be saved by the likes of Japhet from death in a condition for which "poverty…was hardly the name" (Bey 245).

In both *Lilamani* and *That Eurasian*, though the Eurasian is not dogmatically located as a racial outsider, she is alienated from the conditions that facilitate life, be these conditions financial or climatic. Eugenicist Cedric Dover quotes Henry Bruce's 1913 novel *The Eurasian* to claim that this portrayal of alienation is typical of the Eurasian text in which, under Western eyes, "A nigger is a devil, most times. But an Yewrasian is not a proper human being" (qtd. in Dover 9). In other words, the Eurasian remains estranged from a possible claim to subjectivity.

According to Dover, the Eurasian texts "reflect the opinions of their age and in particular the [British] race" (13). I would add that more often than not, these texts attempt to streamline the sexual and eugenic discourses applied after 1857 to the Eurasian. They try to linearize fragments of these discourses into apparently incontrovertible and monolithic racial discourses othering at least the greater part of the Eurasian community. Sujit Mukherjee's book-length assessment of the Eurasian canon concurs that for novels written by the British about nineteenth- and early-twentieth century colonial India, "Inevitably…the novelists fall back upon the stereotypical situations" "trying to fit the Eurasian into a scheme of things only to show that he is a misfit" (174).

[6] In tandem with what I state in footnote 3, I use the term 'Anglo-Indian' in this chapter only to refer to Eurasians in the post-1935 moment. I do not apply the term to the British living in India before (or after) decolonization.

[7] Both Ronald Barthes and Michel Foucault have justifiably questioned the concept of an authorial voice. According to Barthes, "all writing…consist[s] of several indiscernible voices," and consequently, "literature is that neuter, that composite, that oblique into which every subject escapes, the trap where all identity is lost, beginning with the very identity of the body that writes" (142). But when the law threatens to entrap this trap where all identity is lost, it can cast its net not upon the "proliferation of significations within a world" i.e. upon the interpretations imposed upon and effects induced by a text. Under such circumstances, Foucault asks, "How can one reduce the great peril, the great danger with which fiction threatens our world?". The text, after all, can be prohibited but not held culpable. Foucault's own answer to the question is that "One can reduce it with the author." In other words, the law can hold the author culpable for voicing opinions that are supposedly anti-establishment. It can do so by retroactively reducing the proliferative effects of a text in terms of the cause from which it apparently originated—authorial intent. After all, according to Barthes, "the image of literature to be found in contemporary culture is tyrannically centered on the author, his person, his history, his tastes, his passions"—including his political opinions and intents, regardless of whether or not he actually harbored them (143). I later discuss how the rubric of sedition ignores the disjunction between authorial intent and textual effects.

Because the law threatens to engulf the author's voice in such a setting, an examination of a legally excluded/banned text becomes inextricable from a gesture toward liberating the figure of the author from the juridical chains of authorial intent. Hence my emphasis on the

author's voice/subjectivity in opposition to the intent retroactively imposed on this voice/subjectivity by the law.

[8] As if to tease out the ramifications of this expression of desire to the full, Shyam Benegal's Hindi cinematic adaptation of *A Flight of Pigeons*, *Junoon* [*Obsession*] (1978), made immediately after the Emergency, portrayed the Eurasian woman's love for the mutineer in full-blown fashion.

[9] For instance, when Bankimchandra Chattopadhyay wrote his first novel *Rajmohan's Wife* (1864) in English, he was unsure of whether it would be received warmly by a British readership—or whether it would be read by British readers at all. The novel ended up being well-received almost solely among Bengali readers. It was ignored in the *Calcutta Review*, a journal that reviewed Bankim's Bangla novels very favorably (Ratte 37). *Rajmohan's Wife* is today often viewed as a text that laid the foundations for twentieth-century Indian writing in English.

Along the same lines, a British critic in the *Calcutta Review* dismissed Michael Madhusudan Dutt's English poetry because, according to him, Dutt wrote with the English dictionary in one hand and a pen in the other, searching for the most incomprehensible word in the English language so that he could use it in his work and underscore his knowledge of the language to impress British readers (Ratte 37-39).

[10] When I refer to a seemingly monolithic "English literary tradition" in this chapter, I do so in reference to Macaulay's notion of a "single" shelf of Western literary texts—a shelf that ostensibly determined colonial notions of a bowdlerized and sanctified British literary canon (10).

[11] Recall the reference in *Vagrants in the Valley* to Mowgli's desire to return to "his own people" (qtd. in Bond, 214).

[12] The earliest of the many Irish rebellions possibly dates back to 1534, when the Silken Thomas Rebellion against King Henry VIII—led by Thomas FitzGerald, 10th Earl of Kildare—proved a factor in the creation of the Kingdom of Ireland, with Henry being declared King of Ireland in 1542 (Singer).

The rebellion ostensibly closest in time to the plot of "Namgay Doola" would have been the Easter Rising of 1916, when a group calling themselves the Irish Volunteers, coupled with an Irish Citizen Army, occupied central locations in Dublin and proclaimed the inauguration of an Irish Republic. The Republic lasted six days, with the participants being overpowered in the end by the British Army (Singer).

[13] Recall the narrator's emphasis on the "road" by which Doolan "attained knowledge to make [the] devilries" of rebellion sans guilt.

[14] For instance, while *First Love and Last Love* and *Seeta* focus on the figure of the white *sati*, *Cawnpore* favors the racial determinism by which a Eurasian could be claimed to live out of wedlock because she was born outside wedlock. *Lilamani* favors the discourse of acclimatization. These and more discourses were strewn across a colonial administrative imagination in zigzag fashion, with one discourse being favored in one text, and perhaps being patched together with another discourse in a semblance of linearity.

[15] Menen also used his overt homosexuality to magnify his location as an outsider. Perhaps the most explicit description of Menen's homosexual experiences is to be found in his 1953 autobiographical text *Dead Man in the Silver Market*. In one section of the book, Menen describes a homosexual encounter he has with the unnamed heir to a princely state in post-colonial India. Homosexuality was, of course, decriminalized in England after the passage of the Sexual Offences Act of 1967. In India, it is branded a criminal offense. Ironically, Section 377 of

the Indian Penal Code—used to outlaw homosexuality in India—stands today almost exactly as it did when it was codified in 1901 in John Mayne's *The Criminal Law of India* (Arondekar 73).

[16] *Robinson Crusoe* was, incidentally, one of the first books to be bowdlerized for instruction in India. *The New Robinson Crusoe*, published between 1835 and 1836, was literally shorn of sexual references, with its narrative simplified and punctuated with questions apparently put to the narrator by a group of Indian children. This exercise in bowdlerization was, according to *The Spectator*, not a particularly successful one. At any rate, *Robinson Crusoe* was fundamental to the English literary canon as perceived in nineteenth-century India. *The Spectator* stated in the early-twentieth century that the novel was as well known among upper-class Bengali Hindus as Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's 1882 Bangla novel *Anandamath* [*The Monastery of Bliss*] (210).

[17] Campbell's was an Act foundational to prohibiting the publication of English pornographic texts in nineteenth-century Britain. The Act deemed that the sale of "obscene publications" was the equivalent of "A sale of poison more deadly than prussic acid, strychnine, or arsenic" (qtd. in Leckie 36). It did not discount the application of physical force to help destroy prohibited books and shut down bookshops selling 'obscene' publications (Manchester 36). After its promulgation, Campbell declared the Act's success "most brilliant. Holywell Street, which had long set law and decency at defiance, has capitulated after several assaults. Half the shops are shut up and the remainder deal in nothing but moral and religious books" (qtd. in Manchester 229). In light of this last statement, the morally profane and the sexually 'obscene' book quite literally collapse into one and the same space.

Spiritual Wives' discussion of morally-indicted sexual practices common among certain religious sects, was deemed indictable under the Obscene Publications Act because, according to

an article published in the *Pall-Mall Gazette*, "Could anything be more subtle than the poison of such a picaresque depiction of vice as was here given?" (qtd. in Mullin 24). This repetition of the metaphor of poison for the sale of 'obscene' books should be noted.

[18] It would not be an overstatement to say that the narrative of Prince's marriage to Freeman for her wealth from the plantations, strongly recalls the plotline of Edward Rochester's marriage to the Creole Bertha Mason in Charlotte Bronte's 1847 novel *Jane Eyre*. Married off to Rochester so that he can inherit her monetary legacy, Bertha's money, like that of Freeman, comes from her father, also once a plantation owner in the West Indies. Bertha's father, too, had been forced to leave for England when the slave uprisings broke out—a matter that is sidestepped in *Jane Eyre* and dealt with at length in British novelist Jean Rhys' *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966).

[19] According to a minute posited by the Court of Directors of the East India Company, the impetus that the Company initially provided to Indo-British sexual unions stemmed from a need to proliferate a biracial populace loyal to the British in India. However, the biracial soldiers of the British army stationed in the West Indies had considerably sided with the plantation workers during the rebellions. Hence the Company's decision of 1791 to at least unofficially prevent the induction of Eurasians into its covenanted civil and military services. See Durba Ghosh. *Sex and the Family in Colonial India: The Making of Empire*.

The discourse of rebellious energies apparently inherent to biracial subjects born out of a colonial setting, is reminiscent of Patrick Doolan and his family in "Namgay Doola."

[20] See Christopher Hawes. *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India 1773-1833.*

[21] Ironically, according to Jogeshchandra Chaudhuri's 1898 treatise on the law of sedition, "There is no offence known to the English law as sedition. But certain offences are said to proceed from seditious intent." In short, it is not the offence i.e. the completion of the intent, but the intent itself as retroactively interpreted, that is termed 'sedition.' The intent in question is, to put it succinctly, that of overthrowing the government, and the means to do so are "overt acts" "harmful to society," including, pointedly, "writing, speech or signs, or visible representations" incommensurate with the "laws of the Empire." Chaudhuri indicates that textual material such as "a book or a pamphlet, or a newspaper" could, after the introduction of Section 153A of the Indian Penal Code, be considered most representative of that which was said to bear anti-governmental or "seditious" intent ("Law of Sedition" 4-5).

Augmenting his summarization of why and how a text could be considered indicative of seditious intent, Chaudhuri, toward the end of his treatise, inserts a passing reference to Section 292 of the Penal Code. According to this Section that had remained unchanged since 1860, that which the British Government considered "obscene" was tautologically deemed "seditious." A "book, pamphlet, paper, writing…or any other object" would be viewed as obscene if "it is lascivious or appeals to the prurient interest…such as tends to deprave and corrupt persons who are likely…to read, see or hear the matter" (Kalra and Barupal 185). Textual material apparently harboring the intent to overthrow colonial governance, is, in this section, rendered reducible to printed matter adjudged sexually obscene: expressions of sexuality themselves inexplicably assume a seditious configuration. Hence my use of the term 'sexual sedition' in this chapter for the published text that is governmentally declared to be unacceptable or threatening for discussions and/or depictions of sexuality.

[22] See footnote 21.

[23] See footnote 21.

[24] I am in no way suggesting that the question of anti-governmental insurgence was set aside in the law of sedition after 1898. My claim is that an examination of the 1898 amendments to the sedition laws reveals that *at the level of juridical linguistic usage*, the rubric of sedition was reducible to anything that could be claimed to be 'obscene.' After the amendments of 1898, sexual 'obscenity' could be said to have tenuously become a transcendental determinant by which a text could be deemed seditious on the grounds of its having offended a person or group. See Jogeshchandra Chaudhuri. *The Principles of the Law of Sedition, with an Appendix Giving the Law of India, as It Was and as Amended*.

[25] Anthony unconvincingly attributes Nehru's distrust of Anglo-Indians to "some unflattering references to the arrogance of the Anglo-Indians and their overbearing attitude towards other Indian communities that Nehru had made in his autobiography." Anthony "wondered whether [Nehru] would be conditioned by that thinking" (182-83). The only reference that Nehru makes to Anglo-Indians in his 1936 autobiography is in fact to be found in a discussion of an incident involving British repression in Chittagong between September 16 and 25, 1931. The implications of Nehru's discussion of the incident vis-à-vis Anglo-Indians can be teased out very easily:

> A terrorist [in Chittagong] shot down and killed a Moslem police inspector. This was followed by a Hindu-Moslem riot, or so it was called. It was patent, however, that it was something much more than that, something different from the usual communal riot. It was obvious that the terrorist's act had nothing to do with communalism; it was directed against a police officer, regardless of whether he was a Hindu or Moslem. Yet it is true that there was some Hindu-Moslem rioting afterward. How this started, what was the

> occasion for it, has not been cleared up, although very serious charges have been made by responsible public men. *Another feature of the rioting was the part taken by definite groups of other people, Anglo-Indians, chiefly railway employees…who are alleged to have indulged in reprisals on a large scale*. (Nehru 209-11; emphasis mine)

The point seems to be that until then, Nehru had never thought that "other people"—ostensibly a euphemism for minoritarian populations like Anglo-Indians—would participate in communal or proto-communal riots. This questioning of Anglo-Indians' political inclinations against the backdrop of the riots, Anthony seems to simplistically suggest, led Nehru to nurture suspicions against the Anglo-Indian community as a whole.

[26] The Sahgal references are from her novel *Rich Like Us* (1985). This novel is set against the backdrop of Indira Gandhi's Emergency of 1975-77. It was, given its scathing critique of the Emergency, published only after Indira was assassinated—indeed, mere months after the assassination. It portrays a fictionalized account of the corruption surrounding Sanjay Gandhi's "people's car" which endeared itself to prospective buyers through its political identification as a "patriotic, hand-spun, hand-woven car, every nut and bolt of it made in India" (Sahgal, *Rich Like Us* 100). This quote, of course, harks back to Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi's propagation of the "hand-spun, hand-woven" khadi fabric that would, Gandhi suggested, help Indians rid themselves of dependence on the cotton mills of Manchester. The lore of indigeneity validating Sanjay's undertaking was, Sahgal suggests in the novel, transcendentally supplied by Gandhi's version of India as a promised *Ramarajya* or kingdom of Rama—a post-colonial utopia that would borrow its morality of truth and of the representation of the collective will from the 'true' and 'fair' mythic god-king Rama (Chatterjee 92).

Extending this appendage of corruption to the mythos of a *Ramarajya*, *Rich Like Us* takes as its protagonist Dev Surya, son of political honcho and minion of the Nehru-Gandhis, Ram Surya. Ram's last name is an obvious reference to the mythical Rama's ancestry which is traced to the Surya clan. Rose Surya, the British wife of the comatose and dying Ram, helplessly sees her stepson Dev assisting Sanjay squeeze the last drop of money from prospective dealers, investors, and public institutions for his 'people's car,' and storing the money away in an anonymous bank account in Venezuela. Incidentally, an examination of the news reports censored during the Emergency reveals that the second largest number of banned news reports, focused on the corruption surrounding this car ("List of Censor's Orders").

Rose is in an Indo-British marriage legally unrecognized in India because, as she did not know at the time of her marriage, Ram had a wife living. This is redolent of the marital discourse surrounding the pre-1857 Indo-British proto-marital unions in colonial India. On a side note, Ram's wife tried to commit *sati* after coming to know about his second marriage.

As Rose sees Dev and his clan—all Kashmiri Brahmins—work in collusion with the Kashmiri Brahmin Nehru-Gandhi family to fill their respective coffers, she realizes her precarious position in India. She is not only outside wedlock, but also an outsider to India in her association with a family that harbored a "tribal suspicion of the 'outsider'." The irony is that Kashmir is itself 'outside' India, a "territory of the imagination" in that its national status is disputed and still open to conjecture and conflict, as Rose's friend Sonali points out to her (Sahgal, *Rich Like Us* 56).

Because Rose has gotten to know too much about the corruption involving this 'people's car,' and because her marital status seems to threaten Dev's dynastic inheritance of Ram's industrial empire, Rose finds herself raped and drowned in a well by Dev's goons. "[F]ables had

arisen and become eternal verities…The revision of history ha[ving] begun,…there would be no end to the lies" scripted by a "forger's hand." According to this forged/expurgated script, Rose, having gotten drunk, had accidentally fallen into a well and died (Sahgal, *Rich Like Us* 285). The novel ends with news of Rose's murder suppressed and misrepresented to the press, and Dev promoted to the post of cabinet minister to Indira. For anyone to disagree with Dev and his cohorts would henceforth be declared "treason" and "sedition" (Sahgal, *Rich Like Us* 197). Charges of sedition cast incessantly during the Emergency via the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act of February 1976—which I will refer to later—reduced the events of the Emergency to "newsless newspapers" which stated that "There was no trouble of any kind" (Sahgal, *Rich Like Us* 212-13). In this "newsless" space where rumor is the only means of access to news, the rumor of the rape and murder of Rose overtly harks back to a rumored version of the death of Judith of Cawnpore. According to this version, Judith was raped and drowned in a well with a number of other white women (Trevelyan 212-13).

The expurgated figure of Judith ties in with Anthony's fears for the inclusion of Anglo-Indians in the mainstream of the Indian populace. Anthony, who claims to have supported the Emergency to ensure that Anglo-Indians would remain unharmed for as long as it lasted (Singh), expresses fears for a stigma of "shame" apparently appended to the Anglo-Indian community. This element of "shame," as a careful reading of *Britain's Betrayal in India* reveals, is that of Eurasians' having fought on the side of the British during the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. To counter this "shame," Anthony alludes to Trevelyan's 1866 polemic about the Mutiny, *Cawnpore*. Anthony misreads Trevelyan's tract as complimentary to the valor of Eurasians in the course of the Mutiny (76). Nowhere is Anthony's awareness of this deliberate misreading more obvious than in his allusions to a tribute Trevelyan apparently pays in *Cawnpore* to Hugh Wheeler, father

of Judith. Trevelyan had in fact described Wheeler in pejorative terms, as I have discussed in the first chapter. The silence that screams out from Anthony's references to Trevelyan—as in the silence about Rose in the "newsless newspapers"—is that of Judith, to whose 'betrayal' of British sexual 'purity' Trevelyan devotes pages of doctrinaire aspersion. No references to Judith are to be found in Anthony's book.

As if taking up from where Sahgal leaves off, Salman Rushdie locates Saleem Sinai, the protagonist of his 1981 novel *Midnight's Children*, as an Anglo-Indian born out of wedlock. Sinai's rival in the novel is one Shiva, born in Kashmir. Both Saleem and Shiva are born in the same hospital in adjacent wards at the precise moment of the decolonization of India—the midnight between August 14 and 15, 1947. A bumbling hospital nurse accidentally interchanges the nametags of the newborns. This case of mistaken identity reduces Shiva to an Anglo-Indian born of interracial rape outside wedlock, while Sinai becomes a Kashmiri whose family had migrated to India at the moment of decolonization. At the climax of the novel which is set against the backdrop of the Emergency, Shiva, who has ingratiated himself to Indira Gandhi, proves instrumental in destroying the colonies of squatters at Turkman Gate in New Delhi. This decimation of the colonies was one of the Emergency's seminal acts of violence (Tarlo). Shiva's main impulsion toward this act, though, was to try and kill Sinai—who lived in one of the colonies—and reclaim his identity as one of India's 'mainstream,' as Anthony would have put it. The irony is that while this act of reclamation would apparently reduce Sinai to the position of an Anglo-Indian outsider a la Menen's authorial persona in his *Ramayana*, it would simultaneously render Shiva an outsider by two removes: Shiva is Kashmiri, but he is no Kashmiri Hindu, as the Muslim last-name "Sinai" suggests. Indira's "tribal suspicion of the 'outsider'" had made her political outfit take a liking to Shiva as a Kashmiri Hindu, the irony being that even as Shiva

upheld the Emergency as a *Ramarajya*, he was in a blissful state of denial about his Muslim identity.

Though *Midnight's Children* was not banned, Indira sued Rushdie and his publishers over the novel, winning the suit and causing certain passages to be excised from editions of the novel subsequent to the first (Bahri 174).

[27] One biographic account speaks of Valmiki as a sage who felt compassion toward a bird that had been hunted and killed, leading him in lament to utter the first 'Indian' verse, inventing a 'tradition' of Sanskritic poetry in the process. Another narrative speaks of Valmiki as a bandit who became a devotee of Rama after unwittingly repeating his name as a chant. Thanks to this repetition of Rama's name, Rama-as-godhead himself appeared before Valmiki and instructed him to write the *Ramayana*. The bandit subsequently turned a sage and wrote the *kavya* (Rao 164).

[28] Writer and diplomat K. M. Panikkar claimed that the number of people 'offended' by Menen's questioning of an orthodox Hindu reading of the *Ramayana* was insignificant. Consequently, "th[is] action of the government passed practically unnoticed and was not subjected to any criticism in India itself" (qtd. in Smith 191).

[29] See footnote 21. Chaudhuri, among other things, explicates in his treatise on the law of sedition why it was ludicrous to accuse an author with the 'crime' of seditious intent under Section 153A. The juridical exposition of seditious intent according to Section 153A

> makes perfectly legal acts, such as writing, speaking or preaching, an offence, not from any criminal intent in the mind of the writer or speaker, but by the effect they may produce in the minds of the reader or of the listener…*[S]uppose a man preaches morality or religion which is not acceptable to people with superstitious faith, and this gives rise*

> *to enmity and hatred against the co-religionists of a preacher who follows a purer faith and a higher morality, he too comes under this section*. This is sufficient to show the utter absurdity of the proposed section and of the offence which it intends to create. ("Law of Sedition" xxxiii-xxxv; emphasis mine).

In this entanglement between an effect dissociated from its retroactively-interpreted cause, the rubric of seditious intent becomes interchangeable with the rubric of sedition. This makes sedition an all-encapsulating rubric in that it can be used to accuse any author of harboring seditious intent despite the incommensurability between authorial intent and textual effects.

[30] That P. Lal had termed the burgeoning canon of Indian writing in English "Indo-Anglian," is very telling about how this body of writing was perhaps attempting to leave colonial specters like Macaulay and Duff behind it (Spivak 238).

[31] See footnote 21.

[32] In the context of post-colonial Indian realpolitik, the Emergency was part of Indira's effort to hold on to her Prime Ministership after the Allahabad High Court had adjudged her election as Prime Minister invalid, and formally debarred her from holding office for the next six years. See Nayantara Sahgal. *Indira Gandhi: Tryst with Power*.

[33] In a typical nineteenth-century middle-class British household in the hills, it was not the British mother but the native nursemaids (ayahs) and wet nurses (*dais*) who catered to the British children's needs. According to British physician and medical writer Edward Tilt, this degree of cross-racial contact between white infants and native servants endangered the infants with racial reduction to 'Eurasianness.' Tilt claimed that this was inevitable because the ayahs and *dais* "enhance[ed] the bodily risks these children already faced from the climate and regional

diseases." Such contact was also claimed to expose the children to "negative cultural [i.e. sexual] influence" (qtd. in Mizutani 41).

In his tract *Cimmerii or Eurasians and Their Future* (1929), Cedric Dover refuted Tilt's claims. Dover began the tract by summarizing the assertions prevalent in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries about the average lower-class Eurasian in India. To quote Dover, Eurasians of this class were claimed, for all their "sexual immorality," to be "unable to breed beyond the third generation" because of a "defective fecundity" (43; 31). To disclaim this assertion of impotency, Dover used P. C. Mahalanobis' 1928 statistical paper on racial intermixture in the Eurasian subject's body. According to Mahalanobis, "on the Indian side the Eurasians most closely resembled the Bengal Brahmans, socially the highest class…So far as the present analysis [in Mahalanobis' paper] goes we see that the intermixture between Europeans and Indians occurred more frequently among the higher castes than the lower" (qtd. in Dover 17-18). What Mahalanobis was indicating, I would hazard, was that the 200 Eurasians he had taken into account for his statistical study, were largely born of Bengali Brahmin biological fathers. These fathers had perhaps frequented brothels inhabited by 'poor British' or Eurasian prostitutes, or maintained British or Eurasian 'mistresses,' giving birth to these Eurasian offspring in the process. Perhaps that is why Dover says that "We can only treat with contempt a statement which attempts to create the impression that half-castes alone are [sexually] immoral" (43).

Dover additionally claims in his overtly polemical text that "we may dismiss as antiquated Dr. Paul Broca's work…in which he states that …half-castes are…defective in…fecundity and are unable to breed beyond the third generation" (31). Making another reference to Mahalanobis' findings in this context, Dover indicates that the 200 Eurasians Mahalanobis considered for his study, were as fecund as their Brahmin fathers, and that in fact

"Eurasians are superior in stature to other natives of Bengal." Aware that his claims are, after a point, based on what seems to be a polemical reading of Mahalanobis' work, Dover qualifies his claims by saying that "from conversations I have had with [Prof. Mahalanobis], I am convinced [he] will completely support my contention" (34).

[34] Recall that Rusty's mother was also a Garhwali woman.

[35] See footnote 32.

[36] According to journalist Vinod Mehta, the legal suit filed against *The Sensualist* became to India what the suit surrounding the publication of D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) had been to Britain (86).

[37] According to the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act, the "objectionable matter" open to retribution included anything that could

> ring into hatred or contempt, or excite disaffection towards the government established by law in India…and thereby cause public disorder; or…seduce any member of the Armed Forces or the Forces charged with the maintenance of public order from his allegiance or his duty or prejudice the recruiting persons to serve in any such Force or prejudice the discipline of any such Force; or…cause fear or alarm to the public or to any section of the public whereby any person may be induced to commit an offence against the State or against public tranquility; or incite any person or any class or community of persons to commit murder, mischief or any other offence; or which are defamatory of the President of India, the Vice-President of India, the Prime Minister or the Speaker of the House of the People or the Governor of a State. ("Prevention of Publication" 44).

All of these points were part of the colonial laws of sedition. The only significant addition here is the prohibition on defaming the occupants of the political positions mentioned at the end, these positions having been nonexistent before decolonization.

As with the 1860 version of Section 292, though, appended to these tenets—almost as an afterthought—was a tenet outlawing "grossly indecent, or…scurrilous or obscene" material ("Prevention of Publication" 44). For a full text and discussion of the colonial laws of sedition, see Jogeshchandra Chaudhuri. *The Principles of the Law of Sedition, with an Appendix Giving the Law of India, as It Was and as Amended*.

[38] For instance, news reports of the apparent compromising of the political image of any public space were banned. Public spaces were deemed to be representative of the image of the nation-in-progress. Judging by the functioning of the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act, 'seditious' references in the press that would compromise this image, would be viewed as posing a threat to the Government. This was particularly the case if the space was located in Delhi, the seat of the Prime Minister and the capital of India. A typical example displaying a paranoia in sustaining this dazzling image of the capital, was the May 1976 ban on news reports of one Begum Vilayat Mahal, found squatting in a Delhi railway station ("List of Censors' Orders" 31). A mere squatter could thus be declared a seditious presence in the dispensation promulgated by the Emergency.

[39] Indian universities included Shakespeare in their English syllabi long before British universities did. The inclusion started at the University of Calcutta ever since its inception in 1857. Among the patrons of Shakespeare's plays in India, the students of the University were the most enthusiastic while Indian maharajas and the British Viceroy were the most influential (Foulkes 150). Whenever an English troupe of actors toured India in the second half of the

nineteenth century, the theatre was "besieged by Indians, mostly young students from the Universities," as English actor Matheson Lang puts it in his memoirs. This, says Lang, proved particularly the case when one of three plays—*Hamlet*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Merchant of Venice*—was on the playbill (qtd. in Foulkes 150).

[40] An article published in the December 1898 issue of *The Speaker* expresses a dichotomous metropolitan view about *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*. In this article, Burton's magnum opus is said to be invaluable because he was a "genius manipulating English [literary] style." The contents of Burton's text were simultaneously said to be problematic because despite his ability to assume the viewpoints of characters from perspectives that were "at once European and Oriental," he had, according to the article, reduced his authorial perception to that of "a humble Hadji on the way to the Prophet's Tomb and the Kaaba." One part of the problem, then, lay in the authorial voice's being perceived as hyper-Orientalist, compromising the racial position of British "scholar and gentleman" that Burton was said to occupy ("Immortal Part of Kinglake" 788-89). This prejudice against the book was, in addition, tied to Burton's ostensible participation in "bestial" activities in the Karachi brothels, leading one Sir Joseph Jacobs to review *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night* in an 1888 issue of *The Academy* in the following terms: "One hesitates to dissent from so great an authority as Sir Richard Burton on all that relates to the bestial element in man" (qtd. in Burton 87). Burton took extreme umbrage to the comment, and wrote to *The Academy* to argue his case (87). *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night* was, at any rate, well-known among Indian readers, regardless of its exclusion from a 'respectable' metropolitan literary canon (Clark 11). The colonial prejudices against Burton in India changed considerably among the colonial elite at the fin de siècle, and his book proved foundational in proliferating a proficiency in the English language among the

emergent middle-classes in India. His popularity in India was, by then, at par with that of Shakespeare or Defoe (Clark 11).

[41] Fanthome, overtly identifying his authorial position with that of the scribe in the preface to *Mariam*, states that he need not have added the yarn above and beyond Miss Lavater's narrative. He only did so to invest the novel with "an eastern colouring" (Fanthome ii). Recall the Orientalist "colour and movement and poetry" with which the ghost of Kipling says he invested *Kim.* In "The Man Who Was Kipling," though, it is the British novelist and not the Eurasian subject who, "Though dead…yet speaketh."

[42] See James Grant. *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny*, and George Trevelyan. *Cawnpore*.

[43] This a-normativization of a Eurasian's desire for—and cohabitation with—a mutineer was, it must be remembered, one of the reasons why Amelia Horne's testimony in favor of Liaquat Ali, was not looked upon with administrative approval. This was also probably the reason why the narrative of Judith's cohabitation with her Muslim 'savior' remained largely untold. See first chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: "THE ORIGINAL ANGLOS" AND OTHERS: THE 'GENUINE' HALF-CASTES OF MCCLUSKIEGANJ

Though frequently perceived as objects of anticolonial ressentiment given their association with white skin, Anglo-Indians generally do not find themselves at the receiving end of racialized violence, possibly because of their status as a statistical minority in India. However, a captivation with white skin and its equation with colonial power has, I suggest, to lesser or greater extents retained its hold within a default Indian common sense. Consequently, Anglo-Indians are an anachronistic object of fascination in decolonized India. This fascination has, of late, made McCluskieganj—a town in the state of Jharkhand—its focal point, McCluskieganj being generally known—although not officially acknowledged—as an Anglo-Indian homeland.

Catering to this fascination, multiple newspaper articles and documentaries have begun to be produced, with McCluskieganj as their object of scrutiny. These articles and documentaries often take Kitty Texeira, a racially Anglo-Indian inhabitant of the town, as their point of emphasis. Through a reading of Dhiraj Singh's documentary *McCluskie's Ganj: The Lost Home of the Anglos* (2012), I argue that this trend manifests itself because though Anglo-Indian by lineage, Texeira could easily be mistaken for one of the *Adivasi* inhabitants of McCluskieganj. In other words, because Texeira *looks Adivasi*, she has, qua exception, the potential to shock viewers out of their dated equation of Anglo-Indians with British colonialist privilege. The bodily "Indianization" of this Anglo-Indian, as I show, finds itself working at cross currents with the documentary's problematic emphasis on Anglo-Indians as the almost sole pedagogical transmitters of the English language. I claim that this emphasis is problematic because English, though a marker of colonial prestige has, as I discuss, always already been culturally Indianized.

To question the perceptions put forth by Singh's documentary, I conduct a reading of a section of Frank Anthony's 1969 historiography of Anglo-Indians, *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community*. Through the reading, I try to show that the location of the "Indianized" Anglo-Indian as exception, is futile, because miscegenation ad infinitum—rather than an exclusive part-European and part-Indian racial inheritance—constitutes the biological makeup of Anglo-Indians. Hence 'Anglo-Indian' as a closed racial category, is itself prone to question. Furthermore, the indefinite racial intermixture Anthony speaks of, intersects with an equally indefinite linguistic intermixture to define the "history of mankind." Ergo, the exclusive identification of a community with the transmission of the English language to modern India, is circumspect. By extension, the definition of McCluskieganj as a homeland of a community born of only one kind of miscegenation, is also dubious.

To demonstrate how McCluskieganj may open itself beyond closed categories, I examine journalist and novelist Vikas Kumar Jha's quasi-ethnographic novel on the town. In the novel, as I show, McCluskieganj's identity as an Anglo-Indian homeland miscegenatively opens its borders to a proto-nationalist *Adivasi* movement. This helps delineate the town in terms of an 'Anglo-Indianness' that is, akin to Anthony's characterization of an Anglo-Indian racial selfhood, defined by an indeterminate racial identity. Furthermore, even as the miscegenative offspring of the novel's protagonists, signifies the beginnings of a McCluskieganj in open political dialogue with an Indian nationhood, matters of linguistic intermixture textually embody the induction of the town into the heart of India. Rendering eugenic characterizations of an Anglo-Indian identity dubious, the fictionalized avatar of Texeira in the novel, no longer functions as an exception or a racial aberration. This, I indicate, perhaps signifies the birth pangs of a discourse countering the specter of the sexually-seditious Anglo-Indian.

McCluskieganj: An 'Un-European' Homeland

Before proceeding to my arguments, an introduction to the circumstances that led up to the inception of McCluskieganj in 1933, might prove useful to the reader. I have stated in the first chapter that after the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, the British government of India, in tandem with private citizens and organizations affiliated with the government, made a concerted effort to keep Anglo-Indians away from the view of the urban colonized. It was believed that the cloistering of Anglo-Indians into invisibility would ensure that notions of a British imperialist masculinity—a masculinity expressed by an apparently tautological sexual discipline—would remain unchallenged in a default 'effeminate' Indian common sense. The act of cloistering Anglo-Indians, the British government felt, would, to some extent, bolster this discourse of imperialist masculinity because white skin—asserted to be one of the signifiers of British supremacy--would not be controverted by the visible perception of its dilution in not quite/not white Anglo-Indian bodies. With the white masculinity of the British consequently remaining unchallenged, the 'effeminate' colonized would, in an almost self-evident paradigm, not question the 'masculine' right of the British to rule India.[1] Accordingly, the British administration made efforts to huddle Anglo-Indians into secluded farming settlements, to train them for work on ships that would remain at sea for the greater part of the year, and to force them to emigrate to the Andaman Islands on the Indian Ocean. McCluskieganj may be putatively viewed as one such cloistering initiative, given its umbilical link to the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee [CDCEC], a private colonialist initiative founded between 1918 and 1919 (Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora* 73).

The CDCEC was founded to deal with what was, after 1857, popularly called the "Eurasian Question," that is, the matter of how the British government could deal with the vast

numbers of Anglo-Indians in Calcutta. The problem, insofar as the CDCEC perceived it, was that these Anglo-Indians' bodily thinning of white racial supremacy, refuted the paradigm of white=rich. This refutation was said to be augmented by the 'un-European' financially-impoverished lifestyles that the greater number of Calcutta's Anglo-Indians led. These lifestyles were, after all, ostensibly not very different from those of Calcutta's poorer native residents. The CDCEC concluded that these 'un-European' lifestyles resulted from the lack of a Protestant work ethic among the greater number of Anglo-Indians in India. The absence of this work ethic was traced to Anglo-Indians' ostensible self-definition of their identities in terms of a pride they harbored, given their racial alignment with India's colonizers. This pride was said to manifest itself in these Anglo-Indians' refusal to work for a living, work being perceived as a constituent of colonized Indian subjects' lives. Since this refusal rendered Anglo-Indians 'un-European,' the CDCEC recommended that they be cloistered away from the sight of the colonized urban populace (Mizutani 91-110).

One of the sub-growths of the CDCEC was the Colonization Settlement of India [CSI], an institution registered in 1913 to sell shares in land. The CSI promoted the idea of Anglo-Indians settling in well-nigh uninhabited spaces, or in spaces that were less frequented by the urban colonized. Through the dissemination of pamphlets and brochures, it perpetrated the belief amongst an Anglo-Indian audience that such acts of settlement would suffuse Britain's biracial children with an affect of colonizing new lands—an affect that would help these children discursively align themselves with their white colonial forefathers. The only scheme of the CSI's that gathered enough fiscal steam to be launched, was the inauguration of the town of McCluskieganj in 1933. The scheme for the forging of McCluskieganj was initiated by one Ernest Timothy McCluskie, member of the CDCEC's sub-committee for housing (Blunt,

Domicile and Diaspora 73). This sub-committee had, in fact, been involved in producing multiple novel ideas to conjure Anglo-Indians away from urban spaces, given the absence of Victorian-style workhouses and almshouses in India (Mizutani 99).

McCluskie's initiative is now generally perceived to have been philanthropic in intent—an intent traceable to McCluskie's allegedly Anglo-Indian racial provenance, and his consequent allegiance toward Anglo-Indians (Johnson 252). However, McCluskieganj's links to the CDCEC's sub-committee for housing suggest that the town was perhaps inaugurated to seclude a sizable part of India's Anglo-Indian population.[2]

As a colonially-recognized homeland for Anglo-Indians, McCluskieganj was supposed to be run on agrarian lines upon ten thousand acres of land that the CSI had appropriated from three pre-existing *Adivasi* villages—Hesalong, Kanka, and Lapra, located in the current-day state of Jharkhand.[3] In its claim to function as a racial homeland, McCluskieganj eventually came, after the decolonization of India, to be determined in a popular Indian imagination, as a space demarcated by Anglo-Indian racial exclusivity (Kaur 381).

A Knotty Exception: An "Indian *Mazdoor*" in an Anglo-Indian Homeland

Given McCluskieganj's colonial status as an Anglo-Indian homeland, multiple televised documentaries, sociological studies, and newspaper articles produced since the early 1990s, have portrayed the town as an anachronistic proto-*sahib*dom housed in decolonized India.[4] Many of these portrayals have woven a fantasy around the town, suggesting that some nebulous originary Anglo-Indian identity lies waiting to be reified from it, and that given a general apathy among Anglo-Indians toward such an act of reification, this identity will eventually die out.[5] Hints of this note percolate into Dhiraj Singh's documentary *McCluskie's Ganj: The Lost Home of the Anglos*, telecast in 2012 on Lok Sabha TV.[6]

The opening question that the subtitle of Singh's documentary about "the lost home of the Anglos" provokes, hinges on the kind of loss being alluded to. The documentary's voice over suggestively states at the outset, that "Anglo-Indians [in McCluskieganj], once the *sahibs* of the Raj, are now struggling to maintain their identity." The opening shots accompanying this statement, display a series of black-and-white photographs of McCluskieganj's older and more decrepit Anglo-Indian inhabitants. The voice over's opening statement, coupled with the shots, provide the beginnings of an answer to the question of loss, as will eventually be seen (Singh).

The initial shots are followed by the playback of a recorded portion of All-India Anglo-Indian Association President Frank Anthony's 1942 address to the Association. In the portion played back, Anthony exhorts his Anglo-Indian audience to "always remember that we are Indians. The Community is Indian. It has always been Indian. Above all, it has an inalienable Indian birthright. The more we love and are loyal to India, the more will India love and be loyal to us." Following this playback, the voice over claims that though the Quit India movement was a decade removed from 1933, "the freedom struggle…created a sense of insecurity in the minds of those Anglo-Indians who saw their idea of a golden age [under the British administration in India] coming to an end" (Singh). This claim, coupled with Anthony's address, suggests that multiple Anglo-Indians felt a general sense of alienation from India, and that this alienation was the reason for the inauguration of McCluskieganj as an Anglo-Indian homeland.[7]

Anthony's speech resonates his longstanding call to Anglo-Indians to culturally 'Indianize' in the wake of the decolonization of India, and to rid themselves of their misplaced political allegiance to their British forefathers who had juridically disowned them in the aftermath of the Sepoy Mutiny (Blunt, "Home, Community and Nationality" 49). While colonial India saw the "decline of McCluskieganj and its Anglo-Indian settlers," the unwillingness or

inability of Anglo-Indians to Indianize, the documentary insinuates through its reference to Anthony's speech, was in some way responsible for McCluskieganj's current financially- and statistically-depleted situation (Singh).[8]

After panning multiple shots of *Adivasis* living in McCluskieganj, the camera shows Singh interviewing Kitty Texeira, an Anglo-Indian inhabitant of the town, whose maternal grandfather "lost all his savings in [the CSI], the company in whose shares many of the early settlers had invested." It is Texeira who, as a metonymic signifier of McCluskieganj's Anglo-Indian population, is made the focus of the greater part of the documentary (Singh).

The initial shock that the sight of Texeira evokes in the viewer, rests on the fact that though in her fifties, Texeira's body is delineated in terms of a premature geriatry and decrepitude. If Texeira is a metonym for McCluskieganj's Anglo-Indian population, this geriatry ties up with the voice over's tacit suggestion that the town's Anglo-Indians are "struggling to maintain their identity" in that there has been a large-scale migration of younger Anglo-Indians away from their purported racial homeland, given the dearth of employment opportunities there. Such an interpretation would also explain why the documentary opens with the photographs of geriatric Anglo-Indians, the younger among them having left McCluskieganj "in search of greener pastures" in the USA, UK, Canada, and Australia. This would provide the answer to the question of loss that the documentary's subtitle begs: the phrase "the lost home of the Anglos," recodifies McCluskieganj's loss of a sizable part of its Anglo-Indian populace, as this populace's loss of their homeland (Singh).[9] The voice over's reference to the Anglo-Indian inhabitants' struggle to maintain their identity in the absence of this populace, perhaps harks back to the post-1857 perception that in order to hold on to their part-European racial status, Anglo-Indians had to maintain a code of interracial marriage (Hawes 20). Indeed, Anthony claims that interracial

marriage was one of the one of the defining "social and psychological patterns" of the Anglo-Indian community after 1857 (365).

The deeper visual shock value of Texeira's body, by my reading, rests on its incarnation in terms of color, corporeality, and labor: emaciated and dark-skinned, wearing a faded sari, and shown farming fruits and vegetables in a patch of land, the Anglo-Indian Texeira *looks* no different from the farming *Adivasi* women that the documentary provides constant shots of. Even as notions of the racial prestige associated with the "*sahibs* of the Raj" begin to be problematized by this sight, the viewer's shock reaches its zenith when, interrupting her farming activities, Texeira starts talking in clear and unbroken English about the first settlers' loss of their money in the CSI shares they invested in. The shock is evoked not so much by the reference to the CSI and its precarious character as an institution, as by Texeira's articulation of the English language. This moment throws a default Indian association of English with cultural prestige off kilter, as the viewer realizes that "Kitty *Memsahib*" has visually Indianized beyond the ambits of colonially-inherited equations of race, class, and cultural status (Singh).[10]

Confounding these equations further, the voice over informs the viewer that since she was nine-years old, Texeira used to sell fruits and vegetables at the Ranchi Junction railway station, and that now, very hard up for money, she has had to sign up for the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act Daily Wage Scheme.[11] Signatory to a scheme that would legally identify her as an "unskilled manual worker," the function this financially-impoverished "*Memsahib*" serves qua "mascot of McCluskieganj" in the documentary, seems to require further clarification (Singh).

The voice over states that Texeira is a "large part" of McCluskieganj's "appeal for outsiders," because she has been featured in "several books and articles." Against this backdrop,

she can simplistically be said to function for McCluskieganj's national "outsiders" as an object for anticolonial ressentiment, with these "outsiders" reflecting via a lens of visual pleasure, upon how the mighty *sahibs* have fallen. The documentary, though, provides the beginnings of a more nuanced answer through its verbal disavowal of the *Adivasis* inhabiting McCluskieganj: though multiple shots focus on the *Adivasis*, the only word that the voice over uses to allude to them is the nebulous "locals" (Singh). This word demands an explanation of how Texeira would serve as "mascot" for these "locals," given her Anglo-Indian racial status. The clarification begins when the documentary affords the viewer a glimpse of Texeira's husband. The voice over refers to this figure as "a local boy" whom Texeira married when the two were young (Singh). A hunt through a popular blog about McCluskieganj reveals that Texeira's husband is an *Adivasi* named Ramesh Munda (Hourigan). Given that Anglo-Indian communitarian identities are transmitted in juridical terms along patriarchal and interracial marital lines, Texeira, having married an *Adivasi* husband, would herself be deemed a "local"— that is, an *Adivasi*–by law (Chanda 47). Given the documentary's cryptic allusions to interracial marriage as the norm that would help maintain McCluskieganj's status as an Anglo-Indian homeland, Texeira seems to function as an exception within the town's Anglo-Indian collective. Her identity is, after all, cleaved into that of a figure who is Anglo-Indian by race but *Adivasi* by conjugality. This identification is enhanced by the voice of Frank Anthony that looms over the opening of the documentary, Anthony having suggested that after the Sepoy Mutiny, Anglo-Indians functioned as a community by being "rigorously endogamous" (365).[12]

Texeira's status as exception, though, provokes complications at the level of the visual and the aural. Testifying to her "appeal" as exception is the shock value that resides in her running contrary to "the *image* of an educated and well-off Anglo-Indian community." The

sound of her articulation of the English language, though, challenges the viewer's efforts to distinguish a clean break that would demarcate her as exception: it recalls the "educated and well-off Anglo-Indian community"'s being entrusted with the pedagogical transmission of the English language and English literature in post-colonial India.[13] This incommensurability underscores itself at multiple moments. Inscribing itself in the image of law in the Daily Wage Scheme that Texeira signs using the Roman alphabet, the English language functions as the signifier of Texeira's transition from a not-quite/not-white "*Memsahib*" to an impoverished *Adivasi* "*mazdoor*" [laborer] (Singh). Texeira's embellished use of the Roman alphabet, though, signifies an interruption to the seamlessness this transition would otherwise possess. The disjunction between the image of the *Adivasi* "*mazdoor*" and the sound of the English language, can thus be said to reside in the cultural value attributed to the English language—a value that works by reinforcing the colonial prestige associated with English, even as Texeira's visual Indianization beyond such a simplistic equation, depletes the value. What began as a documentary apparently focusing on the migrancy that characterized younger generations of Anglo-Indians, seems now to shift its focus to a question of language.

The matter of language enhances its sprawl when the documentary, toward its end, shifts its focus from Texeira to Glen Joseph Galstaun, the Anglo-Indian Member of Legislative Assembly for Jharkhand. Galstaun says, "We [Anglo-Indians] are more Indian than Anglo…We have taken from the Indian society a lot, we have learned a lot, adapted ourselves, and…vice versa" (Singh). In saying this, Galstaun evokes Jawaharlal Nehru's mantra of cultural Indianization, according to which both the 'foreign' and the 'indigenous' draw benefits through intercultural osmosis (Guttman 24). He simultaneously invokes Anthony's call to Anglo-Indians to culturally Indianize in a decolonized India. However, following this statement of cultural

symbiosis, Galstaun says, “The other side also, they have taken a lot from us, where language is concerned. Before, the English language was only thought to be the language, mother-tongue of the Anglo-Indians. But today you find everybody speaking in English, and they speak the accent that an Anglo-Indian speaks.” In making this assertion, Galstaun indicates that the English language could only have carved a path into cultural Indianization insofar as this path followed an example set by Anglo-Indians. The statement is not completely to be dismissed, given the Constituent Assembly’s 1949 codification of reservations for Anglo-Indians to teach English (Bear 152). Galstaun’s claim is, on the other hand, problematic because in its emphasis on accent, it suggests that some monolithic Anglo-Indian example has inevitably been the rule for the Indianization of English (Singh). This suggestion is knotty because the modern Indian intelligentsia could not, in every case, have depended on Anglo-Indian teachers to draw the English language within their cultural ambit, particularly after 1960, at which point the reservations for Anglo-Indian teachers were discontinued (Bear 152). Furthermore, contrary to Indians using a monolithic Anglo-Indian accent, many Anglo-Indians use their own dialects of English, collectively called ‘chi-chi,’ with differences among such dialects noticeable across India (Anthony 374). These dialects were, in addition, often avoided by upper-class Hindus in colonial India who, perceiving Anglo-Indians pejoratively, associated ‘chi-chi’ in its multiple variations, with Anglo-Indian ‘fallenness’ (Buettner 86).[14] Moreover, the English language had not been the only linguistic terrain on which Anglo-Indians functioned since at least the second quarter of the nineteenth century: non-Christian Anglo-Indians had multiple cultural and religious affiliations, leading many of them to identify themselves outside evangelization and the English language (Mallampalli 143).

With the documentary ending on this note of both identification and caveat, the viewer is left wondering if Texeira would count as part of Galstaun's "other side," given her juridical status as an *Adivasi*. As a figure of Anglo-Indian racial background who fails to function as an unqualified metonym of an Anglo-Indian homeland, Texeira is, in the documentary, an exception with a proviso. Her linguistic signification complicates pulls and pushes for varying degrees of her assimilation into "the other side." It also interrogates the horizons of possibility that Texeira opens to the English language and, by extension, to McCluskieganj itself. Within the body of the documentary, then, the question of language muddles the notion of McCluskieganj as an Anglo-Indian homeland.

Though he had spoken of racial endogamy when discussing the marital trends of Anglo-Indians, Anthony had, almost in the same breath, set aside the question of exception or proviso; he emphasized that despite preconceived notions about their colonial leanings by a post-colonial Hindu-majoritarian India, Anglo-Indians needed to be recognized as figures inhabiting "the other side" in a state of political and cultural liminality. As if to this end, in his 1969 historiography of the Anglo-Indian community, he constructed what I read as a teleology by which a composite cultural Indianization could carve its way *into* the English language, robbing the language of its colonial sting. This teleology would make for an interesting starting point in examining the status of the English language vis-à-vis an imagined Anglo-Indian homeland—a homeland that, rather than being defined by tropes of exception or exclusivity, can, as I discuss, perhaps be viewed as an open-ended space of fluid racial and cultural configurations.

"There are No Half-Castes:" Frank Anthony and the Indianization of English

With the end of British colonialism in sight, Nehru, as the first Prime Minister of decolonized India, was intent on mapping the nation in a way that would set aside language as a

principle for the organization of political communities. According to him, this was important because the strengthening of regional identities would impede the consolidation of the new nation (Tillin 29). After all, regionalisms, by his assessment, tended to assign primacy to a region as value, in comparison with the nation as value, be the regionalist tendency in question cultural, linguistic, economic, political, or administrative (Das Gupta 54).

The first map of India after decolonization left the contours of the provinces of British India largely untouched, while merging in the territories of the erstwhile princely states. For all his attempts to sideline the notion of creating linguistically homogenous provinces, though, Nehru could not make burgeoning linguistic nationalisms subside. To follow up on his concerns about avoiding the formation of states on linguistic lines, the Constituent Assembly of India established a Linguistic Provinces Commission in 1948. The Commission considered the demands made by speakers of Telugu, Malayalam, Kannada, and Marathi, for states organized in regional linguistic terms. With the 1953 decision to create the state of Andhra, followed by the appointment of a States Reorganisation Commission [SRC], by the mid-1950s Article 3 of the Constitution had been drawn upon to reorganize states in the south of India, along the lines of dominant linguistic communities.[15] This resulted in the creation of the states of Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, and Karnataka. The SRC subsequently reported that for the creation of future states, an approach should be followed within which linguistic homogeneity would be made an important principle but not the guiding one. It accordingly opposed the division of erstwhile Bombay City into separate Gujarati- and Marathi-speaking states. By 1960, though, the challenges to the hegemony of the Congress majority in Bombay City resulted in the formation of the separate linguistic states of Gujarat and Maharashtra. These and other subsequent calls for separate states, helped the nation accommodate the regionalist cultural nationalisms that the calls

generated. The means for this accommodation was paved through the political recognition of the various identities generated within these new states—identities that drew on differences of caste, class, region, and sub-state regions (Tillin 29-39). In the long run, then, this concession assisted Nehru's project for the consolidation of the nation—it helped the decolonized Indian nation-state manage these nationalisms by keeping secessionist tendencies within controlled limits, thus allowing India to be held together as a nation.[16]

This entire process of the accommodation of regionalisms, though, was made complex by factors relating to the Indian Constitution's 1950 declaration, that Hindi in Devanagari script was to be the official language of the Union Government of India (George 25). While the Official Languages Commission formed in 1955 had, in keeping with Nehru's desire for national cohesion, insisted that language was to be "the garb which must be tailored to the requirements of the body politic," the Constitution's declaration of Hindi as the official language was partially responsible for the formation of the southern states, the calls of these states for linguistic autonomy emerging from, among other factors, their resistance to Hindi as a symbol of north Indian domination. The complications were enhanced by the fact that even as the Hindu right, with assistance from Hindu traditionalists within the Indian National Congress, tried since at least 1951 to establish Hindi as the 'national language' of decolonized India, Hindi was at best a vague mixed language—one that could not be put into practice as envisaged in theory, as I will discuss shortly.[17] Convoluting matters further, though English was the most significant link language coordinating the regions of India, and the chief language of national administration and academic communication, it was declared the secondary official language (Das Gupta 35-45).

Against this backdrop, in part of his extensive text about the need for the political assimilation of Anglo-Indians into post-colonial India, *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of*

the Anglo-Indian Community (1969), Anthony tries to explain why English—"the language of the Anglo-Indian Community"—had not been fully recognized as Indianized along cultural and, by extension, political lines (281). As I will show, Anthony attributes this failure to the incomplete execution of Hindi in practice as initially theorized. Additionally, he indicates how, when this execution can be taken to its limits, English will officially complete its process of indigenization in a decolonized India.

In his book, Anthony articulates his worries about the future of Anglo-Indians in post-colonial India, given the lack of protections extended to them as a statistical minority. His means of establishing the case for Anglo-Indians as a minority in need of federal protection, interestingly, finds expression in his claim that Anglo-Indians be constituted as a linguistic, and not as a racial or statistical, minority (Anthony 280).

In the absence of safeguards for Anglo-Indians from the Center, Anthony expresses worries about Anglo-Indians living in states dominated by linguistic nationalisms because

> [though i]t is absolutely correct that the minorities must learn to look to and live among the majority in [a] particular State…when we recognise [sic] that the minorities have all manner of difficulties, that these difficulties will be accentuated a hundredfold because of the linguistic passions that have been aroused [in a state], we must provide adequate machinery at the Centre for their ultimate protection. (280)

Anthony accordingly recommends the Constitutional definition of Anglo-Indians as a linguistic minority, against the setting of the December 1953 prohibition in Bombay on the admission of non-Anglo-Indians in Anglo-Indian schools. He simultaneously considers Gujarat University's 1962 outlawing of the usage of the English language (283-87). These prohibitions on Anglo-Indians and on the English language needed, he suggests, to be viewed in conjunction

because multiple linguistic nationalisms defined themselves against the "continuing memories of foreign rule," as a result of which "the lingering resentment against the Englishman is often transposed against English, which happens to be the language of the Anglo-Indian Community, [Anglo-Indians being] the main purveyors of the English medium. In [multiple] States insidious policies to undermine or stifle [Anglo-Indian English-medium] schools are current" (281; emphasis added).[18] Anthony's claim is thus that Anglo-Indians need to be politically recognized as a linguistic minority because though "the language of the Anglo-Indian Community" is also the "the link language in the pattern of higher education through the Country," English will not be given right of way into cultural Indianization by simple means, given the anticolonial ressentiment with which it is viewed by multiple linguistic nationalisms (287).

The post-colonial life of the English language was, according to Anthony, most endangered by the nationalism exercised by "Hindi chauvinists" and "Hindi Imperialism" (287-89). While Anthony does not clarify which groups he is referring to, it can be inferred that he is collectively alluding to 1. the Hindu traditionalists within the ruling Indian National Congress, who tried to exalt Hindi to the status of a 'national' language after the decolonization of India, 2. the Hindu right-wing Bharatiya Jana Sangh that did the same after its own inception in 1951, and 3. "Hindi fanatics" located in the Hindi Heartland in general, and in the state of Uttar Pradesh in particular (Tillin 37; Anthony 303).[19] These were groups that, says Anthony, had, "in their ill-concealed hatred for English…deluded themselves into the belief that if they destroy English, Hindi, by some magical process, will take its place" as the 'national' language, merely because the Constitution of India had declared it the official language of the country in 1950.[20] Consequently, when the Language Commission appointed in June 1955, called for the curbing of

haste in the imposition of Hindi across India, these groups brushed aside the suggestion (Anthony 291).

Against this setting, Anthony writes about the VIIIth Schedule of the Constitution and its links to Hindi and to certain linguistic minorities. This Schedule was promulgated to extend cultural and educational protections to linguistic minorities, through the legal recognition and induction of these minorities' languages within the body of the Schedule. At the same time, according to Article 351 of the Constitution, the Schedule would

> promote the spread of the Hindi language to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and…secure [Hindi's] enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expressions used in Hindustani and in the other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule. (Constitutional Provisions)

Hindi would thus, in theory, need to draw upon the vocabularies of the 14 languages listed in the first version of the Schedule, in order to develop itself as a mixed language. Keeping this in mind, Anthony introduced a resolution in August 1959 to the effect that English needed to be protected through its inclusion in the VIIIth Schedule because

> English is as much an Indian language as the other languages of India…In fact…English is the language of the Anglo-Indians and as much entitled to protection as any other language spoken by any other section or community in the Country…it is the language of the Constitution,…the sole official language…it was the language of the courts, of the High Courts and the Supreme Court. All laws, orders and notifications had to be in English: it was the only authoritative language of legislation.[21] (293)

The noteworthy point in this passage is that even as he concedes the status of English as the official lingua franca of India, Anthony urges the Constitutional treatment of English as the language of a linguistic minority. By making this claim, he extends the proposal that English needs recognition and protection by the Constitution because in the absence of this protection, the administrative machinery of the still young decolonized India—the machinery to which he calls for this protection—may, in due course, no longer be recognized or even protected for its part, encased as the letter of the law is in English. Making this claim, Anthony attempted to protect Anglo-Indians as a largely English-speaking minority, from the perceived threat of nationalisms in the various states. His intent was to ensure that these nationalisms could not subject Anglo-Indians to harassment, out of a welling sense of anticolonial ressentiment against Anglo-Indians' "foreign" linguistic and racial affiliations: "I pointed out that when anybody says that my language is foreign, a stab of pain shoots through me…[I]f we…demanded our rights…no one from the Prime Minister downwards would have dared to insult my Community by referring to our language as 'foreign'." If English were inducted into the VIIIth Schedule, such allegations of 'foreignness' could, he felt, never be used against Anglo-Indians, because the allegations would be tantamount to questioning the civil and military machinery of decolonized India: "Our parliamentary system is foreign, our tanks and jet planes are foreign, but nobody condemns these for that reason" (Anthony 294-95).

Anthony's plea for the inclusion of English in the VIIIth Schedule was refused because, as per his retrospective assessment of the situation, "Jawaharlal Nehru [was] not a free agent politically" (295). This refusal, Anthony states, was opposed to the full cultural Indianization of English that the Sahitya Akademi—India's national academy of letters—had conferred upon the language, having, in February 1959, included it "as among the major Indian languages" in

addition to the 14 languages stipulated in the first version of the VIIIth Schedule. The Senate of Calcutta University had, in July 1958, also asserted that English should be included in the VIIIth Schedule (Anthony 293).

The refusal to induct English, Anthony suggests, posed as much of a problem for the protection of Anglo-Indians as it did for the development of Hindi. After all, if Hindi had to borrow from the languages of the VIIIth Schedule to develop itself as a language applicable to all arenas of Indian life, it had also to draw liberally upon English as the link language of India. This engagement with English, Anthony indicates, was necessary for Hindi to complete its teleological journey toward development as "a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India," because "Some of the languages mentioned in the VIIIth Schedule…[we]re not" "highly developed"—ostensibly unlike English (294; 326).[22] Additionally, many of the languages in the VIIIth Schedule "ha[d] not got the necessary literature" to be deemed fully-flowered, English evidently being the touchstone against which Anthony posits this assertion of lack (Anthony 326).[23]

True to Anthony's assertions, Hindi had, in the 1960s, yet to develop itself as a singular Indian language defined by a composite cultural intermixture: the 1951 Census determined that Hindi was spoken by 42% of the Indian population; in the 1961 Census, Hindi was said to be spoken by 30% of the population--except that this percentage also combined the figures for Hindustani, Punjabi, and Urdu because all these languages, as part of the VIIIth Schedule, had their vocabularies drawn upon by Hindi, and were therefore made to collectively count under the linguistic rubric of Hindi (Das Gupta 33).[24]

By its exclusion from the VIIIth Schedule, English failed to secure Anglo-Indians the status of a linguistic minority, while Hindi, Anthony hints, was in turn unable to complete its

journey toward a telos of full cultural development. After all, the absence of India's unofficial link language in the VIIIth Schedule rendered Hindi a "symbol of retrogression" because it sounded "more foreign than English" (Anthony 341; Guttman 24).[25] In its failure to make its way into the English language and miscegenate with it, Hindi, by extension, juridically refused the "elements of the composite culture of India," disabling the official recognition of India's link language—"the language of the Anglo-Indian Community"—as Indianized.[26]

Very importantly, even as Anthony's text expresses the failure of Anglo-Indians to count as an Indianized linguistic minority, it posits the official inability of the Anglo-Indians' father tongue to intermix with Hindi, in opposition to an indefinite and inevitable racial intermixture that, for all practical purposes, defines Anglo-Indians—or, indeed, any community juridically marked by ethnic terminology. According to Anthony, though a citizen of India be legally recognized as Anglo-Indian based on the tracing of her patrilineage to British or, more broadly, to white European, blood, a juridically-articulated "urge for purity among the impure…would seem not a little ridiculous for a community of mixed blood…implying, as it were, an insistence on being 'genuine' half-castes" (368-69). Of the Anglo-Indians trying to pass for British because of the interdictions imposed upon them after the Sepoy Mutiny, Anthony says, "They failed to realise [sic] that there is no such thing as racial purity…[M]iscegenation represents the biological history of mankind…"There are no half-castes because there are no full-castes"" (370).

The point that Anthony makes, in the final reckoning, renders closed categorizations of 'Anglo-Indianness' precarious. Anthony adds that if racial intermixture has biologically produced "the finest types of the so-called unmixed races…[as] exemplified in the history of the Anglo-Indian Community[, i]t is also significant that Hindus…who have married Europeans have produced some of the most outstanding Indians" (370-71). Anthony genders the categories

"Hindu" and "European" in this sentence, indicating that if the recognition of an Anglo-Indian identity in terms of race is juridically based on patrilineage, then an "outstanding Indian" citizen born of European matrilineage, can, in practice, be located on the same plane of ethnic intermixture. In other words, the "outstanding" Indian citizen in question need not necessarily lie outside parameters of Anglo-Indian identification, given that Anglo-Indians cannot be defined only in terms of one kind of racial intermixture and not another. There is, after all, no "'genuine' Anglo-Indian" community, to use Anthony's phrase (368).

In this racial paradigm where, in practice, there can be no exclusion within an Anglo-Indian collective, based on gender or marriage, Kitty Texeira of McCluskieganj cannot necessarily count as an exception vis-à-vis an Anglo-Indian racial identity, her juridical identification as an *Adivasi* notwithstanding. McCluskieganj can, for its part, no longer be deemed an Anglo-Indian homeland in terms of an identifiable racial exclusivity; accordingly, it cannot articulate claims about an originary Anglo-Indian identity awaiting reification. In sites like McCluskieganj there is, then, no room for the fixing of exceptions a la Anglo-Indians as sexually-seditious figures. After all, racial and sexual codification is preceded by the indeterminate racial and sexual intermixture that forges the codifier. In other words, a figure who adjudges the racial position of another as sexually unsettling, can no longer do so because both his 'other' and he are embodied by nebulous miscegenation, as opposed to closed racial rubrics.[27] In accordance, English—the "language of the Anglo-Indian Community"—can be said to inhabit a significatory universe where linguistic intermixture is, like racial intermixture, unavoidable outside the Constitutional parameters of the VIIIth Schedule. Invalidating readings of cultural, class, and shock value attributable to English, the language that Anthony uses to identify Anglo-Indians as a linguistic minority, now seamlessly transits to Galstaun's "other side." Associations

of the English language with both *Memsahib* and *mazdoor* are now within the realms of possibility. No longer does the letter of the law interrupt the transition of Texeira from one figuration to another in her capacity as an Anglo-Indian. Additionally, despite the Constitutional caveats attached to Hindi as a composite signifier of India's linguistic diversity, the miscegenation of Hindi—and, by extension, the intermixture of the languages it derives its vocabularies from—with English, can now be perceived clearly in the body of Singh's documentary. Texeira's identification as an "Indian *mazdoor*" vis-à-vis her racially-intermixed body, finds expression in a linguistic twain not expected to meet: the cultural Indianization of the "*sahibs* of the Raj" through the incursion of a miscegenative "*chapatti* [lit. an unleavened Indian flatbread; figuratively "mixed"] culture" into "McCluskie's *ganj* [lit. market town]"—disqualifying the town's colonial-era claims to being a "*chhota* [lit. "little"] England"--become distinct in the voice over's statements (Singh). Racial intermixture thus seamlessly intersects with linguistic intermixture in a community, regardless of the juridical definitions that would demarcate that community as a closed body.

This linguistic miscegenation is, however, complicated by McCluskieganj's location in Jharkhand—a state founded on regional nationalist claims to *Adivasi* autonomy. The demand for autonomy recalls Anthony's worries about Anglo-Indians in the context of India's regional nationalisms. Given the indeterminate intersection of racial and linguistic intermixture that would define any community along open-ended lines, it is an interesting exercise to mull over what the status of an unofficial 'Anglo-Indian homeland' might be, in a state demarcated by the federal recognition of a local nationalism. Drawing upon Anthony's commentary on Anglo-Indian racial and linguistic miscegenation, I conduct a reading of Hindi journalist and novelist Vikas Kumar Jha's novel on McCluskieganj to discuss this status of the town.

An Aphasic Passage to India

Jha wrote two versions of his novel *McCluskieganj*—a Hindi version published circa 1998, and an Anglophone version published in 2015. The Anglophone version, while maintaining the plotline of the Hindi version, adds to it in an effort to update the novel vis-à-vis the formation of the state of Jharkhand in 2000. Because the Anglophone version essentially supplements the Hindi version like a sequel would, I will consider the two in conjunction.

The protagonist of the novel, Robin McGowan, is the son of Anglo-Indian parents hailing from McCluskieganj. When he was a child, his parents had migrated with him to Hong Kong, in search of better job prospects that were unavailable to them in their hometown.[28] With his father Dennis running a publishing house in Hong Kong, Robin decides to write an ethnographic book about McCluskieganj. Arriving at McCluskieganj to conduct ethnographic research about the town's history and inhabitants, Robin gets himself involved in rejuvenating the town's monetary infrastructure by trying to set up a tourist industry in it. He simultaneously extends assistance to the *Adivasi* inhabitants of the town who are, for their part, fighting for political autonomy from the tentacular clutches of the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha [JMM], the foremost political party demanding the creation of Jharkhand as a separate tribal state.[29]

Because of his political activism on behalf of the *Adivasis* living in and around McCluskieganj, Robin finds himself facing legal charges of being a "foreign agent" who was working to undermine the credibility of the JMM. He is subsequently arrested (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 391). Eventually freed, and—in the Anglophone version of the novel—continuing his activism to ensure self-sufficiency among the *Adivasis*, Robin and his *Adivasi* wife and fellow-activist Neelmani are murdered in the aftermath of the formation of the state of Jharkhand, ostensibly by figures associated with the JMM. At the closing of this Anglophone

version, after Robin and Neelmani are murdered, Dennis determines that the newborn son of the duo, Birsa Brian McGowan—named after tribal revolutionary Birsa Munda—shall continue his parents' fight for *Adivasi* self-sufficiency in a politically-ravaged Jharkhand.

Contrary to the Colonization Settlement of India's claim that McCluskieganj was inaugurated to help its Anglo-Indian settlers associate with their white forefathers' affect of colonizing new lands, the Hindi version of the novel opens with Dennis saying that Ernest McCluskie had founded the town to help fight the anticolonial ressentiment displaced by the native Indian majority upon Anglo-Indians.[30] The inauguration of McCluskieganj as an apparently agrarian settlement would help this project by proving that "In the land of villages that is India," "these 'Brown' *Sahebs* and *Memsahebs*…could also live the life of the villages," "becoming rural Anglo-Indians" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 4). Against this backdrop, Mr. Miller, the landlord of the guest house Robin stays in, both alludes to and re-coordinates the CDCEC's claim that Anglo-Indians lacked a work ethic and therefore lived 'un-European' lifestyles: he tells Robin that the Anglo-Indian settlers at McCluskieganj failed to become "rural Anglo-Indians" because they refused to "shed their false garb of *Sahebs*, learn to earn for themselves and their families…[T]hey still behaved as if they were of the *Saheb* class, refusing to dirty their hands…[T]hey could not become farmers, refused to become workers" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 239). This recalls the claim in Singh's documentary that the Anglo-Indians in McCluskieganj generally refused to become "Indian *mazdoors*." Interestingly, in the documentary, it is Jha himself who makes this claim (Singh). If, then the CDCEC accused Anglo-Indians of not being European enough, Miller suggests that contrary to Anthony's exhortations to the Anglo-Indians to Indianize, McCluskieganj's settlers clung on to their pride in their European racial ancestry, and refused to assimilate into India after it was decolonized. This, the novel indicates, played a

large part in causing the mass exodus of Anglo-Indians from their 'lost' homeland in search of exilic harbors (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 239).

Miller's accusation against the Anglo-Indians harks back to the "split psychology" that, as per Anthony, Anglo-Indians generally inhabited because of the racial "renegadism" to which the British subjected them.[31] Because of this split, one of the Anglo-Indian inhabitants of McCluskieganj, Mr. Mendez, claims in the novel's Anglophone version, that the town was still in "thralldom to the English." Ergo, the affair between Prince Charles and Camilla Parker Bowles, and the politics of Conservatives and the Labour Party, constituted the stuff of everyday discussion among the inhabitants (Jha, *The Story* 152). This "thralldom" additionally cut the Indian nation off from the horizons of the town's Anglo-Indians who, according to the Hindi version of the novel, refused to politically engage with the mechanisms of the Indian nation-state: they had "never raise[d] a voice for anything, never…come together to unite and voice their demands for anything," because "there is no question of [their] affiliating [them]selves with any political party of this country" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 405). Indeed, even though the inhabitants are, as members of a statistical minority, always already politicized through the representation they receive in the provincial and central legislatures of the Indian state, they express an inability to recognize the political—and, by extension, the synecdochic manifestation of the Indian nation-state—within McCluskieganj.[32] This myopia cripples them into not realizing that they are politically reinforcing 'Anglo-Indian' as a closed racial category within McCluskieganj qua 'Anglo-Indian' homeland: in an "urge for purity among the impure," they lay claim to being "the original Anglos," rearticulating a monolithic Anglo-Indian identity via post-1857 discursive lines of patrilineal and interracial marriage (Jha, *The Story* 77). Furthering their definition of their racial "purity" against an "impure" other, they borrow from the structure of

caste as practiced by the *Adivasis* of the town; contradicting Anthony's delineation of 'Anglo-Indian' as an open-ended category founded on indefinite intermixtures of race, they ostracize Anglo-Indian women who have married *Adivasi* men, locating these women outside-within the confines of the town, and terming them "watered-down" Anglo-Indians (Jha, *The Story* 77).[33] One of these ostracized women is Kitty Texeira in a fictionalized avatar, with her claims to being an Anglo-Indian finding themselves "watered-down" through her miscegenative marriage to the novelistic version of Ramesh Munda. This ostracism interrupts the recognition of the entire spectrum of Anglo-Indians from *Memsahib* to *mazdoor* in McCluskieganj. Consequently, when Dennis McGowan, after a long hiatus, returns to the town from Hong Kong, and sees the fictionalized Texeira for the first time since his childhood, the sight of her reinstates the shock value of the Anglo-Indian qua "*mazdoor*" of Singh's documentary. Unable to reconcile "the *image* of an educated and well-off Anglo-Indian community" with the Texeira he saw before him, Dennis tells Robin of the sight,

> I have known her since her childhood…in *a sky blue frock*…her *golden hair* tied back in a red ribbon…her *blue eyes*…I saw her last time when I had gone back for your grandfather's funeral…at first glance, I could not recognise her…she was in *very ordinary clothes; clothes dripping with poverty*…her wheat crop like beautiful *golden hair all dirty and straggly*…her eyes were sunken. (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 29-30; emphasis added)

Augmenting the shock value of this "*Memsaheb*"'s body become 'un-European' in its features and sartorial appendages, the sight of Texeira "dirtying her hands" to "become a farmer," delimits Dennis' idealization of McCluskie's "rural Anglo-Indian" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 29; 71). Dennis is also yet to come to terms with the fact that Texeira "married *that tribal*," and that their

juridically *Adivasi* daughter Sylvia, born of miscegenation, images and embodies a "watered-down" Anglo-Indian racial identity: "[Sylvia] was exactly like Kitty in looks…yes, her complexion was a little dusky…*tribal colour seemed to have blended with the golden*" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 31-32; emphases added). The printed page of the novel's Hindi version embodies Dennis' horror through the frequent and incoherent ellipses that punctuate his reveries about Texeira. This horror—reinforced by Sylvia's position as a miscegenated anomaly born outside-within McCluskieganj's Anglo-Indian collective—recalls the specter of the Anglo-Indian qua sexual and racial aberration, thus helping buttress the self-bordering of McCluskieganj's "original Anglos."

In the interruption thrust upon Texeira and her caste-ilk within the novel, they too are rendered aphasic, contradicting the indefinitely-intermixed linguistic eloquence that Anthony would attribute to them. Reacting with bitterness at her exclusion from McCluskieganj's 'pure half-caste' collective, Texeira cannot find it in her to speak to Dennis, for all Dennis' efforts to "scratch through her outer shell" and reach her not-quite/not-white/not-*Adivasi* core. She remains silent through the rest of the novel. The only instance in which she does indeed try to sublate her bitterness and attempt to vocalize another sentiment—that of gratitude to Robin for his efforts to resuscitate the infrastructure of McCluskieganj—she can only cry in silence, and then exit from the scene. When Robin asks Miller why Texeira "went off without saying anything at all," Miller responds, "son, she [has] sa[id] everything she wanted" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 382).

Miss Bonner—an elderly inhabitant of McCluskieganj who eventually becomes Robin's mentor for his ethnographic project—seems unable to perceive the *sahib*dom's articulation of its selfhood through the fracturing of the town's Anglo-Indian collective. She does, however, decry the insularity from the rest of the Indian nation, that her fellow-Anglo-Indians have apparently

sustained in McCluskieganj, given their anachronistic "thralldom to the English." Her ideal is that of a McCluskieganj inducted through political recognition into an Indianizing nationhood—a nationhood founded on the mantra that "There is unity in diversity" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 215). Taking Nehru's writings as the embodiment of this mantra, she venerates "The emotion of patriotism, of nationhood, Of oneness and Equality of all men" that were expressed by "the great leaders of this nation through their speeches, the great writers through their writings" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 213; 218). According to her, "the very diversity of this nation, ties it together," but "it was language and sentiment that brought [this diversity] together." Adding to this, she claims that "to tie all Indians with one powerful thread, one needs a *Bhawan* [lit. "haven"/"home"]"—a unifying haven that she has tried to epitomize in her house by "refusing to name it Bonner Villa or…any such other name. It will be always called Bonner *Bhawan*." In her horizons, this interweaving of Hindi and English, that is, the cultural Indianization of "the language of the Anglo-Indian Community," is symbolic of the inclusion of an Anglo-Indian homeland into an India where "language covers and walks its entire strange journey" into oneness. This oneness that, she says, was necessary for the sustenance of a unified nationhood in India, would be facilitated by "Hindi ha[ving] been given the status of a national language"—a language assisting "Indians from the Himalayas to McCluskieganj" to be bound together (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 214-15; 289-90).

Even as Miss Bonner picturizes McCluskieganj's journey into nationhood in terms reminiscent of Anthony's teleology for the Indianization of English, she is mistaken about Hindi's status as the "national language" of India: as of now, India has no designated national language or languages. Additionally, insofar as Robin conceives of Hindi after interacting with inhabitants of Ranchi, he deems it a "local language" of Bihar (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 183). This

leads the reader to question Miss Bonner's conceptualization of how McCluskieganj qua Anglo-Indian homeland can enter "a feeling of nationhood" through the linguistic intermarriage of Hindi and English. The question is a particularly fraught one in the context of a homeland that is itself fractured rather than unified, rendering Miss Bonner's belief that "Where there is unity of language, the unity of feelings will also come," dubious. This dubiousness is paradoxically articulated through the linguistic muteness of the "watered-down" "rural Anglo-Indian" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 214-15).

How flawed Miss Bonner's conception of a seamless nationhood is, finds itself revealed in the instance of linguistic intermixture that she provides Robin with—an intermarriage that, located within her conception of Indian nationhood, finds its transcendental axiomatic in the marriage of Hindi and English. Kashmiri, a "modern language of India" has, Miss Bonner says, been "born out of the wedlock of Shina or Dardi group of Indo-Persian group of languages,…which was first influenced by the Aryan Sanskrit, then by Prakrit and later in the 14th century, by Persian" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 213; 291). While Miss Bonner's etymological knowledge of Kashmiri may be correct, Kashmir's territorial affiliations with India have been a matter of contestation since before decolonization to the present day.[34] Much as Miss Bonner would make a claim for "the feeling of nationhood" through the "unity of language," what she calls the "national" vis-à-vis language is in fact, by Robin's understanding, the disjunction between the primary official language of India, and a local or regional language in India's Hindi belt. Miss Bonner indeed does, at one point, interject her reveries about linguistic intermixture with a passing reference to the local when she says, "Hindi…has not been able to find roots all over because of the reaction to it, [given] the blind adherence to regional languages despite the passing of almost fifty years of independence" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 215).

In referring to the regional resistances to Hindi that I have alluded to, Miss Bonner decries the JMM and its call for Jharkhandi statehood: “Robin, no one is willing to accept the other now…From where will [the] feeling of nationhood appear[?]…feeling and language held us all together, there was mutual acceptance. But that is dried up now” (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 215). Indeed, Miss Bonner does attempt to inconsistently condemn the calls for separate states through a reference to *Adivasi* languages: “There is perhaps a department of [*Adivasi*] languages in Ranchi University” despite which, she says, these languages will die: “What condition will these languages like Santhali, Oraon, Nagpuria be?... don’t you expect the tribal languages to suffer?”. Ergo, she claims, “Hindi is a beleaguered language” in its inability to enrich itself through interactions with these languages. A unified nationhood—a transcendental “Bonner *Bhawan*”—accordingly becomes an endangered cause in her estimation (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 290-91).

Miss Bonner’s reflection on the deaths of *Adivasi* languages vis-à-vis a unifying national language, is inconsistent because she tries to dismiss the Centre for Tribal Languages and Literatures in Ranchi University: the inauguration of the Centre in 1980 was in fact part of the call for linguistic and cultural revivalism made by the Jharkhand Coordination Committee [JCC], an organization that brought together the different groups that were fighting for the formation of the state of Jharkhand. The JCC and the Centre, then, played their own parts in ensuring the resuscitation of *Adivasi* languages, ensuring that these were not “beleaguered.” However, in this contribution to nationhood, the JCC and the Centre’s self-location was firmly entrenched in the call for a separate state. Rather than dismissing calls for statist separation as a hindrance in the path of a unified nationhood, then, languages—living, resuscitating, and “beleaguered”—may perhaps be viewed in terms of fruitful political conjunctures that they form at certain moments

with these calls (Tillin 85).[35] Such conjunctures, and the resultant disjunctions that rear up between the federal/official and the regional/local can, from this point of view, be said to contribute to nationhood through the rise of local nationalisms—nationalisms that, with their own "feeling and language," interject with and ultimately mesh into a unified national body. Miss Bonner and the other Anglo-Indian inhabitants of McCluskieganj do not see this as a means for national unification, and bemoan the formation of separate states. For instance, Mr. Mendez says, "Gorkhaland, Bodoland, now Jharkhand to be followed by demands for Uttarakhand in the northern hills of Kumaon and Garhwal in U.P. Where will it all end?…Just look at the newspapers—every day there seems to be some new corner of the country ready to go up in blazes over a fresh demand for a separate homeland" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 295). The Anglo-Indian inhabitants' own "separate homeland" that is locally but not officially recognized, makes for an interesting matter for examination in the context of the connections between the federal and the local.

Robin, in the course of the novel, falls in love with Neelmani, the daughter of his father's onetime *Adivasi* friend Bahadur Oraon. Bahadur is an activist working to build an "Atmaraksha Samiti" [lit. "self-protection group"], an organization that will equip the *Adivasis* living in and around McCluskieganj, with economic self-sufficiency. His is a movement which recognizes that the JMM has, in its allocation of priority to the call for Jharkhandi statehood, failed to provide these *Adivasis* the 'ideal' community it had promised them, making for a disjunction within the local itself (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 363).[36] Viewing Bahadur as a threat to its movement for statehood, the JMM has him arrested. The cause of the Atmaraksha Samiti comes to a halt with the arrest. When Robin starts working in tandem with Neelmani to rejuvenate the Samiti, he too is arrested by the police—working under the JMM's orders—on charges of being a "foreign

agent." His "fair skin" is used as proof of his 'foreign' origins. Indianization through the ethnic liminality of 'indigenous' and 'foreign' finds itself a far cry in this scenario (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 391).

Enraged at Robin's arrest, the inhabitants of McCluskieganj head toward the local police station where Robin is held captive, and call for his release. Because these inhabitants had never affiliated themselves with politics, and had never overtly engaged with the mechanisms of the nation-state,

> The policemen on duty were amazed to see the Anglo-Indians…and asked each other what had brought them there—they had never seen the Anglo-Indians raise a voice for anything, never heard them coming together to unite and voice their demands for anything…and they wondered what it was that had brought them together…that arrest…of someone by the name of Robin whose name the protesters mentioned so often. (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 405)

In this first encounter that the members of the Anglo-Indian homeland have with a regionalism that was the stuff of their derision and dismissal, they face a lathi charge (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 407-08). The shock of her first rendezvous with a nationalism that interjects its way into her idealized Indian nationhood, proves too much for Miss Bonner: she has a paralytic attack that, much like her homeland fragmented into a closed inside and its 'other,' leaves her body fragmented, freezing up her left side. Proponent of a unified nationhood that she defined in terms of linguistic intermixture, Miss Bonner is, ironically, never able to speak again, much like her novelistic "watered-down" counterpart, Texeira (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 413). In its sudden confrontation with the JMM—and, on a larger scale, with the nation that corroborates the JMM through official political recognition—McCluskieganj enters a disjunctive corridor into a federal

nationhood. This is the beginning of its march toward Indianization that may eventually free it from its "thralldom to the English."

Toward the end of the Hindi version of the novel, Robin is freed by a lawyer and is betrothed to Neelmani. Declaring this betrothal and his intent to relocate to McCluskieganj, Dennis ruminates on two sentences by "an Anglo-Indian author:" "If England is the land of our fathers,...India is the land of our mothers…If to us England is a hallowed memory…India is a living verity" (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 446). The lines are from Anglo-Indian activist Herbert Alick Stark's 1926 *Hostages to India, Or The Life Story of the Anglo Indian Race*—a polemic whose contents are summed up by a question Stark poses on its last page: "WHEN FULL MEASURE OF SELF GOVERNMENT IS GIVEN TO INDIA, WHAT WILL BE THE FATE OF OUR DESCENDANTS AND KINSMEN IN THAT LAND?" (98; capitals in the original).[37] Evidently, the novel ends on the note that McCluskieganj is yet to Indianize because in its "split psychology," it is haunted by the wilderness it perceives decolonized India to be. Hence, perhaps, the settlers' self-cloistering in their imagined homeland, with their 'others' helping strengthen their depleting sense of a colonial selfhood. Given its constitution in terms of a spatio-temporal disjunction and self-fracturing, McCluskieganj's way into and through the "living verity" of Indian nationhood, unsurprisingly starts off on a disorienting and discordant note. The Anglophone version of Jha's novel offers a resolution that may help the town shake itself out of its many fractures, and begin its passage to India.

Spilling Open the Borders: Leaving Sexual Sedition Behind

With the fragmentation of Miss Bonner's body into partial paralysis, the fragmentation of McCluskieganj into self-definition in terms of racial "purity among the impure," comes into sharp focus. This problematizes 'Anglo-Indian' as a racial category that was, by Anthony's

interpretation, inherently delineated by an open-ended racial intermixture. The notion of an 'Anglo-Indian homeland' founded on racial exclusivity, could thus be said to be at odds with the category 'Anglo-Indian' itself, there being no indication in the Hindi version of the novel, that Texeira and her caste-ilk are inducted into the town's mainstream. If McCluskieganj is to carve its way into nationhood, its Anglo-Indian inhabitants have first to problematize this disjunction by which they define themselves. The reader finds 'Anglo-Indian' as a closed rubric, melting when Robin is arrested and imprisoned in Ranchi Jail. While there, in the novel's Anglophone version, Robin gets to know that Birsa Munda had been imprisoned in a cell in Ward No. 5 of the same jail (Jha, *The Story* 254).[38]

Coming to identify his participation in the activities of the Atmaraksha Samiti, with Birsa Munda's leading of the anticolonial revolution on behalf of the Mundas, Robin, when freed, wishes to see Ward No. 5. The sight of it "filled [him] with emotion; he touched the bars of the cell with reverence and thought that Birsa Munda's vision was still to be realized, both his as well as Bahadur Oraon's" (Jha, *The Story* 254). Robin's self-identification with his father-in-law and, by extension, with Birsa Munda, functions in tandem with his racial identity as an inhabitant of an Anglo-Indian homeland, opening the category 'Anglo-Indian' to a fluid symbiosis. This symbiosis finds miscegenative articulation when Robin christens Neelmani and his biracial son Birsa Brian McGowan, bringing together the names of Robin's grandfather—one of the first settlers at McCluskieganj—and Birsa Munda. Mundari—a 'dying' *Adivasi* language, still awaiting inclusion in the VIIIth Schedule of the Constitution—intermixes with English signifiers in the name of this racially-mixed child. Birsa Brian McGowan, embodied by racial miscegenation with an *Adivasi*, has at least one precedent in the McCluskieganj of the novel—Texeira's daughter Sylvia, in whose body "tribal colour" blends with the fair. By patrilineal

marital terms, Birsa Brian would not count as a "watered-down" Anglo-Indian, unlike Sylvia. However, the question of his racial identity vis-à-vis Sylvia, is ultimately rendered unanswerable—aphasic—in an ethnic universe where "miscegenation represents the biological history of mankind."

With Birsa Munda functioning as the figure who inspires the name of Robin's child, and acting as the source of inspiration for the Atmaraksha Samiti's proto-nationalist *Adivasi* movement, McCluskieganj now fluidly meshes into a site for *Adivasi* autonomy. Unsurprisingly, when the state of Jharkhand is inaugurated in 2000, and minions of the JMM assassinate Robin and Neelmani for the Atmaraksha Samiti's anti-JMM stance (Jha, *The Story* 269-70),[39] Dennis and the other Anglo-Indian inhabitants of McCluskieganj look upon Birsa Brian as the figure who will continue Robin and Neelmani's activism. Dennis, taking Birsa in his lap, cries out, "Long live Robin and Neelmani!...Look, Robin and Neelmani are not gone. They are here in Birsa" who is "ordained by destiny" to have his name "affect his personality" (Jha, *The Story* 265; 269-71). With "*Mem Sahebs* and *Sahebs* and the glistening black tribals of the area" becoming one to exalt Birsa Brian as their guide toward *Adivasi* autonomy, the borders of McCluskieganj open beyond racial insularity into a path through discordant political corridors—a path that reaches out toward the heart of the nation (Jha, *McCluskieganj* 400). The linguistic miscegenation that signifies this incipient Anglo-Indian guide and leader, does not seamlessly dissolve the barriers dividing Hindi, from English, Mundari, and the other languages claiming political recognition in the VIIIth Schedule. However, the likelihood that these barriers will dissolve, finds itself embodied outside the plotline, in the linguistic framework of Jha's novel: the Anglophone version of the novel is, after all, the supplement to its 1998 Hindi version. In other words, Hindi and English have begun carving their way into each other in the novel's

structure, with Anthony's teleology for the Indianization of English sustaining itself as a possibility within this miscegenative textual body. This perhaps indicates that McCluskieganj's osmotic journey into "the other side" has already begun. Conceivably, then, "tribal colour seem[ing] to have blended with the golden," is no longer a sight of horror or shock—a specter of a racial aberration or of an outcast. Whether out of a sense of anticolonial ressentiment, figurations of Anglo-Indians as sexually seditious may still count as part of a greater Indian common sense, McCluskieganj's Anglo-Indians may, for their part, have begun to carve inroads into this common sense with unexpectedly overt confrontational political agency. The shock value of a Kitty Texeira is perhaps past its heyday, and whether as *Memsahib* or as *mazdoor*, she may have stepped outside the limits of Singh's camera lens.

---

[1] See Kenneth Ballhatchet's *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and their Critics, 1793-1905* (1980), Christopher Hawes' *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India, 1773-1833* (1996), and Satoshi Mizutani's *The Meaning of White: Race, Class, and the "Domiciled Community" in British India, 1858-1930* (2012).

[2] McCluskie claimed in 1935 that in helping forge McCluskieganj, he wanted to "'help [Anglo-Indians] to have a Home,' and to feel the joy and pride of possession of a real home of [their] very own" (Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora* 87). With pamphlets and cine-films helping proliferate this perception among the town's prospective Anglo-Indian settlers, the rhetoric of 'home' had, by 1939, shifted to that of a homeland that later advertisements and pamphlets helped the settlers collectively imagine. A 1939 advertisement published in the *Colonization Observer*—the mouthpiece of the CSI—has a real or fictional Anglo-Indian settler in McCluskieganj say, for instance, that "We Anglo-Indians are learning to look upon

McCluskiegunge [sic] as our *Mooluk* [lit. "homeland"]…No longer can it be said that we wander in a strange land," the land in question being India ("The proof of the pudding" 3-4). Multiple Anglo-Indians' perception of India as a "strange land"—a land they were exiled in—rested upon their belief that as the sons of white fathers, it was their birthright to live in England (Mizutani 10).

Though McCluskieganj was initiated as a town whose settlers would supposedly run it along agrarian line, providing for themselves by farming the plots of land allocated to them, what seemed to matter more to the CSI than the settlers' self-sufficiency, was that a considerable number of Anglo-Indians physically inhabit the space of the town. The training in agriculture that the CSI had promised these settlers in order to help them in their farming activities, was in fact not extended to them. In this, McCluskieganj is somewhat reminiscent of the CDCEC's schemes to maintain India's less-than-white populace in poverty by promising them vocational training, but selectively or never extending it to them (Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora* 83). To align the CDCEC and the CSI in an unfragmented genealogy, though, would perhaps be sweeping and misleading in the absence of sufficient archival proof.

[3] To the best of my limited knowledge, there are currently no extant archival accounts of contestation offered by the *Adivasis* against this appropriation of their lands.

[4] While the newspaper articles and documentaries almost inevitably describe McCluskieganj's status as that of an "Anglo-Indian homeland," in no way do they—or any sociological studies—indicate that McCluskieganj is officially recognized along these lines by the Indian state. The town's official recognition as an Anglo-Indian homeland, as far as can be gathered from Alison Blunt's study on it, ended with the decolonization of India (Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora* 72).

[5] For two representative documentaries conveying this message, see Dhiraj Singh's *McCluskie's Ganj: The Lost Home of the Anglos* (2012), and the Calcutta Tiljallah Relief's *Dreams of a Homeland* (2015).

Among the newspaper and magazine articles, see Uttam Sengupta's "Reviving chhota London" (2006) published in *The Telegraph*, Achintyarup Ray's "McCluskieganj: In an antique land" (2007) published in *The Times of India*, Saiful Haque's "McCluskieganj: The Little England of Jharkhand now in ruins" (2013) published in *India Today*, and Namita Kohli's "McCluskieganj: The burden of history" (2016) published in *The Hindustan Times*.

For the most rigorous sociological studies on McCluskieganj and its precarious status as an Anglo-Indian homeland, see Alison Blunt's *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home* (2005), and Hugh Purcell's *After the Raj: The Last Stayers-on and the Legacy of British India* (2011).

[6] Lok Sabha TV is the official Indian television channel that covers debates and discussions conducted in the lower house of Indian Parliament. It also telecasts other programs, including documentaries about material suggested to bear some popular cultural significance in decolonized India.

[7] The imminent prospect of a British 'transfer of power' was, since the early part of the twentieth century, creating considerable unease among elite Anglo-Indian circles, leading Anglo-Indian educator and activist Herbert Alick Stark to ask in his 1926 polemic *Hostages to India, Or The Life Story of the Anglo Indian Race*, "WHEN FULL MEASURE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT IS GIVEN TO INDIA, WHAT WILL BE THE FATE OF OUR DESCENDANTS AND KINSMEN IN THAT LAND?" (98; capitals in the original). Stark refers to "*that* land" to highlight the alienation from India that Anglo-Indians, by his assessment,

generally felt, England having been these Anglo-Indians' promised land prior to 1857. This theme of alienation leads Stark to close his book with the lines, "Ask us to sell our British heritage for a mess of political pottage. In every case the answer is clear…It leaps to our lips in the soul-stirring appeal – O ENGLAND! WHO ARE THESE [ANGLO-INDIANS] IF NOT THY SONS?" (Stark 98; capitals in the original).

[8] According to Anthony's 1969 historiography of Anglo-Indians, titled *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community*, Anglo-Indians generally had difficulty imagining themselves as a part of India because they inhabited a "split psychology"—a psychology that Anthony attributes to the fact that in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century India, British schools inducting Anglo-Indians "taught the pupils to look away from India and things Indian, to look up to everything British and to look down upon most things Indian." Anthony claims that because "the British Imperial system placed a premium on [racial] renegadism," it was only by officially negating their Indian racial and cultural affiliations that many Anglo-Indians could become members of the Viceroy's Execute Council, governors of provinces, and senior generals in the British army, the post-1857 juridical exception in the governmental employment of Anglo-Indians notwithstanding (384-85).

[9] According to an article published in *The Telegraph* in 2006, McCluskieganj was 400 Anglo-Indian families strong in the 1980s, and at present houses about 20 Anglo-Indian families (Sengupta). Contrary to what the article states, though, even at the height of its popularity in the 1940s, the town housed only about 300 Anglo-Indian families (Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora* 74).

[10] I use the term "Indianization" with some liberty in this chapter, while broadly alluding to the multiple coordinates appended to it by Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India.

By Nehru's usage, the term described, among other matters, the process of an anticolonial indigenization whereby Western cultural artifacts such as languages and customs, could be incorporated into preexisting Indian sociocultural formations. This cultural exchange and assimilation, was symptomatic of the mantra of "unity in diversity" that determined Nehru's conception of the decolonized Indian nation-state. Within this liminal cultural economy, the English language, according to Nehru, could not be regarded as a foreign tongue because Indians had made it their own, India's colonizers having been, in Nehru's schema, absorbed into the culture over which they ruled (Guttman 24). This disclaimer of a power differential regardless, traces of colonial power and prestige remain popularly linked to the English language in India, given the language's long association with the British empire (Bhatt 28).

Indianization as this form of cultural assimilation, was not shorn of an ethnic aspect when applied to groups that allowed their 'indigenous' and/or 'foreign' aspects to fit into a cultural mold—a mold through which the stranger would become the native (24). In this context, recall the CDCEC's claim that Anglo-Indians depleted white British imperialist prestige through their 'un-European' skin, and by living lifestyles that were no different from those of the native inhabitants of India. Within the limits of the documentary, Texeira, by my reading, functions as a figure who anachronistically performs this act of depletion in ethnic and class terms, bodily transiting from her onetime position as one of the "*sahibs* of the Raj"—as the voice over puts it—to the status an "Indian *mazdoor* [laborer]" (Singh).

[11] According to this Scheme inaugurated in August 2005, signatories will receive "livelihood security…by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year…[by] volunteer[ing] to do unskilled manual work and for matters connected

therewith and incidental thereto" (Pankaj 12). Thus, by signing up for the Scheme, the signatory, for all legal purposes, declares herself a financially-impoverished unskilled manual worker.

[12] Anthony states in *Britain's Betrayal in India* that it was this endogamy that caused the "growth of the [Anglo-Indian] Community especially after the Mutiny" (365). What Anthony refers to as "growth" was in fact the British codification of Anglo-Indians as a community separated from all claims to racial whiteness. Interracial marriage, the British had insinuated after 1857, was the only marital option left to Anglo-Indian men and women, because they could no longer marry their white counterparts. I have elucidated this point in the first chapter.

[13] In the second chapter of my dissertation, I have spoken of the association of Anglo-Indian teachers with cultural prestige, given their popular function as transmitters of the English language to non-Anglo-Indian students.

[14] For a fictionalized portrayal of these linguistic differences and how they defined and were defined by racial prejudices against Anglo-Indians, see Ismail Merchant's English-language film *Cotton Mary* (1999).

[15] Under Article 3, the Indian parliament can, by a simple majority, set stipulations for the federal formation of new states, and for the alteration of existing ones in terms of name or territorial area (Tillin 32).

[16] At the present moment, the calls for the creation of the separate state of Gorkhaland are being hotly contested. To quote from Basant Lama's *The Story of Darjeeling: The Land of the Indian Gorkha* (2009), ethnic Gorkhas inhabiting the town of Darjeeling—currently under the jurisdiction of the state of West Bengal—are demanding that Darjeeling be "*detached* from Bengal and restored to its status as a separate homeland for the Indian Gorkhas within the constitutional framework of India." This claim, writes Lama, is justified because "Historically

and geographically…*the people of Darjeeling* never were, and have no desire to ever be, part of the *State of Bengal*" (Koehler 160; emphasis in the original).

[17] The exact implications of the term 'national language' are vague. Taking only one among many subjective interpretations of this term, according to a Public Interest Litigation filed in 2010, the Central and State governments needed, according to the litigant, to make it mandatory for manufacturers to print the details of goods in Hindi because "many people speak in Hindi and write in Devanagari script." This linguistic trend, claimed the litigant, rendered Hindi's status as the national language of India, uncontestable (PTI).

[18] Anthony's description of Anglo-Indians as "purveyors of the English medium," recalls the reservations for Anglo-Indians as teachers of the English language in decolonized India. Anthony draws attention to this point later in the book, when he speaks about the services that Anglo-Indians have rendered to the cultural development of India (417).

[19] In this context, Anthony speaks at length about the gradual growth of resistance to Hindi in southern India through the 1960s, and of the Hindi Heartland's "spearhead[ing] Hindi chauvinism" in an "organized terror campaign" (303). He also describes the problems that could be introduced into the education systems of various states if Hindi were imposed as the sole medium of instruction in them (Anthony 338).

[20] This "deluded" belief probably stemmed to some extent from the fact that distinctions were rarely drawn between, and definitions left somewhat diffuse about, the categories of common language, national language, and official language. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, the most ardent proponent of a national language policy, had in fact been calling for the acceptance of Hindustani as the "common language." By this term, Gandhi meant not a shared language, but one that would function as a common symbol for India as a unified nation. For Nehru,

Hindustani would function as the "all-India language," by which he meant a language approximating to an official language, as well as an interregional link language (Das Gupta 37).

[21] According to Anthony, the reason Article 343 of the Constitution of India had stated that 15 years after the inception of the Constitution, that is, after 1965, the Indian parliament "may," "Notwithstanding anything in this article…provide for the use of…the English language," was because Hindi, as a mixed language, may not have developed enough by that period to allow it a full range of expression and the consequent ability to function as India's sole official language (303).

Both Hindi and English are now recognized as the official languages of India. However, English is still juridically defined as "the second official language for such period as the Union may, by law, determine" (PTI). In short, according to the letter of the law, the status of English as an official language still remains precarious.

[22] Anthony's claims about English's 'others' in this statement is perhaps a bit sweeping, and needs to be taken with a degree of skepticism.

[23] To validate his point, Anthony quotes one Prof. Pandit, Head of the Department of Linguistics in Delhi University: "Our languages…which did not have any traditions of scientific and serious prose, have acquired newer expressions and traditions under the constant influence of…English. This is a major factor in the 'development' of Indian languages" (343). In the absence of the influence of English, "the new Hindi," says Prof. Pandit, enriches itself with "artificial monstrosities and resurrections from a dust-bin of dead words created by self-styled literati and self-appointed lexicographers in their frenetic attempts to enlarge the poverty-stricken Hindi vocabulary" (344).

Anthony's and Prof. Pandit's argument about the 'other' languages of the VIIIth Schedule not having "traditions of…serious prose," while prone to a generalizing tone, interestingly resonate with Thomas Babington Macaulay's argument about the literary lack demarcating "the whole native literature of India and Arabia." The only difference is that Macaulay's argument is here being reconfigured to deem English a culturally indigenized language in India. See Macaulay's "Minute on Indian Education" (1835).

[24] Hindi's status as a mixed language that is a little more than a century old, can be perceived via the fact that "Hindi" literature, in the 1960s, counted in its corpus the literatures composed in Braj-bhasha and Bundeli, the Awadhi speech with the related Bagheli and Chattisgarhi dialects, a variety of Rajasthani and Pahari dialects, Bhojpuri, Magadhi, Maithili, and Delhi "Hindustani" (Das Gupta 50-51).

[25] English is yet to be included in the VIIIth Schedule.

[26] I am, of course, discussing the Indianization of English—or the lack thereof—only in terms of official codification. It should be stated here that as of 2003, cases have been made for more than 38 languages to be included in the VIIIth Schedule (Constitutional Provisions).

[27] Exemplifying this point, Anthony alludes to two figures who proliferated discourses of racialized communities, and used them, in the first case, to establish a genocidal dictatorship, and, in the second, to strengthen imperialist regimes of power/knowledge:

> The greatest exponents of spurious doctrines of race superiority…were obviously polygenetics. I have always been intrigued by photographs of both Hitler and Kipling: the former was the antithesis of the so-called Nordic type: Hitler's pogroms were probably motivated by a subconscious guilt complex of possessing an admixture of Jewish blood.

> Both in features and pigmentation, Kipling suggested ethnic admixtures with a tan not accounted for merely by the Indian sun. (371)

[28] Recall the claim Singh's documentary makes about McCluskieganj's Anglo-Indian inhabitants migrating "in search of greener pastures."

[29] I will here attempt a brief and, for the lack of other options, rather reductive summary of the JMM's claims and position vis-à-vis Jharkhandi statehood, insofar as the parameters of a footnote will permit.

The JMM's demand for a tribal state can be traced to a precursor, the Jharkhand Party which was the first political group to demand the creation of the state in 1952. The Party had mapped the state to include the Chotanagpur and Santal Parganas districts of Bihar, current-day Chattisgarh, Orissa, and later West Bengal. The Jharkhand Party's support base was largely urban, and its leadership drawn from a tribal elite in the Chotanagpur region. To garner support for Jharkhandi regionalism, the Party cultivated a group sentiment among Mundas, Oraons, Santals, Hos, and other tribal communities, setting this sentiment up in opposition to the caste Hindus in the plains who were mapped as exploitative outsiders or '*dikus*.' Intimate connections were posited between tribal communities and the local forest environments that had been disrupted by the colonial state, and by landlords and moneylenders. The formulation of the outsider provided a sense of community, and radicalized the political position of the tribal communities (Tillin 71).

When the Jharkhand Party eventually merged into the Indian National Congress, in the political vacuum that followed, the JMM burst upon the scene in 1972. Initially setting aside questions of ethnicity, it attempted to define 'Jharkhandis' as an oppressed working class. It argued that Jharkhand was treated as an internal colony of Bihar—a colony in which local

Jharkhandis were exploited in the service of Bihar, and for India's overall development, given its immense mineral wealth. The JMM's claims for statehood gained wider support through the 1970s and the 1980s, particularly from the right-wing Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party [BJP] (Tillin 73-77).

With one of the three founding leaders of the JMM, Shibu Soren, striking a deal with Indira Gandhi and the Congress in 1980, the JMM fragmented into two groups. Following the assassination of Indira, her son Rajiv took over as Prime Minister of India. Rajiv stated that greater sympathy should be extended to regional movements in various parts of India. This led to the Chotanagpur and Santal Parganas regions of south Bihar finding themselves on the verge of being declared a Union Territory—a move short of Jharkhandi statehood. Even as Shibu Soren now moved away from the demand for statehood, various actants in the Jharkhand movement sustained the demand, ethnic identity being deployed over time as a means to help them augment their bargaining power with the Indian state (Tillin 84-85).

Coming to the fore of electoral politics in the Bihar State Assembly in the 1980s, the BJP, in a bid for electoral power in Bihar, pushed for the demand for statehood to better compete with the JMM. Unlike the JMM, though, the BJP appealed to a constituency of regional industrialists, urban middle classes, and *dikus*. The competition between the two parties magnified between 1990 and 1992, when the BJP stepped up the demand for statehood. The JMM conducted economic blockades in response, cutting off Bihar's transport of mineral resources to the rest of India. This resulted in the erstwhile federal Congress government saying that it would consider the issue of statehood only if the JMM withdrew from the Bihar state government. This led to a second split in the JMM in July 1992 (Tillin 88-92).

Subsequently moving its social base away from a predominantly upper-caste Hindu core in the area, the BJP began to make headway into the Jharkhand and Chattisgarh areas by, among other means, promoting a new group of leaders in north Bihar—leaders who would articulate the case for Jharkhand as a separate state. The Party thus began a new phase which was symbolized by, among other features, the rise of Babulal Marandi, a Hindu Santal *Adivasi*, as a tribal *pracharak* [worker] for the BJP. Marandi eventually defeated Soren and became the first Chief Minister of the newly-formed state of Jharkhand in 2000 (Tillin 88-93).

The problem, through all these years, was for the multiple political actants of the Jharkhand movement, to reconcile the contradictions thrown up over time by the various regional economies, societies, and targeted electorates, and to sustain the memory of an 'ideal' *Adivasi* political community (Tillin 77). Jha's novel overtly refers to the disjunction between the JMM's claims for statehood, and its failure to cater to an impoverished *Adivasi* base—a matter symbolized by characters who broke ties with the JMM, and mobilized *Adivasi* autonomy through their individual initiatives.

The only overt reference that Jha's novel makes to the political figures who had actually been involved in the claims for Jharkhandi statehood, is to be found on the penultimate page of the Anglophone version of the novel, the references being to the fall of Soren and the rise of Marandi (Jha, *The Story* 269-70). These matters are not at the core of my argument, but will help the reader get a sense of the regional nationalist backdrop against which the novel's plot is set, as and when I refer to it.

[30] Recollect Anthony's description of the association of anticolonial ressentiment with Anglo-Indians, particularly among "Hindi Imperialists" (287-89).

[31] See footnote 8. Anthony's claim is not necessarily commensurate with Ballhatchett, Hawes, and Mizutani's arguments about how Anglo-Indians were forged as a separate racial community through their disownment by the British. These arguments render the supposed British indoctrination of Anglo-Indians into "renegadism," a questionable matter.

[32] The Lok Sabha has arrangements for the President of India to nominate two Anglo-Indian members so that the Anglo-Indian community, despite its minoritarian status, attains sufficient political representation. For the same purpose, each state in India also has reservations for its governor to nominate one Anglo-Indian member to the state legislature (Bear 152).

[33] That the *Adivasis* were the original inhabitants of the lands appropriated for the inauguration of McCluskieganj, may have contributed to the formulation of 'Anglo-Indian others' along these miscegenative lines (Kaur 381).

[34] For a concise but incisive history of Kashmir's status as contested territory, see Tariq Ali. "The Story of Kashmir." *Kashmir: The Case for Freedom*.

[35] That the JCC sought to sideline the JMM because of the latter's erstwhile affiliations with the Congress, is not a matter to be dismissed in this context (Tillin 85). For the checkered history of the JMM, its associations with the Congress, and its relationship with the formation of the state of Jharkhand, see footnote 29.

[36] See footnote 29.

[37] I have already alluded to Stark's polemic in footnote 7.

[38] Birsa Munda had, according to Munda mythography, led one of the most significant anticolonial revolutions for freeing an *Adivasi* group from the clutches of the British, in an effort to lead the group toward autonomy. The declared aim of his revolution, conducted between 1898 and 1900, was that of liberating the Munda tribe from British rule (Guha 26). According to him,

"the ideal order…would witness the liquidation of the *Dikus* (Kannabiran 245), [colonial] European missionaries and officials and native Christians. The Mundas would recover their 'lost kingdom.' There will be enough to eat, no famine; the people will live together and in love" (Weiner 164).

It is difficult to ascertain the veracity of the novel's claim that Birsa Munda was imprisoned in Ward No. 5, although he had certainly been imprisoned and died in Ranchi Jail (Weiner 164).

[39] See footnote 29. The JMM, as I have stated in the footnote, lost the elections at Jharkhand, and the BJP's Union Minister for Tourism, Babulal Marandi, became the first Chief Minister of the new state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Novels, Novellas, Short Stories, Autobiographies, Films, Proto-Historiographic Treatises, Historic Articles, and Pamphlets

36 Chowringhee Lane. Dir. Aparna Sen. Perf. Jennifer Kendall, Dhritiman Chatterjee, and Debashree Roy. Shashi Kapoor, 1981. DVD.

Ambedkar, B. R. *Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development*. Jullundur city: The Awami Press, 1916. Print.

Andrew, Elizabeth W., and Katherine C. Bushnell. *The Queen's Daughters in India*. London: Morgan and Scott, 1894. Print.

Anthony, Frank. *Britain's Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1969. Print.

Ashokbhatia: Just another WordPress.com site. 11 Dec. 2015. Web. 25 May 2016.

The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British and Foreign India, China, and Australia, Volume 5. London: Parburry, Allen, and Co. 1831. Print.

Bandyopadhyay, Sharadindu. *Aadeem Ripu*. 18 Jul. 2014. Web. 30 Sep. 2015.

---. *Chiriyakhana. Sharadindu Omnibus Pratham Khanda: Byomkesh*. Kolkata: Ananda Publishers, 1970. Print.

Baptist, A. A. E. Foreword. *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached*. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink & Co. 1929. Print. i-x.

Behn, Aphra. *Oroonoko, or the Royal Slave: A True History*. London: Will. Canning, 1688. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1999. Print.

Bennett, Amelia. *Ten Months' Captivity After the Massacre at Cawnpore. The Nineteenth Century and After XIX-XX*. New York, New York: Leonard Scott Publication Company, 1950. Print. 1212-34.

---. *Ten Months' Captivity After the Massacre at Cawnpore. The Nineteenth Century and After XIX-XX*. New York, New York: Leonard Scott Publication Company, 1950. Print. 78-91.

Bernuntz, Gustave, and Ernest Goupil. *Clinical Memoirs on the Diseases of Women Vol. 1*. Tr. Alfred Meadows. London: The New Sydenham Society, 1859. Print.

Beverley, Henry. "Census of Bengal, 1881." *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Vol. 46 No. 4 (Dec 1883). Print. 680-90.

Bey, Aleph. *That Eurasian*. New York: F. Tennyson Neely, 1895. Print.

Bond, Ruskin. *A Flight of Pigeons*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2002. Print.

---. Introduction. *Strangers in the Night: Two Novellas*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India Ltd., 1996. ix-xii. Print.

---. "The Man Who Was Kipling." *Rusty Goes to London*. New Delhi: Puffin Books India, 2014. Kindle AZW file.

---. *The Room on the Roof. The Room on the Roof, Vagrants in the Valley: Two Novels of Adolescence*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1956. Print.

---. *The Sensualist: A Cautionary Tale. Strangers in the Night: Two Novels*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1996. Print.

---. *Vagrants in the Valley. The Room on the Roof, Vagrants in the Valley: Two Novels of Adolescence*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 1981. Print.

Burton, Richard. "The Bestial Element in Man." *The Academy: A Weekly Review of Literature, Science, and Art*. Aug. 1888 No. 849. London: Publishing Office, 1888. Print.

Byomkesh Bakshi. Dir. Anjan Dutta. Perf. Abir Chatterjee, Saswata Chatterjee, Ushasie Chakraborty, Rudranil Ghosh, Pijush Ganguly, Swagata Banerjee, and Swastika Mukherjee. RP Techvision (I) Pvt. Ltd., 2010. DVD.

Chatterji, Bankincandra. *Anandamath, or The Sacred Brotherhood*. Tr. Julius Lipner. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. Print.

Chattopadhyay, Bankimchandra. "Prachina Ebang Nabina." *Vividha Prabandha: Pratham Khanda. Bankim Rachanabali*. 2010. Web. 16 Aug. 2016.

Chaudhuri, Jogeshchandra. *The principles of the law of sedition, with an appendix giving the law in India, as it was and as amended, by J. Chaudhuri*. Calcutta: Weekly Notes Printing Works, 1898. Print.

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness. Youth, and Two Other Stories*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1922. Print.

Cotton Mary. Dir. Ismail Merchant. Perf. Madhur Jaffrey, Gretta Scacchi, and James Wilby. Universal Studios, 1999. DVD.

Devi, Jnanadanandini. *Puratoni*. Ed. Indiradevi Chaudhurani. Kolkata: Ananda Publishers, 1956. Print.

Diver, Maud. *Lilamani: A Study in Possibilities*. London: Hutchinson, 1911. Print.

---. *Candles in the Wind*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1931. Print.

Dixon, William Hepworth. *Spiritual Wives*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1868. Print.

Dodd, George. *The History of the Indian Revolt and of the Expedition to Persia, China, and Japan 1857-8-9 with Maps, Plans, and Wood Engravings*. London: W. and R. Chambers, 1859. Print.

Dover, Cedric. *American Negro Art*. Greenwich: New York Graphic Society, 1960. Print.

---. *Cimmerii, or Eurasians and Their Future*. London: Simon Wallenberg P, 1929. Print.

---. *Hell in the Sunshine*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1943. Print.

---. *Know This of Race*. London, Secker & Warburg, 1939. Print.

Edwards, B. B. *The Missionary Gazetteer; Comprising a Geographical and Statistical Account of the Various Stations of the American and Foreign Protestant Missionary Societies of All Denominations, With Their Progress in Evangelization and Civilization*. Boston: William Hyde & Co., 1832. Print.

Eliot, T. S. "Tradition and the Individual Talent." *Bartleby.com*. 2000. Web. 10 Jul. 2016.

"Exodus." *King James Bible. King James Bible Online*. 2016. Web. 10 Jul. 2016.

Fanthome, Joseph Francis. *Mariam: A Story of the Indian Mutiny of 1857 By J. F. F. (One of the Survivors)*. Benares: Chandraprabha Press Co. Ltd, 1896. Print.

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. New York: RosettaBooks, LLC, 2002. Kindle AZW file.

Ghare Baire. Dir. Satyajit Ray. Perf. Victor Banerjee, Swatilekha Sengupta, Soumitro Chatterjee. National Film Development Corporation of India. 1985. DVD.

Gobineau, Arthur comte de. *The Inequality of Human Races*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1915. Print.

GoMoreFilms. *Dreams of a Homeland*. GoMoreFilms. *YouTube*. 22 Jul. 2013.

Grant, James. *First Love and Last Love: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny*. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1863. Print.

Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf. Mein Kampf by Adolf Hitler. Volume One – A Reckoning. Chapter IX: Nation and Race*. Web. 15 Aug. 2018.

Hourigan, Malcolm. "Kitty Texeira." *McCluskieganj or McCluskiegunj*. Aug. 20 2013.

"The Immortal Part of Kinglake." 788-89. *The Speaker: A Rebirth of Politics, Letters, Science,*

and the Arts. Dec. 31 1898. Print.

Indian Christian Marriage Act, 1872, Amendment Bill. *Abstract of the Proceedings of the Council of the Governor General of India, Assembled for the Purpose of Making Laws and Regulations*. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India, 1892. Print. 41-44.

Jha, Vikas Kumar. *McCluskieganj*. Trans. Sangeeta Sinha. Patna, Srishti Prakashan, 1999. Print.

---. *McCluskieganj: The Story of the Only Anglo-Indian Village in India*. Trans. Mahasweta Ghosh. New Delhi: Harper Perennial, 2015. Print.

"John." *King James Bible. King James Bible Online*. 2016. Web. 10 Jul. 2016.

Johnson, Alan. "Globalization and Anglo-India." *The Way We Are: An Anglo-Indian Mosaic*. Ed. Lionel Lumb and Deborah Van Veldhuizen. New Jersey: CTR Inc. Publishing, 2008. Print. 252-256.

Junoon. Dir. Shyam Benegal. Perf. Shashi Kapoor, Jennifer Kendall, Naseeruddin Shah, and Nafisa Ali. Shashi Kapoor, 1966. DVD.

Kipling, Rudyard. "To Be Filed for Reference." *Plain Tales from the Hills*. New York: John W. Lowell Company, 1889. Print. 278-87.

---. *Kim*. Mattituck: The American Reprint Company, 198-. Print.

---. "Namgay Doola." *Life's Handicap*. New York: Doubleday & McClure Company, 1899. Print. 322-35.

Lynd, James. *First Book of Etymology, Designed to Promote Precision in the Use, and Facilitate the Acquisition of a Knowledge of the English Language for Beginners*. Philadelphia: E. C. & J. Biddle, No. 508 Minor Street. 1860. Print.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. "Lord Clive." *Macaulay's Essays on Clive and Hastings, ed. for*

school use by Alphonso G. Newcomer. Chicago: Scott, Foreman and Company, 1909. Print.

---. "Minute by the Hon'ble T. B. Macaulay, dated the 2nd February 1835." *Project South Asia*. 2 Feb. 1835. Web. 10 Jul. 2016.

Mahanagar. Dir. Satyajit Ray. Perf. Anil Chatterjee, Madhabi Mukherjee, Jaya Bachchan, Vicky Redwood, Shefalika Devi, Haren Chatterjee. R. D. Bansal & Co. 1963. DVD.

Mehta, Vinod. *Lucknow Boy: A Memoir*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2011. Print.

Menen, Aubrey. *The Abode of Love: The Conception, Financing and Daily Routine of an English Harem in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century Described in the Form of a Novel*. London: Chatto and Windus. 1957. Print.

---. *Dead Man in the Silver Market*. Westport: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1935. Print.

---. *The Ramayana as Told By Aubrey Menen*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954. Print.

Miss Shefali. *Sandhyaraater Shefali*. Kolkata: Ananda Publishers, 2014. Print.

Mitra, Dinabandhu. *Nil Darpan; or The Indigo Planting Mirror, A Drama Translated from the Bengali by a Native*. Calcutta: C H. Manuel, 1861. Print.

Mitra, Narendranath. *Mahanagar*. Trans. S. K. Chatterjee and M. F. Franda. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House, 1968. Print.

Muller, Max. *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature So Far as It Illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Brahmans*. London: Williams and Norgate. 1859. Print.

---. *Lectures on the Science of Language*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1861-4. Print.

Narayan, R. K. *The Painter of Signs*. London: Penguin Books, 1976. Print.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *An Autobiography: Toward Freedom*. New York, The John Day Company, 1941. Print.

Pratidwandi. Dir. Satyajit Ray. Perf. Dhritimaan Chatterjee, Krishna Bose, Indira Devi, Kalyan Chatterjee, Miss Shefali. Priya Films, 1970. DVD.

Report on the Administration of Bengal, 1872-73, with a Statistical Summary. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Press, 1873. Print.

Reuter, Edward Byron. *The Mulatto in the United States Including a Study of the Role of Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World*. New York: Haskell House Publishers Ltd., 1969. Print.

Robinson, David Moore. "Greek Literature in English Translations." *The Classical Weekly*. Vol. 8 No. 20. New York: The Classical Weekly, 1914-1915. Print.

Rushdie, Salman. *Midnight's Children*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group, 1981. Print.

Sahgal, Nayantara. *Rich Like Us*. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1985. Print.

Sen Priyaranjan. *Reviews. The Calcutta Review*. University of Calcutta. 1930. Print. 285.

Shakespeare, William. *King Lear: No. 1 of the Edwin Forrest Edition of Shakespeare and Other Plays*. New York, New York: Torrey Brothers, 1860. Print.

Shankar. *Chowringhee*. Kolkata: Dey's Publishers, 1962. Print.

Shree 420. Dir. Raj Kapoor. Perf. Raj Kapoor, Nargis, Lalita Pawar, Nadira, and Iftekhaar. Raj Kapoor. 1955. DVD.

Singh, Dhiraj. *McCluskie's Ganj: The Lost Home of the Anglos*. Dhiraj Singh. YouTube. 14 Nov. 2012. Web. 15 Jun. 2018.

Singh, S. Nihal. *Ink in My Veins: A Life in Journalism*. New Delhi: Hay House Publishers, 2011. Kindle AZW file.

Skeat, Rev. Walter William. *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*.

Oxford: Oxford at the Clarendon Press. 1885. Print.

The Spectator: A Weekly Review of Politics, Literature, Theology, and Art, Volume the Ninety-Eighth. 1907. From January 5th to June 29th, 1907, Inclusive. London: John Baker, "Spectator," Ltd., 1907. Print.

Stark, Herbert Alick. *Hostages to India, Or The Life Story of the Anglo Indian Race*. USA: Simon Wallenberg Press, 1926. Print.

Steel, Flora Annie, and Grace Gardiner. *The Complete Indian Housekeeper & Cook*. London, William Heinemann, 1902. Print.

Tagor, Rabindranath. *Ghore Baire. Boipagla: Sobar Janyaa Boi*. 2016. Web. 16 Aug. 2016.

Taylor, Philip Meadows. *Seeta*. London: K. Paul, Trench and Co., 1872. Print.

Trevelyan, George Otto. *Cawnpore*. London and Cambridge: Macmillan, 1866. Print.

Wallace, Kenneth. *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached*. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink & Co. 1929. Print.

Secondary Sources: Critical Theoretical Texts, Monographs, Journal Articles, Contemporary Ethnographic Accounts, Legal Documents, Newspaper Articles, Online Articles, and Interviews

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

Anderson, Clare. *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790-1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Andrews, Robyn. "Living Anglo-India: Making Australia 'Local' at St. Joseph's Hostel." *Local Lives: Migration and the Politics of Space*. Ed. Brigitte Bonisch-Brednich and Catherine Trundle. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing, 2010. 119-34. Print.

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

Bahri, Deepika. *Native Intelligence: Aesthetics, Politics, and Postcolonial Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003. Print.

Balakrishnan, Ravi. "Miss Fonseca Remains Mario Miranda's Most Enduring Legacy from the Time." *The Economic Times*. 12 Dec. 2011. Web. 25 May 2016.

Ballhatchet, Kenneth. *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and their Critics, 1793-1905*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980. Print.

Bandyopadhyay, Shirsho. "Kolkatar 'Cabaret Queen' o Samasamayik Nagorik Binodon." *Sandhyaraater Shefali*. By Miss Shefali. Kolkata: Ananda Publishers, 2014. i-xiv. Print.

Banerjee, Monideepa. "Park Street Rape Survivor Suzette Jordan, Who Took on Bengal Government, Dies." *NDTV*. 14 Mar. 2015. Web. 30 Oct. 2015.

Banerjee, Sumanta. *Dangerous Outcast: The Prostitute in Nineteenth Century Bengal*. Calcutta:

Seagull Books, 2000. Print.

Barthes, Ronald. "The Death of the Author." *Image Music Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. Great Britain: Fontana Press, 1977. Print. 142-48.

Basu, Moni and Harmeet Singh. "The Girl Whose Rape Changed the Country." *CNN.com*. Mar. 8 2015. Web. 11 Mar. 2016.

Bear, Laura. *Lines of the Nation: Indian Railway Workers, Bureaucracy, and the Intimate Historical Self*. New York: Columbia UP. 2007. Print.

Bhatt, Rakesh M. "Expert Discourses, Local Practices, and Hybridity: The Case of Indian Englishes." *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice*. Ed. A. Suresh Canagarajah. Delhi: Routledge, 2004. Kindle file.

Blunt, Alison. *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. Print.

---. "Embodying War: British Women and Domestic Defilement in the Indian 'Mutiny', 1857-8." *Journal of Historical Geography*, 26, 3: 2000. 403-28. Print.

---. "Home, Community and Nationality: Anglo-Indians Women in India before and after Independence." *Colonial and Post-Colonial Geographies of India*. Ed. Saraswati Raju, M. Satish Kumar, and Stuart Corbridge. New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2006. Print. 49-69.

Brown, Warren. *Anglo-Indians: The Secret Race. Lulu.com*, 2010. Web.

Buettner, Elizabeth. *Empire Families: Britons and Late Imperial India*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.

Chadha, Yogesh. *Gandhi: A Life*. Indianapolis: John Wiley and Sons Associates, 1997. Print.

Chatterjee, Partha. "Bombs and Nationalism in Bengal." Calcutta: Centre for Studies in Social

Sciences, 2004. Print.

---. *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012. Print.

---. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993. Print.

---. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. Print.

Chatterjee, Ratnabali. "The Queen's Daughters: Prostitutes as an Outcast Group in Colonial India." *Report 8*: 1992. Print.

Chattopadhyay, Swati. *Representing Calcutta: Modernity, Nationalism, and the Colonial Uncanny*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.

Chaudhuri, Rosinka. *Freedom and Beef Steaks: Colonial Calcutta Culture*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2012. Print.

"A Chronological List of Censors' Orders September 1975 to January 1977." *The Emergency, Censorship and the Press in India, 1975-77*. By Soli Sorabjee. New Delhi: Central News Agency (Pvt.) Limited, 1977. 26-38. Print.

Clark, Anna. *Desire: A History of European Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 2008. Print.

Clark, T. W. Introduction. *The Novel in India: Its Birth and Development*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970. 9-20. Print.

Constitutional Provisions Relating to the Eighth Schedule. Web. 26 Sep. 2017.

Das Gupta, Jyotirindra. *Language Conflict and National Development: Group Politics and National Language Policy in India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970. Print.

David, Saul. *The Indian Mutiny, 1857*. Delhi: Viking, 2002. Print.

Forbes, Geraldine. “In Search of the ‘Pure Heathen’.” *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 21 No. 17 (April 1986). Print. WS2-WS8.

Fisher, Michael H. *The Inordinately Strange Life of Dyce Sombre: Victorian Anglo-Indian MP and Chancery ‘Lunatic.’* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books. 1978. Print.

---. “What is an Author?”. *Generation-online.org*. Web. 18 Aug. 2016.

Foulkes, Richard. *Performing Shakespeare in the Age of Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

George, Rosemary Marangoly. *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999. Print.

Ghosh, Durba. *Sex and the Family in Colonial India: The Making of Empire*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.

Gist, Noel P. and Roy Dean Wright. *Marginality and Identity: Anglo-Indians as a Racially-Mixed Minority in India*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973. Print.

Guha, Ranajit. *Dominance Without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997. Print.

---. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. Print.

Guttman, Anna. *The Nation of India in Contemporary Indian Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Print.

Haque, Saiful. “McCluskieganj: The Little England of Jharkhand now in ruins.” *India Today*. 28 Jun. 2013.

Hawes, Christopher. *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India,*

1773-1833. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print.

Jaffrelot, Christophe. *The Hindu Nationalist Movement and Indian Politics 1925 to the 1990s*. New Delhi: Penguin, 1993. Print.

James, C. L. R. *The Black Jacobins Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1963. Print.

James, Lawrence. *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*. London: St. Martin's Griffin, 2000. Print.

Joardar, Biswanath. *Prostitution in Historical and Modern Perspectives*. Delhi: Inter-India Publications, 1984.

Kalra, Kush and Priyanka Barupal. *Law Sex and Crime*. New Delhi: Viji Books India Pvt. Ltd., 2013. Print.

Kannabiran, Kalpana. *Tools of Justice: Non-discrimination and the Indian Constitution*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Kaur, Simren. *Fin Feather and Field*. New Delhi: Partridge, 2013. Print.

Kinsley, David R. *Hindu Goddesses: Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Tradition*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1988.

Koehler Jeff. Darjeeling: *The Colourful History and the Precarious Fate of the World's Greatest Tea*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015. Print.

Kohli, Namita. "McCluskieganj: The burden of history." *Hindustan Times*. 25 Dec. 2016.

Kortsch, Christian Bayles. *Dress Culture in Late Victorian Women's Fiction: Literacy, Textiles, and Activism*. London: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Kotiswaran, Pratibha. *Dangerous Sex, Invisible Labor: Sex Work and the Law in India*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 2011. Print.

Lal, Vinay. “The Incident of the Crawling Lane: Women in the Punjab Disturbances of 1919.” *Genders*. No. 16 (Spring 1993): 35-60. Print.

Leckie, Barbara. *Culture and Adultery: The Novel, the Newspaper, and the Law, 1857-1914*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. Print.

Lehning, James R. *European Colonialism Since 1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. Print.

Mallampalli, Chandra. *Race, Religion and Law in Colonial India: Trials of an Interracial Family*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.

Manchester, Colin. “Lord Campbell’s Act: England’s First Obscenity Statute.” *The Journal of Legal History*. Vol. 9, No. 2, 1988. Print. 223-41.

Mani, Lata. *Contentious Traditions: The Debate on Sati in Colonial India*. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1998. Print.

Mizutani, Satoshi. *The Meaning of White: Race, Class, and the “Domiciled Community” in British India, 1858-1930*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. Print.

Molendjik, Arie. L. *Friedrich Max Muller & the Sacred Books of the East*. Oxford. Oxford UP: 2016. Print.

Mukherjee, Sujit. *Forster and Further: The Tradition of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Limited, 193. Print.

Mukhopadhyay, Anindita. *Behind the Mask: The Cultural Definition of the Legal Subject in Colonial Bengal (1775-1911)*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.

Mullin, Katherine. “Poison More Deadly than Prussic Acid: Defining Obscenity After the 1857 Obscene Publications Act.” *Prudes on the Prowl: Fiction and Obscenity in England, 1850 to the Present Day*. Ed. David Bradshaw and Rachel Potter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013. Print. 11-29.

Oddie, Geoffrey A. *Missionaries, Rebellion and Proto-Nationalism: James Long of Bengal 1814-87*. Richmond: Curzon Press, 1999. Print.

"The Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act, 1976." *The Emergency, Censorship and the Press in India, 1975-77*. By Soli Sorabjee. New Delhi: Central News Agency (Pvt.) Limited, 1977. 41-61. Print.

PTI. "Hindi, not a national language: Court." *The Hindu*. 25 Jan. 2010.

Pankaj, Ashok. "Guaranteeing Right to Work in Rural India: Context, Issues and Policies." *Right to Work in Rural India: Working of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme*. Ed. Ashok K. Pankaj. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, 2012. Print. 3-36.

Purcell, Hugh. *After the Raj: The Last Stayers-on and the Legacy of British India*. UK: History Publishing Group, 2011. Print.

Quraishi, Humra. "The Man and His Road to Mussoorie." *The Metrognome*. 30 Aug. 2013. Web. 19 Jan. 2016.

Raman, A. S. "Aubrey Menen: Born to Write." *India Today*. 15 Mar 1978. Web. 31 Jan. 2015.

Rao, Velchenu Narayana. "The Politics of Telugu Ramayanas: Colonialism, Print Culture, and Literary Movements." *Questioning Ramayanas: A South Asian Tradition*. Ed. Paula Richman. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001. Print. 159-86.

Ratte, Lou. *The Uncolonised Heart*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman Limited, 1995. Print.

Ray, Achintyarup. "McCluskieganj: In an antique land." *The Times of India*. 1 Oct. 2007.

Sahgal, Nayantara. *Indira Gandhi: Tryst with Power*. Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2012. Print.

"Satyameva Jayate – Undying Spirit – Inspiring Moment." *Youtube*. 3 Mar. 2014. Web. 3 Mar. 2016.

Sen, Sudarshana. “Living Stories of Anglo-Indian Women in Kolkata.” *International Journal of Anglo-Indian Studies* Vol. 14 No. 1 (2014). Web. 31-40.

Sengupta, Uttam. “Reviving chhota London.” *The Telegraph*. 28 Feb 2005.

Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minnesota: Minnesota UP, 1993.

Singer, Alan J. *Teaching Global History: A Social Studies Approach*. London: Routledge, 2011. Kindle AZW file.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The ‘Manly’ Englishman and the ‘Effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995. Print.

Slate, Nico. *The Prism of Race: W. E. B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, and the Colored World of Cedric Dover*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Print.

Smith, Donald Eugene. *India as a Secular State*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?”. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988. 271-313. Print.

---. “How to Teach a “Culturally Different” Book.” *The Spivak Reader*. Ed. Donna Landry and Gerald Maclean. New York: Routledge, 1996. Print. 237-66.

Stokes, Eric. *The English Utilitarians and India*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1959. Print.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 2002. Print.

---. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 1995. Print.

“Suzette Jordan.” *blog.blanknoise.org*. 12 Oct. 2015. Web. 11 Mar. 2016.

Talalay, Kathryn. *The Life of Philippa Schuyler. Composition in Black and White: The Tragic Saga of Harlem's Biracial Prodigy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Tarlo, Emma. *Unsettling Memories: Narratives of the Emergency in Delhi*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Print.

Tillin Louise. *Remapping India: New States and Their Political Origins*. Oxford, Oxford UP, 2013. Print.

Van der Veer, Peter. *Imperial Encounters: Religion and Modernity in India and Britain*. Princeton: Princeton UP. 2001. Print.

Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. Print.

Weiner, Myron. *Sons of the Soil: Migration and Ethnic Conflict in India*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978. Print.

Williams, Blair R. *Anglo-Indians: Vanishing Remnants of a Bygone Era*. New Jersey: Calcutta Tiljallah Relief, Inc. 2002. Print.