

A Study on Criticism on the Raj Quartet

Ashish Devi^{1*} Dr. Naresh Kumar²

¹ Research Scholar of OPJS University, Churu, Rajasthan

² Associate Professor, OPJS University, Churu, Rajasthan

Abstract – The study explores the concepts of critique in *The Raj Quartet* (1966-75) by Paul Scott and provides objective review of Scott's particular contributions to British and postcolonial literature in the second half of the 20th century by comparative textual research. According to recent critical claims criticizing the flagrant anti-colonial agenda already discernible in different branch analyses of the post-colonial periods, this paper questions the sometimes-critical view of the Quartet's nostalgia for colonialism and challenges Scott's banning name as either an imperialist or a neo-colonialist.

Critics have drawn comparisons to the work of previous authors, such as Rudyard Kipling, and E. M. Forster, of English-speaking literature. In the mid-1980s, after an adapted miniseries of text broadcast on British television between 1984 and 1985, unfavorable parallels between the Quartet and early colonial narratives increased. This thesis tackles Scott's narrow criticism and extends the reach of current constructive approaches to the text.

Keywords – Paul Scott, Criticism, Raj Quartet.

-----X-----

INTRODUCTION

The Raj Quartet (1966-75), a major sequence on the crypts of British colonial rule in India, reveals a revealing vision of imperial history and exposes the significant shift in cultural consciousness of Britain; the four books not only point to the transition from colonial to postcolonial ways of thinking and representing, but also the crystalline ones. The Raj Quartet was comparison from its beginnings with previous authors, such as Rudyard Kipling and E.M. Forster, and as a result sometimes characterized as a derivative text—the thematic coda of an archaic colonialist writing mode. This feeling is expressed by a unique mention of the work as "The nostalgia for old colonial days," the introduction to the new issue *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Twentieth Century and After* (2006) (Stallworthy and Ramazani 1841). Following the postcolonial explosion of the second half of the 20th century, critical literary exhibitions by theorist Edward Said (Gayatri Spivak) and Frantz Fanon (Frantz Fanon) and Homi Bhabha tended either to focus on the voices of previously colonized voices, such as Chino, who established the Orientalist discourses of European imperial rule, as Kipling and Forster. Scott's thesis would not readily associate itself with increasingly intransigent labels such as "colonialist" or "neo-colonial," or "post-colonial," within critical models that follow a static approach to the generic categorization of category, and therefore holds a peripheral stance in literary studies, with the

consequence that postcolonial writers dismissed the Quartet. In addition, many crucial evaluations recently carried out in the Quartet, which examine it from a post-colonial point of view, place numerous anti colonial agendas on the document, thus imposing a proscriptive generic categorization. Therefore, Scott has been at risk of slipping through the vital shadows with a mistaken image as a latter colonial apologist.

Peter Childs presents an informative survey of the essential readings of Scott's Quartet, in his 1998 book *Paul Scott's Raj Quartet*:

The Raj Quartet has differed tremendously from critical views of Paul Scott's. Edward Said uses the epithet 'great' and M. Mahood defines it as 'a imaginative Tolstoyan development of complexity and scope,' William Walsh considers it 'not a truly literary encounter of an important nature.' The British historian Antony Copley claims that the Quartet 'is maybe the best novel we'll ever get into the entire mixed tragic decolonizing tale,' whereas the SriLankan scholar, Tarzie Vittachi, feels that he was doing for India what "Dostoevsky and Gabriel García Márquez did for Russia of his period and his Andes." Margaret Scanlan's feeling that the Quartet is "unparalleled exploration into historical fantasy" represents a consensus."

In the book, the Quartet's *Jewel of the Crown*, shows that Childs' catalogues at the opening of his

introductions are very controversial. Jacqueline Banerjee states that before the book was over there were already widespread awareness of Indian novels coping with the same incidents as the Kushwant Singh Train to Pakistan in 1956 and The Princes in Manohar Malgonkar in 1963. In this article Scott discussed, in reverse, the position of colonists in this work and examined the impact of colonizing and imperialism on British national and cultural identification ("Paul Scott as Imperial Author" par. 2). He also explores the fallacies of British imperialism, which have led to the evolving national and cultural identity of India and Pakistan. Retrospectively, why Scott's work found a mainstream audience difficult, and why his work is now critically overlooked, is understandable. The Quartet dealt with a perhaps more tender wound in the British psyche at the time of its release. Scott discussed a topic he probably would like to ignore with British viewers in the 1960s and 1970s. Scott analyzes and criticizes the British Raj and the colonial philosophy machine that produced them with relentless commitment to historical precision. Scott's deft usage of metaphors, though, helps him to implicitly explore the horrors and perversions of the imperial system throughout his characteristic circumstances and images. Furthermore, a broad range of competing critical views of the text will understand the intractably laden metaphorical content of the Quartet and its contradictory treatment of the Raj society.

For certain postcolonial critic, Scott's British white speech recalls so closely the voices of the leading representative architects of European Orientalism – namely Kipling, Gustave Flaubert, and Forster, in a lesser degree. Rushdie's 1984 essay "Outside the Whale" epitomizes this view. In this report Rushdie sharply criticizes the adaptation in 1984 of Scott's work *The Jewel in the Crown* to ITV television, as well as a host of other 1980's films aligned with the increasing popular interest in imperial India, the expression "Raj Revival," which describes the cultural phenomena, is used by Rushdie and other commentators. Rushdie criticizes Scott's novels in comparison to the film. He suggests that their main theme, the white woman's abuse from Indian men, reinforces just ancient myths of colonialism—"the fear of the dark by White culture" (89). Rushdie's cursory judgment of Scott's text was undoubtedly the biggest blow to the critical reputation of the Quartet and more assessments as found in Jenny Sharpe's *Allegories of the Empire: Women's Figure in the Colonial Text* (1993) and Keith Booker's *Colonial Power* (1997) also followed Rushdie to produce similar hastily unfavored texts in the *Modern British Novel* (1997).

'Until recently,' suggests Peter Morey, 'vigorous exclusive lectures frequently said 'colonial' and 'post-colonial' are anti-thesis and mutually exclusive bodies: the former are synonymous with colonizers and the latter are identified with colonized entities.' The dilemma he recognizes is a consequence of continuous criticism of the usage and criteria of the

expression "postcolonial." *The Empire Writes Back* (1989), which discusses (as its subtitle specifies) "theory and experience in post-colonial literature," offers this description as Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin's most important work in constructive criticism:

We use the word 'post-colonial' to encompass, from the time of settlement, all society influenced by the imperial era. This five is because the past phase of European colonial aggression causes continuation of concerns.

Ashcroft, et al., say that "Africa, Australia, Bangladesh, Canada, the Caribbean, India, Malay, Malta, New Zealand, Pakistan, Singapore and the countries of the South Pacific island," and "all post-colonial literature" (2). They argue that one of the main characteristics common to all such literature is "that they arose from colonialism in their present form and were formed by emphasizing the conflict with colonial powers and by emphasizing their difference from the hypothesis of the imperial center" (2). Further, the definition of the literature "Post-Colonial," as defined by *The Empire Writes Back*, emphasizes the geographical locations, which are critically located inside formerly colonized areas or produced by formerly colonized individuals. The definition of the "Post-Colonial Literature" often emphasizes the convergent political contents of these texts. [The Williams and Children 3]

While Ashcroft et al. offer one of the thoroughness insights into postcolonial critique, they do not discuss European replies to decolonization in their conception of the "post-colonial" literature and philosophy and thus strengthen the opposite distinction between former colonial and formerly colonial writings. Critics Sieke Boehmer and Sara Suleri, however, have offered a way by emphasizing the mutual story relations between colonizers and settlers to extend the concept of "postcolonial" literature. Finding a redefinition of 'postcolonial' literature, Boehmer's *Colonial and postcolonial* (1995), which mostly abandon ethnic and regional parameters:

The postcolonial literature is that which scrutinizes the colonial partnership, instead of merely writing which 'came after' empire. It is written to resist the prospect of colonization in one direction or another. In addition to a shift of authority, decolonization needed symbolic revision, a reshaping of the dominant significance. (3)

In drawing on the claim of Boehmer, Morey contends "The two settlers have a tradition that subverts simple binaries, each of them being built in part by imperial agendas, such that they both are post-colonial subjects in their separate ways". Suleri also offers an integrative understanding in the Rhetoric of English India, in comparison to

Boehmer's concept of "postcolonial condition" (1992):

The postcolonial situation is neither territorial nor more the domain of one individual than of the other: instead, it's obviously retroactive story enables the inclusion as essential corollaries of the historical stories either of its colonial history either of the critical role at present.

A criticism of British colonialism and imperialism is the response of the Raj Quartet to decolonization and represents the changing British cultural stances in the sixties and seventies against empire discourse. This draft takes up the redefinition of "postcolonial" by critics including Morey, Boehmer and Suleri, who mostly deem post-colonialism on political and cultural grounds, in the investigation of the postcolonial dimensions of his job. This research project also acknowledges that postcolonial texts are those that "involve and operate to eradicate the essential elements of the imperial discourse in oppositional and questioning activities, and illuminate and challenge the hegemonic complicit drives of some representative conventions" (The 12th Morey). In its work, "Colonial" literature relates to the period of the period, and "Wrote about colonial conception and experience, written mostly by metropolitans, but often by Creoles and Indigenous people, during colonial times," and "includes literary works written in England and the rest of the Empire" In the other hand, the "colonial" literature "was particularly concerned with colonial conquest" and "was written by and for the colonization of Europeans in their dominated non-European territory" (Boehmer 3),

Incorporated the opinion of the imperialists.....Theory of the hegemony of European society and the correctness of the monarchy influenced the colonialist literature. His distinctive stereotype has been designed to reflect on the partnership of the white man with colonized peoples.

For Scott's literature, Lazarus critically wishes to recognize alternative postcolonial literary styles. As Danny Colwell rightly points out, the Quartet "inhabits an undefined area between the colonial and postcolonial texts because of their temporal and classification liminality." Furthermore, Scott's dissertation does not stem from a literary heritage that might simply be classed as "postcolonial," citing the comparatively early dates of the publication by the Quartet. As opposed to Indian writers from the Post-Independence period, written in English who, according to Morey, disproportionately fell into the peculiar Indian post-colonial literary tradition of "ethnic allegories." Given the unique influence of Scott's text, Lazarus must be somewhat adapted to a progressive view: in contrast to identification of an alternate post-colonial literary tradition, texts that follow an alternative trajectory towards post-colonial sensibility must be considered—texts that operate inside and through several liters.

The aim of this analysis is to analyze the postcolonial aspects of the Quartet, by delineating the range of textual practices that flow throughout the four novels, and to explain the "ambiguous room." The Quartet's earlier critical explains sought to address the issue of the marginality of the text by incorporating a single critical lenti, concentrating exclusively on colonial or post-colonial elements of the text; looking mostly at the text as a historical novel; or studying the systemic and esthetic aspects. Critical studies which have taken an exclusive approach almost inevitably produce issue evaluations, as a particular critical point of view results in a misguided viewpoint for the Quartet, which blurs multiples genre distinctions. Clifford Geertz also argued that textual 'blurring genre' is not confined to movement among novel and fiction, nor is it confined to unconventional types of contemporary fiction; he noted that it can also be found in fields like history, documentary, study, and essential artworks, in particular in non-fiction literature. However, the most important characteristic that all "genus-blurring" instances share, says Geertz, is that they indicate a "refiguration in social thinking" cultural changes. Not only is Scott's text at the threshold of the colonial and post-colonial literature, it also examines the boundaries of traditional "realistic," traditional historical narrative, advances beyond epistemological considerations of Modernist history and moves into tacit ontological issues of the recording, transmission and understanding of history. The dynamic, structured narrative framework that Scott introduces throughout the Quartet suggests a post-modern sensitivity that prefigures metahistorical fiction and historiographic metafiction later in the twentieth century. Although these textual characteristics associate them with literary traditions and genres which may be beyond the traditional reach of postcolonial studies, they form fundamental aspects of Scott's alternative developmental trajectory as a postcolonial writer. Therefore, the different aspects of the Quartet that are 'blurring genre' are not, as some reviewers have suggested, representative of its underlying derivative, but rather the areas of the text in which, in the words of Geertz, its 'refiguration of social feeling' is most exposed.

The chapters that compose this research are based on a collection of independently published essays that explore the concrete connections between the Quartet and different literary styles and genres, in an effort to promote a broader critical examination of the Quartet's post-colonial developmental trajectory.

CRITIQUE OF THE SUBALTERN

The definition of 'subaltern,' as it causes divisive problems and misunderstanding, appears lax and confusing. For those "poor ranking" individuals or groups that are governed by governing elites who deprive the former of their essential privileges, Gramsci uses in his prison notebooks the term

"subaltern." Gramsci contemplated the agricultural and working communities that the National Fascist Party and its representatives suppressed and abused at the time. He searched out how his speech could be understood. However, because of their submission to the elite class, he claimed that the subaltern had little access to its own representation. By dismantling the master-slave bond, Gramsci suggested their liberation. Dismantling here requires releasing the subordinate knowledge from elite intellectual hegemony.

In his writings Gramsci emphasizes peasantry as a distinct subordinate category to the assignment of national, cultural and political power. The Subaltern Studies Group, which wanted to redesign Indian farming historiography, re-started this effort. Ranjit Guha, Touraj Atabaki, Shahid Amin, Dipesh Chakrabarty, David Arnold, Partha Chatterjee, David Hardiman, and Sumit Sarkar were all members of the Subaltern Studies Group. Guha has attempted to underline the Indian peasants' dominance over the elites, as a forerunner of this party. The 'subaltern studies' were described as the word for the general attribute of subordination, whether expressed in class, caste, age, gender, and office, or otherwise in the South Asian society (Ashcroft et al. 216). This party sees the Indian national background as consisting of the British or the indigenous elites. Guha confirms that the efforts of the poor citizens or the subaltern cannot be accepted by such a historiography.

Sometimes, the concept of 'subalternity' was used in post-colonial philosophy, which applies to individuals or communities who live beyond the hegemonic power system economically, politically and geographically. McLeod maintains that the word "subordinate" means the many citizens not part of the imperial hierarchy. He explained that "minor rural people, weak landlords, and rich peasants" could include such. The 'subaltern studies' of Leela Gandhi are "an effort to allow the people to talk at last on the jealous pages of the elitist history, to speak for or to sound the stupid voices of those who genuinely oppress them" (Leela 2).

Spivak concludes from the example of the Indian women in her contentious essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" that the center cannot talk or hear the subaltern. It starts the discussion of the recovery of the subaltern speech that seeks to subvert imperial past and ties of authority in order for the subaltern to recover their heritage. Spivak criticizes Foucault and Deleuze as a "benevolent" act, "for voicing" the subaltern. At the end, she still seems to be slipping into the same class of kindness to assert her privilege to serve the subaltern. She thus seems to be following the very same "colonial epistemology" Foucault and Deleuze are criticizing. She apparently oppresses the subaltern further by giving them a certain identity, however she modifies her subsequent views on the subaltern representation. In her essay "A Literary Portrayal of the Subaltern: The

Third World Text of a Woman," she states that a subordinate representation is possible. In this analysis, the term "representation" is used in the context of the literary representation and not as a government agent on behalf of others. In the democratic context, a hyphenated phrase is used or a word "political" is inserted. In addition, in her prose, Spivak uses complicated and enigmatic vocabulary that further alienates the subaltern from their essays.

The gendered subalter, particularly the indigenous women, seems to have a greater regard for Spivak. She maintains that colonization leaves the settled man colonized, whereas the settled people, both colonizers and the indigenous bourgeoisie, are doubly marginalized. So, she announces that it's impossible for the subaltern to talk. Its disputes may also be taken in a certain direction such that the marginalized community could not register its opposition and had little connection to the mainstream language that could be understood. Her arguments can be debunked since "post-colonial speech itself is an illustration of this kind of speech and often the prevailing vocabulary or kind of representation is appropriated to make the marginal voice known".

The subaltern representation remained a concern after the Raj's downfall. The subordinates played a definite part in the creation of free nations in the post-colonial nations, and thus their positions were crucial in anti-colonial nationalism. There are two options for decolonization. The West's dominant class is first succeeded by the trained Western indigenous elites, who speak out to serve the ordinary citizens. The ordinary people's speech therefore disappears. Second, the revolutionary fight for decolonization is commemorated by the portrayal of the actions of a hegemonic class except the anti-colonial fight of the subaltern. McLeod argues therefore that "anti-colonial nationalism will result in the substitution of a Western, colonial ruling class with a Western-educated ruling class, which seems to speak for the citizens, but works to disinfest the people" (108). Moreover, anti-colonial literature documents the elite's actions without acknowledging the status of the less privileged societal classes.

The remark by Tyson provides instructions for studying imperialist fictions that highlight the activities of repressive ideology. This criticism, which seeks fictional fault lines, thus gives agency to the excluded layers in society. He's arguing:

Naturally we will find a work which is deficient in its purpose or inadvertent promotion of sexist, classist, racial, heterosexist, or colonialist values while applying critical theories which imply a want to make the world better - like the feminism, Marxist, or postcolonial critique. Although still in these situations the defective analysis is worthwhile so

we will use it to see how these authoritarian philosophies work.

An interpretation of every text depends on the understanding of repressive ideologies. If the Colonial Philosophy is expected to continue, the Raj Quartet will establish a counterpoint to ideology from its sublateral viewpoint.

An interpretation of every document requires an understanding of the authoritarian philosophies. In order to defend the colonial philosophy, the Raj Quartet will establish a counterpoint to the ideology in its reading out of a subaltern viewpoint.

The argument of the subaltern study authors who claim that Indian culture is either governed by the Elites, or lacks the voice of the excluded groups in society, seems dramatized by Scott. In the case of Daphne, Rowan and Gopal interrogate Hari. If Hari produces Merrick's atrocities, Rowan commands the scribe to omit this aspect of the interview, so that it will not be publicly revealed. Rowan is silencing Hari's speech; it reveals the colonial officer. However, like the subordinate project, this analysis attempts to rebound from these holes and omissions the speech of the marginal character. These silencing activities are taken into account. Goonetilleke claims, while otherwise but appropriate, that '[h]istory is a document but words cannot encapsulate the actual and, considering deletions, removals and the subjectivity of the recording device, the records will never catch the condition anyway. According to Rowan, the Indian officer, Gopal, intervenes to get Hari Kumar to justice, and he resists any deletion and abolition (Goonetilleke 820). This picture, together with the subversive reading technique of fictions, distorts the system of influence of the former generic conventions. Gopal will discuss the situation in tandem with Rowan, the British cop. In addition, the colonizer Merrick is 'writing the wrongs' that inspires Gopal's consciousness and feelings of nationalism. Similarly, Rowan's resistance to misusing records and loss indicates nationalism for Gopal's sake. In this example, the condition of the 40s can also be seen as the Indians have been kept in parallel and posing a challenge to the British Raj.

CRITIQUE OF PAUL SCOTT'S "THE RAJ QUARTET"

Many authors like the English, who wrote valuable fictional genre about India, encounters between the Britons and the Indians. Some of the British literary works romanticize Indian everyday life, while others are necessarily related to the English Raj. Kipling, E.M. Forster, John Masters and the fairly recent one, Paul Scott, were the prominent novelists who wrote about the Raj. Each author has shown his own imperial embrace. Some are Raj attracted, and some are liberalistic. Kipling is known to perpetuate the Raj and defend the 'burden of the white guy.' Forster is the forerunner of Liberal humanism and keeps his identity as a British Indian with a gentle corner.

Masters seems to be a British storyteller in India. His stories help "mythologize the colonial meeting and protect the legacy of the white man" (Morey 4). Nevertheless, Masters keeps the colonized accent as well. But Morey explained better his stance that the Indians have "the thorns of philosophy and bleeds" (11). Paul Scott, who is a British, shares his predecessors with this character, but his novels deeper on the vital scene. Goonetilleke claims that "[i]t should be regarded as a serie of historic novels in which the author transforms current history into fiction and is not a book that dealing with India like Kim or A passage to India." It was the last days of the British Empire as Scott stationed in India from 1943 to 1946. The British's superior stance against the Indian people, which Forster's critique might equate with by Mrs Moore's voice in A Passage to India, seems to be surprised. Apparently, he noted among the Indians the feeling of resistance and nationalism. This stress led Scott to write to more specifically discuss the issue.

The Raj Quartet consists of the following four novels: The Crown Jewel (1966), Scorpion's Day (1968), Silence Towers (1971), Spoils A Division (1975). The incidents in these four novels are overlapping and contributing to the core story of India's independence. The Raj Quartet has been formed in the decreasing years of British Raj in India, a key time in this historic period. In August 1942 the congress started with the Movement to Leave India and culminated in Independence in August 1947 and lasted five years.

Hari Kumar and Daphne Manners are the key narratives of the first novel in the series. The second novel combines accounts from the family of Kasim, the Layton family along with the interviews between Merrick and Hari Kumar. Sarah Layton appears to be replacing the part of Daphne in this volume. The third novel deals with Barbie Batchelor's plot and existence in the Rose Cottage, although Guy Perron is the first one. At the time of the rape, Ronald Merrick is positioned as District Police Superintendent, but he remains in the British army in the later novels. Michael Gorra suggests that the third novel 'no longer undermines the events mentioned in the first novel but reinvasés them, from the perspective of formerly insignificant protagonists.' This is what Michael Gorra claims. 7 The same may also be seen for the quartet's fourth book. "The ambiguity of the Quartet's storytelling procedures and its complicated layout of one character to another's views may not be fully respected by any story synopsis," Gorra says (19).

In the tetralogy of Scott, the subaltern reaches "agency" by discussing colonialism, orientalism and the use of the indigenous, who forge the civilizing task. Goonetilleke maintains that Scott always refers to a 'Indian Unknown' that stands for 'exploitation and inequality and shows how he is removed from the 'Jewel of the Crown' image' (833). Scott also touched on the mental dilemma

caused by colonialism as the homelessness of the Indians. In India, he projects the linguistic diasporas through the characters of Duleep and Hari Kumar. The story appears to jest at the simplistic cultured project of the British after reading the text and that is done by juxtaposing various voices in the plot. Similarly, British chromatism and inequality bring out the Empire's fallacy.

The English officer looks over his home, as big and richly decorated on the eve of M.A. Kasim's detention. The storyteller explains that the English official's feeling that "the spicy scent of Indian food and Indian perfumes" does not make a difference between ancient and modern cultures is disrupted "not yet civilized, not civilized, nor civilized" (The Day 20). It appears that the Englishman only dislikes Indian traditions and culture for the purpose of appearing modern and civilized. In other terms, he is the Englishman's innate contempt towards the native customs. M.A. Kasim and the British official juxtaposition reveals to their readers that the former is a trained, cultured and active agent of the subaltern. Mr. Kasim also communicates that "the role of England as rulers is harmful to their relationship," by undermining our determination to stand up against them while betraying the illusion of governing (The Day 112). The novels often show the Indians to be able to act or to fight the West. The texts reject the stereotypical British ideas, allowing the Indians to establish a position. Morey argued that:

The friendship between Miss Crane and Mr. Chaudhuri is the expression of Subaltern department. Miss Crane serves the colonizers, besides her multicultural humanism. But after his near study of Mr. Chaudhuri she is undergoing ideological change. Mr. Chaudhuri is an indigenous, selflessly learned Indian according to the stereotypical conceptions of colonizers. "To the depressed classes of his own race, he is genuinely sympathetic and truly convincing that educated men like himself are most frequently prepared to betray their private interests in the interests of the whole world" (The Jewel 50). Miss Crane initially observes the patriarchal position of Mr. Chaudhuri at dinner as his wife waits at the door to "look at their husband's least hint of the forgotten, mistaken or wanted replacement item" while "pretending not to be there" (The Jewel 53). But it is her ignorance that the narrator assures us that Mrs. Chaudhuri wants "to rescue the lady in the kitchen" (The Jewel 54). Later Miss Crane is shocked at the love and understanding which extricates her misunderstandings in patriarchal Indian society between Mr. and Mrs. Chaudhuri. Such a representation appears to be contradictory to the generic norms of Indians.

As part of its subordinate organization, the Raj Quartet seem to embody hybridity. Western thought and ideology are transferred from the colonized land to desired indigenous people, which lead to hybridized topics. Although hybridity is "an intense

time of confrontation and opposition against a ruling colonial force, [...] depriving the imposed imperialist society, not just of the genuineness, mostly by aggression, that it has long been imposed politically, but also of itself" (Ashcroft et al. Key Concepts 121). It is considered the place of rebellion and democracy toward colonialism. But the effort of the colonizers to have imitators leads to natives who mock. According to Homi K. Bhabha, hybridity pollutes the philosophy of the colonial world while colonized natives are hybrid striking the imperial government. Hybridity is thus capable of undermining and appropriating the existing discourse. Argues Bhabha:

The social articulation of distinction is a dynamic, ongoing negotiation from a minority perspective, which tries to permit cultural hybridity in moments of transition in history. The 'right' to indicate permitted control and privilege from the periphery does not rely on the continuity of custom. (Cultural Location 3)

The tetralogy of Scott penetrates the depths of the unequal structure of classes in British society which alienates some English people and creates differences between British and Indians. Goonetilleke also supports this opinion, which maintains that the Quartet 'strongly emphasizes classes'. Another way to go about mingling with the colonized population is as if the British people are not prepared to embrace the so-called socially lowness of their own race. They show that their interactions with both the Indians and the Whites are endangered by the ethnic differences and by the structure of class that are set up in the minds of the British. In addition, there is a similar class structure between British if there is a caste system in Hindus. The class dominance and the duty of the white man on the British appear contradictory. "[for] all their flag waves, the ladies of the canton seemed to bias the British Other Ranks" the storyteller said. Miss Crane was lovingly welcomed in England as a ruler by the Nesbitt-Smith tribe, but abandoned in Mumbai. 'The experience of Miss Crane as a 'British' at one of the lower levels of the hierarchy of his own self-suffering community was first of all of social snowboarders abroad' (The Jewel 15). Hari and Merrick's antagonism in the Quartet provides expression to the class wars of the past in Britain. Sara Layton tells Merrick if "that it is real, that it's not our class (The Division 365). Merrick however has a strong official rank in India but of these are overlooked in England by the British. Merrick is further characterized as "it's a shadow middle class with vowel sounds" "not quite pukka" (The Tower 100). "the kind of citizens who belonged to India's rulership: the raj," the real or rather pukka refers to (The Tower 20, Italics in original). It emphasizes that Merrick is not a middle-class Englishman and his vowel sounds are different. Merrick is also aware of the English people's speculation about him. His study reveals his inferiority complex after Hari's arrest:

He understood all things in India, which rendered him one of them — imperial unity, fair standing, wearing uniform, service to the king and the country [...] What they both

Merrick is a middle-class member, but seeks to increase his status in the social whiteness hierarchy. This social complex causes Hari, Syed and Ahmad Kasim to become victimized to 'very pukka' and to take vengeance on the Indians above in the social ladder of indignity. The opinion of Goonetilleke is also worthy of notice, since he took a position other than the other commentators. He claims that Merrick follows Daphne and Sarah as he finds that they are not snobbish like other girls in the English higher rank, creating a ray of light to everyone in his center. Therefore, it "is his desire to unite and legitimate his aspirations and claim to be meritocratic with the capitalist class" (Goonetilleke). When Daphne comes to speak to Hari while Sarah is on horse-ride, he learns this perspective. The fact that both women oppose him exacerbates his dislike of the Indians (Goonetilleke). Gorra claims that Merrick "requires the cooperation of the survivor to ease his suffering". Merrick says to Hari: 'English corruption is their claim that they disregard Indians and the actual degradation of Indians is their claim to equality'. He thus points out that both British and Indians there is no comradeship. He says that if the two shy of these claims or in other words freely accept the ties of power hierarchy, they will exist in brotherhood. In The day, Sarah embraced the whole project of colonization and its downfall in India thus reflecting on Merrick. He torments Daphne Manners and Sarah in their interactions with the Indians, apparently:

Our dark side, your arcane portion. You announce something we are sorry for, as if here, without doors or walls, we had designed a house without any way in or out. All India lies at our door and cannot warm or warm us. We exist in holes and tears of the collapsing stone, which is no longer protected by the carapace of our past. And one day, in our tender bodies, we will lie naked. both you and us.

She compares the existence in India of the British to a blind house that has no windows and no doors or a blind alley. As their colonial mansion is destined to destruction, they are also exposed to all the dangers, even those posed by resistance. She appears to claim that darkness is the embodiment of darkness and coloniality in this house in India, and Merrick. Gorra believes "Sarah refers unknowingly to more than imperialism's secret facts". Though Haswell claims, "Throw the basic myth of British empire through painfully disclosure of the two key characters – Edwina Crane and Sarah Layton"

CONCLUSION

Thus, the deconstructive study of the text tends to dissociate the negative idealism that colonial writers have developed with India, since real India has a vibrant community and distinctive values. Subaltern

organization discerns India's true picture from its romanticized image when writing colonialism's mistakes. Criticism of Loomba and Chakrabarty claims that the subaltern agency corresponds to a subaltern's oppositional consciousness when this consciousness relieves the subaltern state. In other terms, a subaltern entity makes them central, breaking down the bond of master and slave. The realization of the opposing consciousness is thus associated with the 'decolonization' of Fanon. In addition, subordinate organization opposes globalization's hegemonic forces or modern patterns of dominance and exploitation.

In his work, Scotts' stylistic approach to the historical depiction anticipates the innovations of later British historical fiction authors, he tries to challenge the crucial claim that the Quartet express "nostalgia for old imperial times".

REFERENCES

1. Durrell, Lawrence (2012). *The Alexandria Quartet: Justine, Balthazar, Mountolive, Clea*. 1957, 1958, 1958, 1960; 1962 (as a collection). New York: Open Road Media, Kindle AZW file.
2. Farrell, J. G. (1974). *The Siege of Krishnapur*. 1973. 1st American ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Print.
3. Forster, E. M. (2005). *A Passage to India*. Ed. Oliver Stallybrass. 1924. New York: Penguin. Print.
4. Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. 1901. London: Penguin, 2011. Print.
5. Rushdie, Salman (2006). *Midnight's Children*. 1981. New York: Random. Print.
6. Scott, Paul (2007). *The Raj Quartet, Volume One: The Jewel in the Crown, The Day of the Scorpion*. 1966, 1968. Vol. 1. Ed. Alfred A. Knopf. New York: Random. 2 vols. Print.
7. Aschcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. Second ed. New York: Routledge. Print.
8. Badiger, V. R. (1999). *Paul Scott: His Art and Vision*. New Delhi: Atlantic. Print.
9. Baluch, David (2013). "Burgess's *The Long Day Wanes*." *Explicator* 60.2 (2002): 105-6. *MLA International Bibliography*. Web. 24 Apr. 2013.

10. Bhabha, Homi (2004).. The Location of Culture. 1994. New York: Routledge Classics. Print.

Corresponding Author

Ashish Devi*

Research Scholar of OPJS University, Churu,
Rajasthan