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ABSTRACT

THE DISORIENTATION THEME IN PAUL SCOTT'S
THE RAJ QUARTET

by

MARIA F. TURNLEY

Paul Scott's *The Raj Quartet* dramatizes the disorientation of both rulers and ruled during the last days of the British Raj in India. Around the vortex of social change affecting the Raj, the characters emerge on a spiral of disorientation. They can be divided into four groups: the insane, the emotionally troubled, the ineffectual and the self-contradictory. Mired in their illusions about India, they blame it for their disorientation. Observers of the Raj, Guy Ferron and Count Bronowski, form a stable group which helps us to understand why communication between individuals and groups fails. The other characters cannot sufficiently detach themselves from the disintegrating structure of the Raj to realize their inability to fulfill their aspirations. As the system malfunctions, the characters that make up that system break down. In the skewed world of the Quartet right and just behavior reap no reward and ultimately even love fails.
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INTRODUCTION

The four novels which make up Paul Scott’s *Raj Quartet* dramatize the disorientation of both rulers and ruled during the last days of British rule in India. In the television production of *The Jewel in the Crown*, Peter Kemp comments that "[d]isorientation is the guiding force" of the work and that its characters "manouevre ... like zombies in the graveyard of the Raj, through the defunct routines of a once ossified, now disintegrating society." The characters in the *Quartet* stand on a spiral where the center represents a stable, moral and almost impersonal understanding of the Raj. As one proceeds outward along the the circling ribbon of the spiral the characters become more disoriented, their views of Anglo-India more warped. Finally, at the outer edge exist people whose vision, however false, defines their role in India; serious threats to these visions eventually drive these characters insane.

While the characters possess in common an incapacity to reconcile their ideals with the changes through which India passes, each reacts differently. They divide into four groups: the insane, the emotionally troubled, the ineffectual, and the self-contradictory. In the insane group, Ronald Merrick and Susan Layton, both antagonistic to love, contrast with Barbie Batchelor and Edwina Crane who champion the emotion. The emotionally troubled, Hari and Duleep Kumar, Mildred Layton and Brigadier General Reid, blame
India for their disorientation. The ineffectual, Nigel Rowan, Colonel Layton, District Commissioner White and Mr. Knight, represent a benevolent, anachronistic paternalism. Likewise, the self-contradictory characters, Daphne Manners, her aunt, Lady Manners, Mabel Layton and Lili Chatterjee, suffer because, despite their sense of justice, they limit themselves from participating in social change. Guy Perron and Count Bronowsky form a stable group who function as a moral yardstick against which we can assess the disoriented characters. Their observations help us understand why communication fails between individuals and groups. Scott believes in the fundamental human need for love, but argues that the perversions colonialism imposes, prevent its realization. The characters create their own illusions (maya) about the world and distances between people grow as each individual reacts to accepted social, political and behavioral norms. Lack of empathy destroys any sense of fulfillment in the Quartet.

**The Insane Group**

Ronald Merrick, Susan Layton and Barbie Batchelor, become insane in a societal situation where change and stasis overwhelmingly conflict. Though less acutely disturbed than the first three, Edwina Crane too becomes insane, or, lives on the borderline between insanity and acute emotional disturbance.

The insane divide into two groups: Edwina Crane and
Barbie Batchelor; and Susan Layton and Ronald Merrick. The first pair champion love while the second evade it. Anglo-Indians reject Edwina and Barbie because of their missionary zeal, lower middle-class backgrounds and unbalanced views of India. Despite their altruism, both are socially alienated. Edwina possesses a mystical, impersonal love for the subcontinent, not any individual Indian. Barbie expresses a more personal love, but she, too, remains unaccepted by both English and Indian.

In sharp contrast with Barbie and Edwina, Ronald Merrick and Susan Layton, who find social acceptance, are vicious, petty, emotionally sterile, sexually maladjusted and confused. As they are both amoral, neither experiences qualms about their loveless, barren marriage and each attempts to manipulate those they perceive as a threat. Their mutual animus towards Indians further emphasizes their disorientation -- Susan plays the haughty, cold memsahib and Ronald, deeply bigoted, sadistically abuses prisoners.

Ronald Merrick's disorientation manifests itself in his inability to accept the coming independence of India and the destruction of the Raj. His manipulation of others, to accept his version of the truth works in all directions. He also disintegrates because of his sexual confusion and inability to love. In the process his homosexuality becomes overt. Ultimately, forced to confront both his homosexuality and the dissolution of the Raj, Merrick
himself completely displaced in the new India. Merrick’s acute disorientation adds up to an insanity which not only destroys him but many of the lives he touches. Unlike Barbie Batchelor who destroys only herself, Merrick takes as many with him as he can.

Numerous incidents demonstrate Merrick’s fixity. The most striking occurs at Susan Layton’s wedding reception, during which Count Bronowsky uncovers Merrick’s unshakeable conviction of Kumar’s guilt for Daphne Manners’ rape in the Bibighar Gardens. Despite evidence and the belief in Kumar’s innocence of an increasing number of people in Mayapore, Merrick imprisons Kumar first on a rape charge and then under the Defense of India Rules. As he tells Bronowsky he will believe Kumar guilty "to his dying day" (II, 199). ²

Bronowsky finds this obsessive interest pathological. After Lady Manners instigates a reinvestigation of the case, he seeks to convince Nigel Rowan of Merrick’s instability, describing him as an "ordinary man on the surface but underneath ... a man of unusual talents" (II, 471); a man who distorts the truth because he believes the distortion. Bronowsky also suggests that Merrick’s courage and dominating personality enable him to act out his convictions and convince others of their legitimacy.

In the end, Merrick’s courage becomes suicidal. Believing himself inviolable, he denounces the Indians who
target him as preferring "anarchy to law and order" (IV, 425). Identifying himself with the law, Merrick uses it to create a personal tyranny, a screen behind which he hides his sadistic activities. To Mohammed Ali Kasim, Merrick's inability to discriminate between the use and abuse of the law in both the Bibighar case and the trial of his son, Sayed, an I.N.A. prisoner, proves Merrick's insanity.

Eventually Merrick recognizes that his actions force the Indians to exact vengeance. According to Bronowsky, Merrick believes his inevitable murder by Indians would be avenged in spectacular fashion "in a kind of Wagnerian climax, the raj emerging from the twilight and sweeping down from the hills with flaming swords" (IV, 595). For Merrick his death will invite retribution and vindicate his 'truth', 'truth' in which Kumar's friendship with Daphne Manners represents a "liberal corruption" (II, 310) of values that leads to disasters like the Bibighar rape.

Kumar suggests that Merrick's reaction to the rape manifests the Englishman's sense of social inferiority, finding outlet in racism and sadism. He tortures the Indian to make him accept the 'reality' of his social and racial inferiority in Mayapore, but also to repress his confusions about his own position both in Anglo-India and England.  

Even more than reflecting ambiguity about his social role, Merrick's treatment of Kumar mirrors his sexual preference. Pandit Baba Sahib describes the superintendent
as a man whose "cruelty and perversions were well known" (II, 115). Bronowsky, the most vocal about Merrick's deviant behaviour, says that he "didn't really like women" (IV, 176) and that, in pursuing Daphne, he actually pursued Kumar for whom "he had an obsession, an absolute fixation" (IV, 177).

Prior to his murder by Indians, Merrick flaunts his homosexuality, as if recognizing the inevitability of death and the futility of disguising his preference. In the Nawab of Mirat's service just before his murder, Merrick has homosexual relations with at least one of his temporary houseboys, afterwards beating the boy. To Bronowsky the sexual encounter and the beating awaken Merrick's consciousness of the link between his "homosexuality ... sadomasochism ... sense of social inferiority and ... grinding defensive belief in his racial superiority" (IV, 594).

Despite his social and sexual problems, Merrick remains in a position of authority in India because of his ability to manipulate others. He gains access to Susan Layton's private file by playing upon the latent homosexuality of her psychiatrist's assistant, Pinky. The incident displays Merrick's gift for intrigue and pathological enjoyment in torturing his victim. The policeman

had a talent, one that amounted to genius; for seeing the key or combination of keys that would open a situation up so that he could twist it to suit his purpose (IV, 271).

Merrick's marriage to Susan Layton, despite incontrovertible
evidence of her mental instability, demonstrates his negligible interest in love and sexual fulfillment. It also illustrates how he uses situations to his advantage. He knew her vulnerability after her nervous breakdown and this, along with her obsession with social form, made him certain she would accept his marriage proposal.

Merrick's personality stands in strongest contrast with that of the retired missionary, Barbie Batchelor. Both go insane, but Merrick's inability to love makes him actively evil. Merrick's distorted perception of Kumar, Barbie instinctively recognizes as "sexual jealousy? racial jealousy?" (IV, 384). Since Barbie considers love indispensible to existence, for her "the devil was Ronald Merrick" (IV, 390). Daphne Manners, one victim of Merrick's obsession, describes him as "a mansion without doors and windows with no way in and no way out" (II, 415). In her diary she pillories Merrick's inability to accept the love between herself and Kumar. Merrick's windowless personality, impervious to love, warps his attitude to those with whom he comes in contact, especially Kumar who brings out his homosexuality and class resentment. More than any other character in the Quartet, Ronald Merrick represents the dark, hidden side of the Raj. We do not despise his ambition, but his ruthless, amoral and, ultimately, insane pursuit of a reality that exists only for himself.

Like Ronald Merrick, Susan Layton's disorientation
results from an inability to distinguish role-playing from reality. Raised as a memsahib, Susan plays roles to hide her vicious, sexually frigid and loveless self. Susan successfully exerts her will over others, but becomes insane when unable to hide her real nature. Playing the pukka memsahib for her mother highlights Susan's gift for manipulation. Her performance of the ideal Anglo-Indian role elicits both Mildred's praise and indulgence. In contrast, Susan's sister, Sarah, rejects such charades and so invites her mother's animus. By her behavior, Susan encourages Mildred's callous rejection of her sister. Their filial relationship suffers because of Susan's selfish demand for love which she does not reciprocate.

Many events support Susan's ability to role-play in the Quartet. Just before Susan's wedding to Teddie Bingham, Ahmed Kasim tells Count Bronowsky about her uncanny ability to appear helpless and vulnerable. He comments ironically about how "[p]eople do things for her. She must have trained them to think she can't do them for herself" (II, 90). In private Kasim sees Susan react violently to her fiance, Teddie's embraces yet in public

Miss Susan Layton submitted to Captain Bingham's protective and possessive touch with equanimity, even with approval, in fact with an air of demanding it quite frequently as if it were due to her at regular intervals (II, 91).

The discrepancy between Susan's private rejection of Teddie and her public responsiveness to his trained embraces
illustrates three aspects of her personality: her inability to be penetrated by love, her sexual impotence, and her scrupulous adherence to social form to hide inner emptiness.

Susan's orchestrates her wedding into an elaborate tableaux focusing on herself. Although an unknown Indian throws a stone which hits Teddie on his way to the wedding, his emotional upset leaves Susan unconcerned. She does not even mention the incident at the reception; it would interrupt her fairy-tale wedding. Susan insulates herself from social disapproval by her outwardly perfect match with Teddie Bingham. Sarah describes the marriage as,

[s]o many white well-bred mares brought out to stud for the purposes of coupling with so many young white well-bred stallions, to ensure the inheritance and keep it pukka (II, 139).

In a moment of dependency after Teddie's death, Susan confides to Sarah the appalling truth about her marriage,

I ... wanted to make a life for myself that would add up .... Marrying Teddie was part of it ... even though I didn't really love him (II, 357).

Without any rewards for playing the role of widowed mother, Susan must face life. Widowhood not being a part she can handle, she suffers a nervous breakdown. For Susan the attempt to burn her child would eliminate one of the accoutrements of a role she no longer wants. Without the security of another social marriage she behaves like an insect deprived of its cover, "out in the open. Like when you lift a stone and there's something underneath running in circles" (II, 355). Scott uses another insect metaphor to dramatize
Susan's inability to contain her subliminal fears. Like a scorpion that burns itself to death trying to sting the fire that surrounds it, Susan attempts to burn Baby Teddie to clear the slate for a new role. To Scott her insane action also symbolizes the Raj's exploitive participation in society. The whole Anglo-Indian community suffered from Susan's predicament: "the inadequacy of their armour, of the code, conduct, ideas and principles by which they lived."  

Susan encourages Ronald Merrick's attention to shield herself from public disapproval after her nervous breakdown. The two search each other out for selfish, exploitive reasons. Susan cannot bear public scrutiny unprotected by a role and Merrick seeks an advantageous connection with the Laytons. Both partners reject love, and neither bothers about the destructive effects of a sterile marriage. They concentrate on the social approval which marriage brings to hide their inability to lead normal lives.

Like Ronald Merrick and Susan Layton, the two spinster missionaries, Barbie Batchelor and Edwina Crane, fall into the insane category. Unlike the first pair, the missionaries believe in the necessity of love. Barbie Batchelor needs to love and be loved intimately, though asexually. Edwina Crane cannot cross from abstract to personal love. As spinsters and missionaries, Edwina and Barbie occupy an ambivalent position in Anglo-India. Largely excluded from
cantonment society because of their lower-class origins and their empathy for Indian aspiration to equality, they disrupt a society that encourages racial separation. Scott complicates the image of the two missionaries as visionaries when he addresses the question of their dislocation from both Anglo-Indian and 'native' society. Indeed, throughout the Quartet, social forces inimical to love intervene to suppress it. In the end they drive both to insanity.

Barbie functions as an instrument of truth in the Quartet. Scott criticizes British racial hypocrisy through Barbie's decline from an inveterate talker into an insane mute. Barbie's accident while conveying her trunk from Rose Cottage to the Peplow's residence triggers her insanity. Its strewn contents symbolize her goodness, honest mistakes, ideals and illusions matured and cherished in India. In a sense, the contents of the trunk also represent a final casting away of Britain's good intentions about India. The trunk's spilt contents symbolically link Barbie's history with the history of the Raj in India. Their illusions about the weight of past mistakes defeats whatever good intentions the British had in India.

Though the accident with the trunk triggers Barbie's decline into speechless madness, she has moved there through phases. Barbie's search for a love between the races, her chief illusion and motivation defines and informs her decline. But the love Barbie seeks to create cannot exist
within the rigid social confines of a British cantonment. Barbie's insanity is accelerated by her understanding of the tragic ramifications of the failure of love.

A relationship being a sharing of love, Barbie tries to share the emotion with a variety of characters -- Mabel Layton, Edwina Crane, Sarah Layton, the Peplows (Cantonment representatives of the Church of England), Ashok, the chokra boy, even Mildred and Susan Layton. In most cases Barbie experiences disappointment if not rejection. Mabel's deafness limits their friendship and her largely unspoken love leaves Barbie unsure. Barbie's unanswered correspondence with Edwina Crane leaves her disappointed. Ashok, the vagabond chokra boy, another recipient of Barbie's love, initially seeks rupees as much as love from the old missionary. The Peplows only grudgingly board Barbie after Mabel's death. They do not love the old, destitute missionary. Only with Sarah Layton and Mabel does Barbie find acceptance, but Sarah cannot devote all her time to Barbie and Mabel spends most of her time in her garden. Mildred and Susan Layton, on the other hand, overtly reject Barbie; Mildred rejects Barbie's wedding gift to Susan of silver apostle's spoons. On Mabel's death she evicts Barbie from Rose Cottage after an altercation about Mabel's burial place.

Barbie encounters people and situations that cannot fulfill her need for a reciprocated, satisfying love.
Ultimately, as with the ambiguity that characterizes the British presence in India, she divides against herself. In a letter to Edwina, Barbie claims, "There is more than one of me and one, I'm not sure which, has a serious duty to perform" (III, 79). Anxious and confused about the importance of her contribution to India, Barbie pursues myriad, unsuccessful ways by which to fill a need for herself, a need for her love.

Scott uses Barbie's lace veil with a butterfly pattern to symbolize the similarity between Barbie's confusion on a personal level and Britain's confusion on a larger scale about its role in India. Incarcerated by India, without purpose, separated by class from each other and racially from Indians, the British are like the lace butterflies defined, patterned and imprisoned by the veil. Before Barbie degenerates into madness, she covers her head with the veil, symbolizing defeat by a system that cannot accept her love.7

In some ways Barbie represents an ideal which, unburdened by cynicism and pragmatism, cannot survive in Anglo-India. Her difficulty becomes more acute when she loses Mabel. Indeed, with Mabel's demise Barbie becomes the object of Mildred's active and vengeful animus. Mabel's death gives Mildred the opportunity to evict Barbie from Rose Cottage. Although the Peplows board Barbie, they do not censure Mildred's abuse because in the small world of
the cantonment, Barbie, as a retired missionary, has no social cachet. For Scott, Mildred's rejection of Barbie and of Mabel's last wish symbolically shows the English guilty of "the sin of collectively not caring a damn about a desire or an expectation or the fulfillment of a promise" (III, 236). All these factors accelerate Barbie's decline into madness. Like Mabel who went deaf to insulate herself from the frictions of Anglo-Indian society, the formerly garrulous Barbie regresses into dumb nihilism.

The word was "dead". Dead. Dead. It didn't matter now who said it; the edifice had crumbled and the facade fooled nobody (III, 229).

As she deteriorates, Barbie creates an intense personal reality with her visions and dreams. She exposes the paranoia of Anglo-Indians seeking to victimize Hari Kumar over the Bibighar rape in a nightmarish vision where

his eyes were blinded by cataracts. He had a powerful muscular throat ... exposed because his head was lifted and his mouth open in a continuous soundless scream (III, R1).

Later, meeting Ronald Merrick, Barbie recognizes him as the Indian's persecutor. Repelled by his jealousy of Kumar, Barbie gives him an allegorical picture of Queen Victoria which to her ironically symbolizes England's diminished ideals about India. Barbie recognizes Merrick as a spoiler, incapable of dealing fairly with Kumar or Daphne Manners. Merrick tells the missionary that Daphne's child threatens Anglo-Indian standards of decency. He cannot see, as Barbie does, that the orphan child has "Krishna as well as Jesus"
(III, 341). After their conversation, Barbie has an accident with her trunk that leaves her delirious and, in her delirium, she equates the devil with Merrick.

Barbie's insanity results from her inability to withstand the destructive power of hate. Once hospitalized, Barbie preoccupies herself with watching the vultures at the Parsi Towers of Silence wheel and feast on the newly dead. She finds solace in speechlessness, for she has, finally, no more to say. Locked into a private world, she likens the vultures preying on the dead to those who pick over the rotten carcass of the Raj; and, in her last words, forced from a failing chest, she defends her sanity:

I am not ill, Thou art not ill. He, she or it is not ill. We are not ill, you are not ill, they are all well. Therefore ... (III, 397).

While Barbie's madness results from a persistent rejection of her love, Edwina's disorientation follows from her capacity to experience love in the abstract but not personally. Like Barbie, the destructive effects of Edwina's idealizations about India disorient her. An agnostic mission teacher, outcast and critic of cantonment society, Edwina supervises native schools in Mayapore and the vicinity. She holds her beliefs about racial equality despite Anglo-Indian hostility but remains divorced from India. Edwina regards her tea parties for Indian ladies as meaningful cross-cultural gatherings rather than friendly encounters. As a consequence she has few friends; her principles about racial
equality make her disliked by the British, while educated Indians find her politics simplistic and her reserve disconcerting. Edwina lives in an emotional vacuum, driven by an impersonal love for India, but, as Lili Chatterjee comments, for no particular Indian. Her character prevents her from realizing even the small personal triumph of friendship with Indians, much less the grander ideal of communion between the races.

Edwina lacks Barbie Batchelor's visionary insight. In a land suffused by religion and mysticism she remains an agnostic. At moments, famished in spirit by the immense weight of India — the land, the air, the incomprehensible space — Edwina feels that "she is being touched by the heavy finger of a god" (I, 18). But her agnosticism leaves her spiritually out of touch with India. She chooses the subcontinent after her tenure as a governess because she feels unfulfilled. In her choice of public service Edwina nurtures delusive ideals as her life lacks a firm emotional base. Excluded from the Anglo-Indian community, without any real Indian friends except for Miss Williams a eurasian also excluded from both English and Indian society, Edwina works frenetically to "promote the cause of human dignity and happiness" (I, 24).

Edwina's disassociation from India makes the reader critical of her experiments to foster racial unity. Her use of an allegorical picture of Queen Victoria surrounded by
Indian princes bearing gifts in order to teach English to native children ironically symbolizes dependence and inequality to represent the importance of obligation and self-denial:

[I]n order to promote a wider happiness and well-being ... to rid the world of the very evils the picture took no account of: poverty, disease, misery, ignorance and injustice (I, 30).

Edwina’s divorce from her colonial environment becomes obvious when, unable to correctly interpret the meaning of the picture, she gives it qualities it does not possess. Unconsciously she teaches an imperial ideal, and deludes herself that by self-denial and pursuit of duty, her dreams for India will materialize.

Edwina’s song, "There’s a friend for little children" further illustrates her disorientation. Ironically she sings this during the Quit India riots just prior to the attack upon her and Mr. Chaudhari by goondas. At this moment of danger the song represents Edwina’s delusions about her life and work in India. Her unrealistic assumption that the rioters would not attack Mr. Chaudhari and herself illustrates her ignorance of the political mood. As the attack begins Mr. Chaudhari also exposes Edwina’s inability to personally step across the gulf between English and Indian. Angered, he shouts, "Do you only take orders from white men? Do you only keep promises you make to your own kind?" (I, 67). In the end Chaudhari perishes, unable to convince Edwina about the menace the rioters pose.
Chaudhari's death at the rioters hands snaps the last thread that binds Edwina to sanity. It destroys her convictions about the achievability of racial unity. She sits by the roadside, holding his lifeless hand, muttering, "Nothing I can do. Nothing. Nothing." (I, 69) Forced to confront the fragility of her illusions that Indians and English can under a colonial government mingle with equality, friendship and love, Edwina commits suttee (self-immolation). It becomes her personal act of contrition for making Chaudhari pay for her illusions with his life, and also, as Ronald Merrick suggests, an act of love for her dead mate, India.

The Emotionally Disturbed Group

While Edwina's disorientation eventually results in death, another group of characters in the Quartet -- Duleep and Hari Kumar, Mildred Layton and Brigadier General Reid -- suffer because of the destruction of an image of the British which, when broken, breaks them. All four are displaced in time and blame India for their troubles. Hari and Duleep's displacement arises from their unique position as brown-skinned Englishmen. Though he cannot be English, Duleep rejects India completely. He first goes to England to study law and later, as a wealthy businessman, settles permanently with his son. He aims to have his son raised in the white man's world. This serves as a stage set for Hari's dislocation. Educated in England, English in all but color, at his father's death he returns to India a penniless orphan.
While the first two characters are Indian, the second pair, Mildred Layton and Brigadier General Reid, are English, resident aliens in India. Mildred and Reid exist as fractious elements in cantonment society, exacerbating class and racial tensions. Denied their position at the vanguard of the Raj, they react negatively to changes that threaten colonial rule.

Duleep's disorientation arises directly from the stratification which colonial rule imposes on India. He migrates to England to pursue a better life for himself and social equality with Englishmen for his son. His disorientation turns on the contrast between his ideals for himself and his son and the shattering of these ideals by his bankruptcy. This contrast becomes so traumatic after he loses his fortune that Duleep has no goal left and commits suicide. After his death English values prove insufficient to sustain Hari in India.

Scott takes care to illustrate the differences between father and son. Duleep's dislocation stems from a cultural displacement clearly different from that which affects Hari later in India. Scott creates Duleep in exactly the opposite mold from his son. As an Indian living in a white man's world Duleep, though misguided, forms his destiny, something Hari even as an adult, does not. There are many reasons for this basic difference, Duleep, unlike Hari, consciously choses to live in an alien culture. He goes to
England already an adult, already an Indian. His identity, however unsatisfactory, gives him underpinnings his son lacks. Duleep recognizes that he will never be English, but believes that by bringing up his son in England Hari will have the same privileges as the English: "Power, Duleep felt, lay not in money but in [the] magical combination of knowledge, manner and race" (I, 212) which was the heritage of an English, upper-class education. Too late, the son learns the basic folly of his father's ambitions and pays the price for his delusions.

On arriving in England, Duleep believes the English superior, not as individuals, but as a people. This belief spawns the mistaken idea that by becoming like them his son can become one of them. Aware that the English have feet of clay, Duleep still believes himself racially inferior. He sees in England

dirt, squalor and poverty . . . barefoot children, ragged beggars, drunken women, and evidence of cruelty to animals and humans; sins which in India only Indians were supposed to be capable of committing (I, 225).

Despite this, Duleep refuses to accept the logic of a world existing in contradiction to his expectations. As a consequence Duleep shields his son from socio-economic differences in England. The boy's education at Chillingborough, a prestigious public school, Duleep feels will guarantee acceptance in Anglo-India. The father denies the strong Indian need to see, hold and love his son because he refuses to infect him with Indian customs and manners. Although
Duleep does not want to burden Hari with the cultural ball and chain of being Indian, he leaves him without a heritage he can call his own. Duleep’s change of fortune makes manifest the destructive illusions he has about himself, his son, India and England. He recognizes too late that without money and influence his ambitions for Hari will come to naught, and so commits suicide.

Duleep’s suicide results from more than shock at his bankruptcy. He consciously chooses it rather than admit that his life has been a series of failures. Duleep fails, firstly, as an Indian because he cannot come to terms with his own culture. His failures as a husband and a father result from his inability to achieve his own identity. Suicide becomes Duleep’s final act of failure, one he can consciously control. Duleep, however, cannot control his legacy to Hari, namely, a life in which the impoverished son must live out the father’s illusions in a world peopled by Ronald Merricks.

Through Hari Kumar’s progressive disorientation Scott exposes the disintegrative effects of British rule in India. Indian by color, English by education, Kumar exists as an historical anomaly, a member of a subject race raised as one of its rulers. Inimical social forces conspire to distort his personal realtions in India. His fate dramatizes the dark side of the Raj, the estrangement between English and Indian and Indian and Indian under colonialism. As Edwina
Crane symbolizes the havoc a colonial environment wreaks on imperial ideals, Hari Kumar represents its damaging effect on legitimate ambition.

Brought up comfortably in England, given the best education and insulated from social abuse, young Kumar does not understand the social evils and racism that beset the subcontinent. Scott emphasizes his displacement by highlighting the young man's two names: Harry Coomer in England and Hari Kumar in India, each representing a different identity. In India Kumar's relatives deny him his Hari Kumar persona and Anglo-Indians deny him his Harry Coomer identity.

Scott creates Kumar as Macaulay's brown-skinned Englishman, then illustrates the hollowness of the ideal and the poignancy of the Indian situation. Kumar poses a potential threat for both men and women in the cantonment. The women cannot admit his existence, even though they find him attractive; "[h]e was handsome in the western way, in spite of his dark skin" (I, 134). More than a racial threat, Kumar also represents a class threat to men like Stubbs and Merrick. In India these men are victors by accident of birth in a class war they have lost in England by that same accident. Srinivasan, the lawyer, feels certain Kumar's rejection by Stubbs of the British India Electrical Company resulted because the Englishman "probably spoke English with a Midlands accent, and resented the fact
that an Indian spoke it like a managing director" (I, 256).
Srinivasan's pessimism about Kumar's future springs from the
latter's negligible social position; without money and
contacts, Kumar's education counts for little in India. The
aspirations of the young Indian and, indeed, those of his
dead father, are set against hostile social forces. Kumar's
educated accent puts the lie to myths about inherent super-
iority. Only by distorting his part in society, by neutral-
izing him, can the challenge he represents be beat back.

Unable to penetrate cantonment society, Kumar refuses a
firm core to his life by his distaste for his Indian
environment and relatives. Pandit Baba Sahib, Kumar's old
Hindi teacher turned anarchist, believes that Daphne Manners
was the only friend his pupil had in India:

> All of us were foreigners to Hari Kumar. He knew only
> English people and English ways. Only he wanted these
> people and these ways. In Mayapore he could not have
> them. He was a most unfortunate young man. His case
> should be taken to heart. (II, 113)

Kumar was "an English boy with a dark brown skin, and such a
combination was hopeless in India" (II, 280). Scott shat-
ters Kumar's hope of integrating the English and the Indian
in him by destroying the love he and Daphne Manners share.
He drives home Kumar's divided identity in India. At the
re-examination of the Bibighar rape case, Nigel Rowan (a
fellow Chillingburian and one of the examiners) cannot
overcome his awareness of Kumar's Indianness and so ignores
his evidence against Merrick: "it went against the grain to
hear Kumar accuse an English public officer" (IV, 318).

At the re-examination, Kumar learns of Daphne's death and sinks into a depression from which he does not emerge.

[He] seemed to have no ambition ... one had only to look at [his] face to see that [his] window on the world was ... closed and darkened (IV, 336).

Scott uses Kumar and Daphne as a stick to censure both the upper and lower-class English for their destructive bigotries which deny individual aspiration and love. The affair demonstrates two salient point of Raj history: First, the hollowness of Macaulay's ideal, and, secondly, Anglo-Indian prejudice against such experiments in social engineering. Kumar's affair with Daphne Manners antagonizes Anglo-India. The two, though lovers, "could never be described as star-crossed because they had no stars" (II, 305). Merrick regards their love as miscegenation, unacceptable within the strict confines of Anglo-Indian society. The small-minded in the cantonment regard Kumar as "the Indian boy Miss Manners thought she was in love with ... some kind of hypnotist" (III, 79).

Through Kumar's truncated affair with Daphne, Scott questions the social stigma imposed on the Indian, but he also emphasizes Kumar's passivity. The affair, after all, was Daphne's idea. Kumar exists as a victim of her failure to successfully cross the chasm between English and Indian. In India Kumar has no real identity and remains a pseudo-Englishman, yearning for an unattainable home. His essay
for the Mayapore Gazette describes England as a place of "endless summers and the shade of different kinds of trees, and then of winters when the branches of the trees were so bare ..." (IV, 622). To Kumar it remains a home where his ambitions might still be realized, a vision dramatically shattered by the brutal reality of India.

While Kumar's attempts to better his prospects in India fail, Mildred Layton, aggrieved that life has cheated her, makes no attempt to change. She feels her descent from old Anglo-Indian stock should give her a position of dominance in India. In defiance, she maintains the pukka memsahib role in public even though privately she becomes an adultress, an alcoholic and a cause of familial discord. Mildred's dislocation partly results from an illusion that class and race, not personal merit, entitle her to preferential treatment. Consequently she uses social forms to hide her inner emptiness and inability to love. Mildred's vicious nature, "damped down by compulsive drinking" and her vision of "her fortitude as exemplary" (III, 43), fools almost nobody. But Anglo-Indians allow her latitude for social reasons. Her lineage from the Muirs and her marriage to a Layton entitle her to this treatment.

Mildred's credentials also guarantee public acquiescence in her vindictive humiliation of Barbie. Scott uses Mabel's death to herald Mildred's open warfare on Barbie. The event also illustrates the differences between Mabel's,
Mildred's and Barbie's outlook on India. To Scott, Mabel represents the nurturing, man-bap aspect of the Raj, Barbie the ideal of love, and Mildred the corruption of which the system was capable. After Mabel's death Mildred exploits Anglo-Indian acquiescence in her behavior to evict Barbie from Rose Cottage and to dishonor Mabel's last wish to be buried at the side of her husband.

Upon gaining possession of Rose Cottage Mildred obliterates the last vestige of Mabel's presence, the rose garden, to build a tennis court. Barbie considers her act an insensitive defacement and, at a mystic level, interprets Mildred's presence as demoniac. She replaces the once heavenly scent of the rose garden with a noxious emanation from indoors "as if there was something dangerous in the room whose attention it would be foolhardy to attract" (III, 24). To Barbie, Mabel's loving care of the roses symbolizes the liberal spirit of the Raj while Mildred represents an insular, malicious spirit who "no one in her right mind would want to cross" (III, 43).

Anglo-Indians ignore Mildred's mistreatment of Barbie but censure her aggression towards Sarah and pampering of Susan. In their gossip sessions the Pankot women condemn Mildred's role in transferring Teddie Bingham's and Ronald Merrick's affections from Sarah to Susan. They cannot see that Mildred and Susan, the quintessential memsahibs, empathize with each other. To them, Mildred's partiality to
Susan seems unfair only because they think of Sarah as "upright, honest, and, one imagined, a tower of strength to her mother" (II, 127).

Mildred's indifference to Sarah after the latter's affair and resulting pregnancy, demonstrates her icy unconcern about her daughter's passage into adulthood. Mildred does not alleviate Sarah's trauma over the affair and merely tells her sister, Fenny, to get rid of the thing. She remains impervious to Sarah's need for love. Her destructive tendencies towards Sarah become manifest when she continues to direct the attentions of her older daughter's suitors to Susan, especially Nigel Rowan, whom she knows Sarah loves. Ultimately, Mildred's constant aggression forces Sarah to recognize her mother's true nature:

To Sarah she preserves the mask of perfect form and perfect cruelty .... For her mother ... the pregnancy and abortion had never happened .... For her mother the silence was part of the code, the standard: the angel's face in the dark. Or was it a demon's? (IV, 131)

Besides a cause of familial discord between her daughters, Mildred exposes another negative aspect of her personality in her liaison with Kevin Coley. Her husband's imprisonment as a German P.O.W. gives Mildred this opportunity. Their adulterous relationship, described by Barbie as "joyless coupling", a perversion of the creative-process, proves Mildred incapable of having any genuine relationships. She admits Coley because he believes her theatrical performance as the perfect memsahib.
Mildred demonstrates her neurotic concern with appearances when she organizes a special tour of the neighboring villages accompanied by Coley. For Mildred the tour of thanks for gifts received at Baby Teddie’s birth becomes a private celebration of her role as benevolent patroness in India. Mildred becomes a memsahib for Coley’s benefit and that of the ignorant villagers to establish the importance of her role. Unable to see through the illusion Mildred perpetuates, Coley regards Mildred’s behavior as socially uplifting. By believing her to be superior he becomes her creature and of her tour he observes:

Mildred had gallantly drunk cup after cup of syrupy tea, eaten piping hot chappatis, a bowl of vegetable curry, been soaked in a sudden shower between villages, held squealing black babies ... discussed the crops with village elders, more intimate problems with the wives and mothers, the hopes of recruitment with shy striplings pushed forward by their old male relatives to salaam Colonel Memsaahib, and returned exhausted but upright through one of the wet season’s spectacular sunsets which turned her white shirt flamingo pink and the shadows of the horses brown. (III, 258)

Like Mildred, Brigadier General Reid, the last of the group of emotionally disturbed characters, also upholds behavior which encourages stratification within the cantonment and racial privileges outside. His disorientation stems from his belief that, as an Englishman, he has unlimited power in India. Any person who threatens this belief Reid considers an antagonist.

Reid hates Indians and systematizes his responses to them. Unlike him, District Commissioner White, receptive to
racial equality, feels that Reid hides behind his conception of a British officer, comfortable with the Army's institutionalized discrimination. White outlines their differences as those between Englishmen who liked and admired Indians and believed them capable of self-government, and Englishmen who disliked or feared or despised or, just as bad, were indifferent to them as individuals. (I, 338)

Reid views White as an unknown quantity, not part of the system and, therefore, dangerous. To protect British interests Reid represses the individual and political rights of Indians. This perception motivates his support of General Dyer's massacre of Indians at Jallianwallah Bagh. White satirically draws an analogy between Reid and Dyer and suggests that "if the Indians didn't start a rebellion Reid would be forced to invent one so that by suppressing it he'd feel he'd done his whole duty" (I, 338). Reid's obedience to the 'white-robot' mentality disassociates him from his Indian environment. Once caught up in the machinery of the Raj, Reid suppresses individuality in the cause of a system on the verge of extinction.

Scott takes pains to present Reid as a victim of the system he serves. A good family man, Reid's personal losses (his wife dies in India and his son in a Japanese P.O.W. camp) make him even more dependent on institutional beliefs. This crutch motivates his inability to see beyond the system, creates his loathing of Indians and informs his dislike of the civil service because it offers equal
opportunities to Indians and English. Reid believes that the civil side has become corrupt, a gangrenous limb of the Raj that must be cut off:

[T]he civil [has] become so riddled with Indians that the old dependable type of English Civilian has more or less died out and ... only the English army and police officer ... can really handle an explosive situation. (II, 197)

Blind racism motivates his support of Merrick's imprisonment of Kumar after the Bibighar rape. Seeing a fellow believer in Merrick, he does not feel Merrick exceeds his authority in the Bibighar arrests. Merrick presents his report of the case first to Reid because he knows the latter's prejudiced notions about Indians make him an ally. Reid, unsurprisingly, refuses to accept the popular accusation in Indian circles that the police, at Merrick's instigation, brutalized and defiled their Indian prisoners. Instead he believes Merrick is justified in detaining the men under the Defense of India Rules after the initial rape charges will not stick. Merrick, an opportunist, exploits Reid's unquestioning obedience to the system to pervert justice in the Bibighar case.

The Ineffectual Group

Nigel Rowan, Colonel Layton, District Commissioner White and Mr. Knight are disoriented by their ineffectiveness in the face of change. As upper-class Englishmen (who attended Chillingborough, an institution famous for its empire builders) they have the capacity for good but cannot
handle India's rapid transition from colonial paternalism to political freedom. They harken back to a time when Britain dominated its colonies, secure in its role in the world. Under the pressures of world war and a movement for Indian independence, these four officers mentally pull out and abdicate power to men of inferior status. Unlike the lower class Englishman who regards India as the only place he can be on top, they have position and class to fall back on in England. In the vacuum between the coming of Indian rule and the abrogation of authority by traditional Anglo-Indian officials, low-class Englishmen like Merrick and Stubbs assume powers that in earlier times would have been strongly challenged. While much of what occurs in the Quartet happens because of the peculiar combination of war, an independence movement and the intrusion of the modern world, the ineffectual do much to abet what does happen, by their disinclination to halt corruption within the Raj.

These officers know of Bibighar and Kumar; indeed, White and Rowan are officially involved with the case. During the Bibighar re-examination Nigel Rowan's disorientation results from a conflict between his Chillingburian code of honor and his duty as a Raj officer. Under the stress, Rowan cannot impartially judge the case. He uncritically reads Merrick's report and believes Kumar's "complicity in rape" (IV, 299). At the examination, Rowan confronts the contradiction between Merrick's report and his
impression of Kumar at Kandipat jail. Rowan distances himself from Kumar to counteract his shock at his own

"initiation into one of the raj’s obscurer rites, the kind concluded in a windowless room with artificial light and air ... the ominously still centre of the world of moral and political power" (IV, 302).

Unfortunately for Kumar, in India the ties of class and background do not cross those of color. Rowan regards Kumar as an Indian, one of 'them'.

Though Rowan cannot bring himself to side officially against Merrick, the interview awakens him to the chilling fact that Merrick tells lies because he does not believe in the English officers’ code of incorruptibility. He realizes that despite Kumar's innocence of political crimes and rape, Merrick's class prejudices compel him to persecute the Indian. Rowan diagnoses the persecution as the result of a clash

between Macaulay's brown-skinned Englishman -- and Merrick, English-born and English-bred, but a man whose country's social and economic structure had denied him advantages ... which Kumar had initially enjoyed. (IV, 314)

Rowan correctly understands Kumar's innocence and Merrick's abuse of authority but cannot make the transition from incorruptible Englishman to scrupulous official. Nevertheless, he cannot completely dissociate himself from Bibighar. He confesses to another Chillingburian, Guy Perron, his conviction of Kumar's innocence and Merrick's guilt. He accepts the incongruity of a value system that leaves him unable to act:
[for] whatever [Kumar] said sounded like the truth ... he'd told the truth about the caning. I accepted that ... I don't condone it. I'm not sure I can condemn it. It would be unfair to single Merrick out. (IV, 319,326)

On hearing his friend's confession, Perron mourns Rowan's loss of an administrative 'ethic'. By compromising his standards to fit the 'white-robot' mold, Rowan's dilemma becomes "the dilemma of the raj -- the dilemma of men who hoped to inspire trust but couldn't even trust themselves" (IV, 319). Rowan's abdication of duty left men like Merrick free to manipulate a corrupt system. Through Perron's silent condemnation of Rowan's attitude to Kumar, Scott portrays India as a place where the unprincipled Englishman as well as the old Anglo-Indian can enjoy and abuse power. However, both Merrick and Rowan are out of place in a country breaking free from two centuries of colonial domination, in a world going through the fire of a great war.

Rowan's confusion about his role in the Indian Civil Service is echoed by Colonel Layton's bewilderment at change in the army. Layton's inability to act in accordance with old Anglo-Indian ideas about service or succeed in convincing others of their legitimacy makes him weak and ineffectual as an officer. The discrepancy between the old and the new disorients him. Like District Commissioner White, Colonel Layton passively hangs on to the idea of Raj while mentally withdrawing from a purposeful life.

Layton's disorientation about India infects his personal life. A cuckold, Layton refuses to believe that his
wife, Mildred, would compromise the standards of old Anglo-India and behave with impropriety. Through their tainted marriage Scott questions the values upheld by old Anglo-Indian families. The colonel also distances himself from his daughter Sarah's familial problems to avoid a confrontation with Mildred. By dissociation from family problems he hopes to keep up the facade that as a family they survive with values intact.

Layton's belief in man-bap (mother - father), an outmoded, paternalistic attitude to India, is another indicator of his disorientation. He uses it to give his work legitimacy. Through his behaviour Scott evaluates both the political usage and social ramifications of man-bap as it makes Indians inferiors in a relationship of inequality. In the struggle between old and new social attitudes between English and Indian, people like Merrick, antagonistic to man-bap, win and people like Colonel Layton lose. Man-bap requires incorruptibility to avoid abuse. By the time of the Quartet, however, it lacks viability. Though Layton espouses the idea, his inability to act in accordance with its tenets leaves him disoriented. Unable to protect Muzzafir Khan, one of his men, made a political prisoner by Merrick, Layton fails to act on his beliefs. Layton's abrogation of responsibility in this instance makes him morally culpable in Muzzafir Khan's suicide and further emphasizes his dislocation. Colonel Layton's behavior
during Muzaffir Khan's imprisonment demonstrates the poverty of *man-bap* as a unifying concept for English and Indian during the last days of the Raj.

District Commissioner White, another Chillingburian and member of the old Raj, though not so morally befuddled as Colonel Layton, also behaves ineffectually. White clearly understands his duties, and his inability to perform those duties. This leaves him disoriented. He represents the liberal attitude of the Indian Civil Service, the "heaven-born", who despise racism but lack the moral strength to actively oppose it. White derides force, mourns the degeneration of colonial ideals and recognizes the misuse of authority in the service of bigotry. Simply and ineffectually, he divides the world into those who support Indian ambitions towards self-government and those antagonistic to or, equally negatively, indifferent to them.

Scott's portrayal of the District Commissioner depicts the failure of the Civil Service during the last days of the Raj. As senior representative of the Raj in the area, White has authority to take action against abuses Merrick practices. His clear understanding of the relationship between English and Indian displays moral courage considering his background and the times. Yet, when given the opportunity to oppose reactionaries like Reid and Merrick during the Bibighar case, White disassociates himself and delegates responsibility to his assistant, Jack Poulson. Though he
knows Poulson reflects popular Anglo-Indian feelings towards Indians, he allows the corruption of authority. Ultimately White embodies the failure of traditional norms within the Indian Civil Service.

Though weak, White possesses credibility. The Civil Service, paramount in interpretation and application of law and policy, plays a passive role in enforcement. White abdicates authority in the Bibghar case because he feels he cannot win by opposing Reid and Merrick. The rape creates social pressures within the Anglo-Indian community because Indians use it as a political weapon. White's inability to defuse a volatile situation represents not only individual disorientation, but the way political dislocation within the Raj mirrors that confusion. A man of sufficient moral strength to understand his dilemma, White fails to act when his morality conflicts with his duty as a custodian of the Raj. White limits his opposition to trivialities such as flouting club rules by inviting Indian guests; on major issues he remains silent. As much as any other character White reveals how the 'white-robot' attitude percolates to the top and infects administration.

Another Chillingburian, Mr. Knight -- senior manager of the British Indian Electrical Co. -- suffers from the same paralysis. He avoids a class and racial confrontation within his company when his recommendation to recruit Kumar fails. Knight introduces Kumar to Stubbs, the Technical
Manager of the company, hoping to help a fellow Chillingburian, but Stubbs reacts negatively. Kumar's background makes Stubbs feel socially inferior. He didn't "like bolshie black laddies" (I, 258) on his side of the business. By playing out his class antagonisms in India, Stubbs forces Knight to take sides. The senior Englishman cannot handle the situation. Weak and afraid to challenge Stubb's views because they represent the popular attitude to anglicized Indians, Knight allows Stubbs to reject Kumar.

Knight's disorientation results from the fact that in India color substitutes for class. By his failure to help Kumar, Knight compromises his values first as a Chillingburian and then as a part of the British establishment. Knight loses the bearings that mark his world when he rejects Hari Kumar, the Chillingburian, someone from the right school, someone whose color was secondary to his background. Without these bearings Knight floats morally adrift like so many old Anglo-Indians, dislocated by India's transformation into an independent nation.

The Self-Contradictory

Daphne Manners, her aunt Lady Manners, Mabel Layton -- the first three English -- and Lili Chatterjee may be described as self-contradictory. These women are upper-class and related by blood or marriage to men in authority. They have firm ideas about the British presence in India and view racial problems as a consequence of British insularity.
But, however aware of the moral bankruptcy of British rule, they do not, perhaps cannot, act to make a difference. This contradiction between their sense of right and inability to act on their beliefs leaves them disoriented.

Perhaps no character within the group suffers dislocation more than Daphne Manners. Scott portrays her courage but admits to her self-contradictory nature. Daphne responds to Hari Kumar, even propelling their relationship forward when other white women in Mayapore, equally aware of his appeal, dismiss him because they saw him as if he stood on the wrong side of water in which even to dabble their fingers would have filled them with horror. Perhaps there were times when the girl felt the horror of it too, but resisted such a feeling because she knew it to be contradictory of what she first felt when she saw him. And then she rejected the notion of horror completely (I, 151).

Daphne is disoriented by the pull between her acceptance of Kumar and her fear of accepting the consequences. Concern about English prejudice limits their secret meetings to the Indian section of Mayapore -- the Sanctuary, Tirupathi Temple, Bibighar Gardens and the homes of Aunt Shalini and Lili Chatterjee. Their meetings in Indian Mayapore were the only places she and Hari could meet freely as individuals, one on one.

Scott uses water symbolism to dramatize the cultural and philosophic barrier Daphne crosses to be Kumar's friend and lover. The MacGregor House on one side and the Bibighar Gardens on the other mark the boundary between the white and
the black town. In the mile that separates the MacGregor House and Bibighar

... flowed the dark currents of a human conflict ... no bridge was ever thrown across it and stood .... MacGregor and Bibighar are the place of the white and the place of the black. To get from one to the other you ... had to take your courage in your hands ... and enter the flood. (I, 151)

Though Daphne has the courage to admit a cross-cultural relationship, she cannot overcome her rape and Hari's unjust imprisonment. The destructive repercussions of the rape teach Daphne a bitter lesson "that although a white man could make love to a black girl, the black man and white girl association was still taboo" (I, 379). But Daphne's bitter reaction to the racism of Merrick and the other Mayapore Anglo-Indians contrasts with the emotional distance she keeps between herself and Kumar after the rape. In her diary Daphne writes that Merrick cannot accept her relationship with Kumar,

Ronald wont unless you blanch Hari's skin, blanch it until it looks ... like that of a white man too shaken for another white man not to feel sorry for, however much he may reproach him. (I, 438)

Daphne's dream of being violated by a many lingamed Shiva further emphasizes her disorientation. In her dream re-enactment of the rape, Daphne mistakes Hari for one of the rapists: "I had this idea that Hari had gone with them because he had been one of them" (I, 434). Only after the dream does Daphne overcome her subliminal fear of dark skin and realize that Hari's color is inseparable from his
attractiveness.

Though she intellectually overcomes her fear of a dark skinned lover, Daphne makes no effort to contact Hari after his detainment. Many events in the Quartet reveal Daphne's contradictory nature. Daphne's lies to protect Hari in part cause his imprisonment, though she tells herself that she "mustn't believe that he is being punished more badly because of my lies than he would have been by the truth." (I, 440) Haunted by her lies about their meeting before the rape -- "the only way to have faced it was with the truth" (I, 436), Daphne insists that Hari support the lie "for [her] sake, if that was the only way he could say nothing and know nothing for his own." (I, 436)

Like Miss Crane at Mr. Chaudhari's death, Daphne's actions at the time of her rape suggest an assumed inherent superiority. Indeed, this may be the root of her self-contradiction. Despite Kumar's repeated injunctions that they face the ordeal together, she feels she knows better, being English. Miss Crane sat by the roadside holding her dead colleague, convinced she could do nothing. Daphne turns away from Hari after Bibighar because she believes "There's nothing I can do, nothing, nothing." (I, 436)

Through Daphne's self-contradictory behavior Scott demonstrates how the upheaval in India before independence encourages a passive inaction resulting mostly from confusion about role. Although Daphne condemns the lack of
"originating passion" (I, 460) in the English, her words are something of a self parody. Kumar’s persecution results from destructive prejudice but Daphne’s inaction makes her partly guilty for his eventual fate. Indeed, after the rape, Kumar depends on an image of Daphne for his dignity. He believes Daphne initiates the re-examination and so cooperates with the questioners. Daphne, however, disassociates herself from the case after her initial pleas on Kumar’s behalf go unheeded. Her character exists in tension between a fundamental grasp of justice and an inability to realistically accept the consequences of her attempt to put those beliefs into practice. She recognizes the ‘white-robot’ in Merrick and Poulson but, lacking the will to resist them, becomes both their victim and unconscious supporter.

Only Daphne’s baby remains, evidence of her beliefs about morality and justice; her own "ham-fisted offering" (I, 376) to the future. On learning of her pregnancy and believing the child Kumar’s, she faces ostracism rather than have an abortion. Yet she jeopardizes both hers and the baby’s life by refusing a caesarian delivery. Daphne rationalizes her refusal by saying she wants the birth to be proper,

I don’t want to be cut open, to have the child torn out like that. I want to bear it. I want to give it life, not have its life or my life or both our lives saved for us by clever doctors. (I, 374)

The pattern of disorientation, given shape by the discrep-
ancy between Daphne's words and her actions, concludes in a final and contradictory death. Her child lives, but motherless, a final touch to the contradictions of Daphne's life.

Like Daphne's, Lady Manners' self-contradictory actions towards her dead niece's lover illustrate disorientation. Though she wields considerable influence, Lady Manners suffers from paralysis. She welcomes the birth of Parvati, Daphne's daughter, and publishes a notice of it in The Times of India. More importantly, after she reads Daphne's diary she believes Kumar's innocence, and, like her niece, believes he fathered Parvati. In spite of all these factors favoring Kumar, she intercedes for him too late.

Scott highlights Lady Manners' contradictory behavior during the Bibighar reinvestigation. Though she initiates it, she does not reveal herself to Kumar, even when he breaks down on hearing of Daphne's death. She only mourns silently for the lovers: "[for] the truth and memory of their having been in Bibighar that night as lovers, ... the joy of union; and ... the terror of ... separation" (II, 305). Lady Manners only mourns, she does not unite Kumar with his daughter.

These actions do not come from prejudice. We know Lady Manners likes Indians of the right class, witness her friendship with Lili Chatterjee. Raising Parvati personally despite social pressures, she makes Lili promise the girl would grow up at The MacGregor House after her death. Lili
keeps the promise but, following Lady Manners' instructions, keeps the knowledge of her father from the girl. Parvati and Kumar's separation results from Lady Manners' failure to cross from sympathy to action. Kumar and the daughter he does not know become victims of social fragmentation that characterizes the end of the Raj.

Mabel Layton, another representative of the upper-class English, also displays self-contradictory behavior. Unlike Lady Manners whose sponsorship of Parvati challenges group beliefs, Mabel outwardly conforms to cantonment norms. Mabel regards General Dyer's massacre of Indian civilians at Jallianwallah Bagh in the 1920's an act of infamy yet she does not oppose the praise Dyer receives for his action by the Anglo-Indian community. At a party given in his honor, she does not correct the misinterpretation that her tears are in sympathy with the general's forced retirement. Only secretly she sends money to a fund for the Indian victims' families.

Part of the contradiction between Mabel's beliefs and actions may not be a contradiction at all. As the spokesperson of traditional English values in the Quartet, she believes those who rule must be incorruptible, above politics. India's growing political unrest drives her into her garden. The governor's widow gives more time to her roses than she does to people. Through vegetative imagery Scott symbolizes the creation and destruction of British colonial
ideals about India. Mabel represents the nurturing aspect of the Raj, its promise of political fulfillment in which the British believe, but carry out so slowly that it never materializes -- roses, after all, do not flourish unless carefully tended.

Mabel's emotional torment results from her inability to withstand the destructive effects of Raj politics. In her nightmares about Jallianwallah Bagh, her muttered "Gillianwaller, Gillianwaller", overheard by her companion, Barbie, acts as a mnemonic device to remind us of the Raj's destructive role in India. Scott uses the dream world to illustrate the contrast between Mabel's quiet, nurturing role during the day and her nightly preoccupation with the British role in India.

Mabel demonstrates many instances of contradictory behaviour. Her treatment of Barbie Batchelor illustrates one. Though she considers Barbie a friend, in their years together Mabel spends most of her time in the garden and tells Barbie almost nothing about herself. Barbie thinks herself a disappointment to Mabel: "I'm simply not her kind of person" (III, 29). Looking into her friend's bedroom one night, Barbie gets the absurd feeling that she and Mabel live in different worlds:

In a way my secret sorrow is Mabel. I don't know how much of me gets through. I'm rather like a wave dashing against a rock. (III, 95)

When Mildred Layton and her daughters visit Rose Cottage
Mabel allows Mildred to treat Barbie like a usurper. Yet, without Barbie’s presence, Mabel would have to admit Mildred into Rose Cottage. She makes no effort to protect Miss Batchelor from Mildred’s presence. It became doubtful that the missionary woman could survive and it was not at all clear whether Mabel cared one way or another. (III, 37)

Mabel also trusts Mildred to harbor Barbie at Rose Cottage after her death. She refuses to acknowledge that Mildred will evict the missionary.

In a last act of misplaced trust in an image of class, Mabel relies on Mildred rather than Barbie to carry out her last wish to be buried next to her husband at Ranpur. After Mabel’s death Barbie fails to persuade Mildred to keep the promise about the old lady’s burial place. By her breach of promise, Mildred Layton, the antagonist of love, denigrates Mabel’s dying wish into an act of hate. Before Barbie goes completely mad she looks for a spade to resurrect Mabel and to defeat Mildred’s evil with good. The motif also works symbolically to show the English guilty of not caring about the fulfillment of a promise. It echoes the Raj’s failure to behave with moral responsibility towards its subjects. Kemp argues that Mabel clings to a meaningless set of beliefs about class. 10 The framework which defines life for Mabel, as it does for Lady Manners and Lili Chatterjee, collapses in the maelstrom of Indian independence and British withdrawal.
Even those who seem most self-assured suffer. Lili Chatterjee, a Rajput princess, widow of the distinguished Sir Nello Chatterjee -- founder of the British India Electrical Company and of the Mayapore Indian Gymkhana -- cannot handle India's furiously changing pace. A high-born Indian, accepted by the upper-class English, Lili suffers scorn from Anglo-Indians in Mayapore and cannot fully integrate herself with the Indian community. The wife of the founder of a social club for Indians, she despises its money-lending Indian members. Lili's confusion stems partly from her background. Educated in England and Switzerland, she cannot completely identify with Indians. Nor can she empathize with another like herself. Although she invites Hari Kumar to one of her integrated parties at MacGregor House she finds it difficult to sympathize with his predicament as an Anglicized, penniless Indian. She believes that Kumar has a chip on his shoulder, without admitting their similar positions. Despite her wealth and birth, she too must accept an inferior position under the Raj. Perhaps Lili dislikes the young Indian because he reminds her of herself, neither English nor completely Indian.

Scott questions some of Lili's apprehensions about Kumar. Lili protects Daphne from Kumar out of concern about the social consequences of their relationship. But her action also stems from the fact that she views him as a social embarrassment. Kumar does not receive a second
invitation to one of her parties. On the night of Daphne's rape Lili even unintentionally helps Merrick trap Kumar by indicating that Hari and Daphne might be together. The suggestion gives Merrick sufficient cause to arrest Kumar, thus realizing Lili's prophecy that the Indian and the Englishman were fated to clash because both lived in darkness: "on Kumar's part a darkness of soul. On Merrick's a darkness of the mind and heart and flesh." (I, 159)

Scott uses Lili's experiences of discrimination in the Quartet to emphasize her dislocation from both Anglo-India and her native environment. The discrimination she suffers while travelling with Daphne in a first-class, English-only train compartment, on a visit to Edwina Crane in the English ward of a hospital, and the social rebuff she endures at the Mayapore Gymkhana all demonstrate Lili's social alienation. At times, indeed, it seems that Lili seeks out these petty humiliations. Lili has never invited Edwina Crane to her house, yet, playing the Good Samaritan with rather thin and self-contradictory charity, she visits her in the English ward of a hospital, then complains when she is thrown out. At the Gymkhana Lili submits with gracious politeness to bigotry from a low-class Englishwoman. She acquits herself with admirable courage though we cannot tell whether she deliberately seeks the humiliation. Lili's contradictory behavior arises from her deluded perception that prejudice towards Indians of her class does not really exist under the
Raj.

In the end, however, Lili's ambivalent social status cannot be ignored. At a time when Indians need to realize their Indianness, Lili has no concrete political or social identity. Her Anglicized education excludes her from her fellow Indians and, despite her class, her skin remains a negative for much of Anglo-India. In the ground between these two Lili manifests her disorientation in self-contradictory behavior towards both English and Indian.

The Stable Characters

Those who survive the maelstrom, though not the subject of this work, maintain their values in the face of pressures that beset the Raj. Count Bronowsky and Guy Perron, aware of the chaos around them, emerge as survivors and observers. Perron in particular typifies Scott's ideas about truth and moral responsibility in race relations. Bronowsky serves as a fulcrum to give us a more balanced view of events.

An emigre, Count Bronowsky adjusts to India better than her colonial rulers. He exposes the disorientation of other characters, especially Merrick. Bronowsky's interrogation of Merrick at Susan Layton's wedding reception and his analysis of the policeman's untimely death illuminates the dark side of the Raj Merrick represents.

Guy Perron, Scott's persona in the Quartet, shows even more stability than Bronowsky. He tries to bridge the moral
void between Britain's first desire to administer India and the final demission of power. Against the reasonableness of Perron, Scott assesses Purvis' economic interpretation of the Raj and Merrick's inversion of man-bap. Perron stands above the intellectualized, depersonalized reasoning of Purvis and the brutal, self-serving cruelty of Merrick. Perron's visit to Kumar's slum tenement, even though he feels Kumar represents a failed English ideal, illustrates the humanity both Purvis and Merrick lack. This 'pragmatic' idealism and humanity better fits Perron to survive changes within the Raj. In contrast, Purvis commits suicide, Merrick invites his own murder, and Kumar sinks into a depression from which he never emerges.

Through Perron, Scott exposes the illusion of principle that informs British policy in India. A lack of political ethic distinguishes Purvis the economist from Perron the philosopher. Purvis disassociates the Raj from its mistakes by refusing to feel moral obligation. He believes the British should "get rid of [India] fast to the first bidder before it becomes an intolerable burden." (IV, 33) To Perron, Purvis' self-interested view represents that of the Labour Party under Clement Atlee which rejects a phased withdrawal from the subcontinent after the war. Like Purvis, Perron's Aunt Charlotte, another Labourite, regards the "British presence in India [as] an economic and administrative burden whose quick off-loading was an essential
feature of post-war policy." (IV, 230) For Perron, British actions grimly prove that to misjudge or mistime historical events invites catastrophe. In Perron's view, Britain's early withdrawal left India unable to solve its political antagonisms. In A Division of the Spoils, he censures Britain's abandonment of principle with regard to India:

For at least a hundred years India has formed part of England's idea about herself and for the same period India has been forced into a position of being a reflection of that idea .... Since 1900, certainly since 1918, the reverse has obtained. The part played since then by India in the English idea of Englishness has been that of something we feel it does us no credit to have. Our idea about ourselves will now not accommodate any idea about India except the idea of returning it to the Indians in order to prove that we are English and have demonstrably English ideas .... Getting rid of India will cause us at home no qualm of conscience because it will be like getting rid of what is no longer reflected in our mirror of ourselves. The sad thing is that whereas in the English mirror there is now no Indian reflection, ... in the Indian mirror the English may be very hard to get rid of, because in the Indian mind English possession has not been an idea but a reality; often a harsh one. (IV, 109)

Perron's political views reflect Scott's clearly defined ideas of political right and wrong. He deplores Britain's refusal to use its power to maintain peace during partition. In contrast, Peabody, a Raj protagonist, refuses to accept suppression of communal violence as Britain's responsibility. While on a train to Pakistan, crowded with Muslim refugees, he cannot relate to Ahmed Kasim's murder by marauding bands of Hindus and Sikhs. Unlike Peabody, Perron condemns Anglo-Indian disassociation from Hindu/Muslim strife. Though both men witness Ahmed Kasim's brutal death,
Peabody refuses Perron's entreaty that "we can't just leave it like that. Someone's got to go back." (IV, 608) Peabody's attitude symbolizes the negative effect of English political alienation. He refuses linkage with Ahmed's death on a personal level, much as the British, as a group, deny responsibility for India's partition and resulting communal massacres.

Perron also censures Merrick's abdication of moral responsibility by his inversion of man-bap. The policeman rejects Aunt Shalini's pleas of mercy for her nephew, Kumar. Perron feels that Merrick is concerned with form not content: "He's spent too long inventing himself in the image to have energy left to realize that as an image it is and always was hollow." (IV, 217) Perron rejects such image making. Though against the notion of Macaulay's brown-skinned Englishman, he sympathizes with Kumar's abandonment by both English and Indian after his release from Kandipat jail. He goes to visit Kumar in Koti Bazaar, where "[p]erhaps no Englishman had ever walked." (IV, 620) Though he does not meet Kumar, Perron's instinctive understanding of his cruel fate demonstrates his stability. He understands Kumar's desolation and reminiscences about the other boy, Harry Coomer, who did not know the "difference between karma and dharma but who ... had [since] learned the answer ... he was living it." (IV, 621)
CONCLUSION

In the skewed world of the _Raj Quartet_ neither English nor Anglicized Indian has a firm grasp of role. They have lost the security of class, race and position in a system which no longer unambiguously dictates right and wrong. As the system malfunctions, the characters that make up that system become disoriented. Scott makes us aware that in the world of the _Raj_, right and just behavior reaps no reward and that ultimately even love fails. The characters in the work fail to communicate with each other. In Scott’s pessimistic view, lack of individual communication leads to failure between groups. As in _A Passage to India_, inimical social forces defeat individual attempts to cross the boundaries of color and background.

Around the vortex of social changes affecting the _Raj_, the characters emerge on a spiral of disorientation. Those closest to the center remain the most stable. Being closer to the pressures that alter the structure, they see the effects more clearly. Observers of the _Raj_ such as Guy Perron and Count Bronowsky understand why communication between individuals and groups fail. The self-contradictory characters, Daphne and Lady Manners, Mabel Layton and Lili Chatterjee, cannot sufficiently detach themselves from the disintegrating structure of the _Raj_ to realize their inability to fulfill their aspirations.

The ineffectual, Nigel Rowan, Colonel Layton, District
Commissioner White and Mr. Knight, intellectually accept the end of the Raj. But since they have already mentally pulled out of India, its coming dissolution leaves them unable to function effectively.

An illusion about the British makes the emotionally unstable characters, Hari and Duleep Kumar, Mildred Layton and Brigadier General Reid, blame India for their disorientation. All four regard Britain as the last bastion against chaos. The conflict between their English aspirations and Indian color disorients Hari and Duleep Kumar. The shifts within Anglo-Indian society traumatizes Mildred Layton. Reid, too, remains alienated by challenges to his values about the Raj.

The other four characters studied in this thesis, Ronald Merrick, Susan Layton, Barbie Batchelor and Edwina Crane, drive themselves insane in an effort to reconcile their personal ideologies with existing social conditions. The adversaries of love, Merrick and Susan, make no attempt at communication; instead, they manipulate others into their version of the truth. Ultimately they destroy themselves. Barbie and Edwina, on the other hand, exist as champions of love unable to realize their ideals. Indeed, Barbie Batchelor, spokesperson of love, becomes mad as she tries unsuccessfully to share love. Edwina's awareness of the impracticability of love between the races makes her commit suttee. The death of an Indian colleague because of her
notions transforms her suicide into a private atonement.

In the *Quartet* a sense of fulfillment shatters as the system declines. Inequality in social and official hierarchies leaves virtually every character a victim of trauma and alienation. In a society built to be ruled by division, as the system breaks down, so do its manipulators — the 'white-robots'. Divergent views reflect this breakdown. Each character sees the world from the shattered remnant of the once whole system to which he clings, whether military, police, civil, missionary or the vague, chimerical world of the anglicized Indian.
FOOTNOTES

1 Peter Kemp, "A Drama of dislocation", Times Literary Supplement, 6 April 1984, p. 374.

   Please note that all quotations from The Raj Quartet are hereafter cited in the text. Each of the four volumes is designated by a roman numeral followed by the page number. The edition used for this thesis is by Avon Books (New York, 1979). Each of the four volumes is designated as follows:
   I, The Jewel in the Crown,
   II, The Day of the Scorpion,
   III, The Towers of Silence,
   IV, A Division of the Spoils.

   As Patrick Swindon points out, Merrick's treatment of Kumar magnifies "in its deviant sexuality, its masochism, its sadism, and its arrogance -- some of the real facts of the Anglo-Indian relationship.

   Through Daphne's diary we also learn of Merrick's unpopularity amongst the Anglo-Indians: "he had a bit of a reputation for being on the quarrelsome side and apart from a few unmarried girls who chased him, people didn't like him much" (Quartet, I, 389).

   Benita Parry and Patrick Swindon both write about this complex relationship. To Parry, Merrick's sexual/psychological abuse of the Indian is an "erotic game, a perverted ritual because Hari is an unwilling participant in the premeditated phases of degradation"

   Swindon, p. 89.
   Swindon writes that Kumar is not only the ... Indian for whom he [Merrick] feels contempt, but the contemptuous English public school boy for whose class, accent and perfect manners he feels [an] un-self-acknowledged envy.

5 Francine Weinbaum, Aspiration and Betrayal in Paul Scott's 'The Raj Quartet', Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1976, p. 112.
   Weinbaum describes Susan as "a girl of forms", concerned always with outward behavior and not with
love or communion with people.

6 Parry, p. 363.

7 Weinbaum, p. 182.
Weinbaum argues that the veil has become a veil of
imprisoned ideals and good intentions which assumes a form
of a "monstrous membrane" ... that blinds her ... as
England's good intentions and ideals blinded her to the
actual destructive course she was pursuing.

8 Parry, p. 367.
Benita Parry writes that the Indian's disorientation is a
result of the "being forced to recognize his membership [in]
a subject race, to examine the false consciousness instilled
in him, to question his identity".

9 ibid., p. 363.
Parry writes that
Scott obliquely offers for reappraisal the whole
production of man-hap, service responsibility --
[through] Merrick the outsider who is made the
repository of racism's obscenities and the corruption
with which some individuals who served imperialism were
infected.

10 Kemp, 374.
Kemp, writing about Granada Television's production of
The Jewel in the Crown, argues that during the
terminal phase of British influence in India codes
formerly followed have become meaningless.
Persons hitherto occupying a clearly defined
social niche start to lose their bearings.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


16. Scott, Paul. (The Raj Quartet)
The Jewel in the Crown,
The Day of the Scorpion,
The Towers of Silence,


