THE CULT OF IMPERIAL HONOR IN BRITISH INDIA

STEVEN PATTERSON

The Cult of Imperial Honor in British India

This page intentionally left blank

The Cult of Imperial Honor in British India

Steven Patterson

palgrave
macmillan

First published in 2009 by PALGRAVE MACMILLAN® in the United States – a division of St. Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Where this book is distributed in the UK, Europe and the rest of the world, this is by Palgrave Macmillan, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-61287-7
ISBN-10: 0-230-61287-3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Patterson, Steven, Dr.
The Cult of imperial honor in British India/Steven Patterson.
p.cm.
Originally presented as the author's dissertation (Ph. D.—University of Memphis).
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-230-61287-3
1. Honor—Political aspects—India—History. 2. India—Politics and government—1765–1947. I. Title.

DS463.P29 2009
954.03'5—dc22 2008039104

A catalogue record of the book is available from the British Library.

Design by Macmillan Publishing Solutions

First edition: April 2009

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

"I never could believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world, ready booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled to be ridden."

Richard Rumbold, on the scaffold in 1685, implicated in a plot to assassinate King James II

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

I owe many debts to those who have sustained me in my research over the past few years. Since this work is based on my graduate research at the University of Memphis, I would like to thank my dissertation committee of Abraham Kriegel, Jonathan Judaken, Jan Sherman, Theron Britt, and Lynn Zastoupil. Even though he was not on the faculty at Memphis, Lynn graciously provided his time and encouragement, and I have always profited from his advice about my topic. Likewise, Doug Peers at York University has always responded quickly to random queries I've had about sources, saving me much time in the library. Frank de Caro of LSU recorded the oral histories that are sprinkled throughout this work, and I am grateful for his hospitality during a research trip to Baton Rouge. Lastly, the anonymous reviewer for Palgrave also made a number of suggestions that have strengthened the work, though, of course, any deficiencies left in the work are purely my own.

Ryan Guth at Lambuth University read the entire draft manuscript and made innumerable stylistic improvements in the text. My sister, Amy Cooper, also made many perceptive points about the work, and I am also grateful for her advice over the years on navigating the academic world.

The librarians at Lambuth University have also been extraordinarily helpful, and I thank Rex West, Sammy Chapman, and Jackie Wood for their diligence and assistance. Cyndi Hill at Lambuth also fixed many of the formatting problems with the text, saving me an untold number of expletives.

Chris Chappell and Allison McElgunn at Palgrave and the staff of Macmillan Publishing Solutions have patiently guided the work during the publication process, and I thank them for their encouragement and many measured responses to a first-time author.

I also thank my family for all their support. My wife, Nancy, and my two young sons, Dean and David, have provided many joyful distractions from this work, and my in-laws, Larry and Barbara Austin,

have provided much support, primarily in the form of free meals. My four-year-old son, Dean, has untethered me many times from the computer, providing some balance in my life, and having my newborn, David, wake me up at 4:00 a.m. has led to many early-morning editing sessions, so at least I have profited from living on a newborn's schedule. Lastly, my mother, Libby Patterson, has been constant in her support and love through many years of higher education, and it is to her that I dedicate this work.

Introduction

We don't want a definition of empire. By its fruits ye shall know it. It is a spirit, an attitude of mind, an unconquerable hope. You can phrase it in a thousand ways without exhausting its content. It is a sense of the destiny of England.

—*John Buchan,* A Lodge in the Wilderness[1]

In W. D. Arnold's 1853 novel *Oakfield*, the eponymous protagonist refused to fight a duel against Lieutenant Stafford, the bully of the East Indian Company regiment to which they both belonged. Soon, all of British India knew that Oakfield had declined to defend either his own reputation or that of the woman Stafford smeared in order to provoke Oakfield to fight. The devoutly religious Oakfield saw no need to fight Stafford, in part because of the "blackguard's" reputation, which he deemed degraded and immoral (as indeed the rest of English society in India seemed to him at the time). Oakfield, a rather thinly disguised Arnold, believed that it would be "foolish, dishonorable, and wicked" to fight, but he was immediately branded a coward for using a religious dodge to cover up his shameful avoidance of the duel.[2]

Though written prior to the Revolt of 1857, *Oakfield* prefigured the changed moral tone of British rule in India after the Mutiny, when conquest gave way to the "virtuous" rule of the British Raj and the new rulers of India would be lauded for their quiet and gritty determination to rule justly. Though fiction, Arnold's work accurately portrayed this changing ethos, when the questionable ethics and hazy morals of the early conquerors of India fell into disrepute among the people who increasingly replaced them in

the nineteenth century. The agents and soldiers of the East India Company followed a very different code than Oakfield's, and their willingness to duel and even kill one another over perceived slights reflected the customs of a conquering race that had not yet fully embraced the moral reform found in England by that time. Still essentially pagan in their outlook, these rulers would be (largely) swept away by the political and moral reforms of Victorian society, especially the reforms of evangelicals.[3]

In many ways, Arnold (and his alter ego Oakfield) therefore represented the changed moral temper of the times. Having been educated at Rugby and infused with a messianic fervor to lead an exemplary life, Arnold believed India would be the ideal place for the moral regeneration of society through evangelical methods. He left England for India most likely thinking of the good he could do there, but instead found a philistine European society in India not yet "reformed" by the evangelical influence being felt in mid-Victorian England (thanks in large part to the actions of men like Arnold's father, Thomas, the reforming headmaster of Rugby). British society in India typically lagged behind Victorian society in its reforming zeal and middle-class mentality, and in Arnold's view, European society in India as a whole was more reminiscent of England's past, when an entrenched aristocracy lived degenerate lives filled with gambling, boozing, and whoring. To Arnold, this lifestyle not only damaged the character of the British who resided there, it slowed the moral growth of India as well, since India could never be made to fulfill any higher purpose with such men in charge.

Such views did not make Arnold popular in India, and—largely because of his religious enthusiasm and moral fervor—he was not socially accepted in British India. For his part, Arnold was clearly disappointed with the European men in India, and they predictably returned the favor by responding negatively to his novel, which was seen by the imperial community as an "anonymous attack on an honorable body of men."[4] For all their talk of honor, however, Arnold found the Europeans in India to be unchivalrous toward women, which Arnold found ungallant and unbecoming of gentlemen. Yet being at odds with the informal customs of Anglo-Indian[5] society marked Oakfield as an outsider, and his refusal to fight rapidly identified him as dishonorable, a judgment that was widely accepted in the European community. While official regulations forbade dueling, honorable men were expected to fight if called out, and at his inevitable court martial, Oakfield was charged with "'conduct highly unbecoming an officer and a gentleman,' for being 'grossly

and publicly insulted at the mess table of his regiment, and neither reporting to his commanding officer, nor in any way noticing the affront.'"[6] The commanding officer of the regiment chastised Oakfield for not responding to Stafford's taunts, which "no man of spirit or honor would brook for an instant."[7] The officer also contended that Oakfield's conduct would bring "ignominy and degradation" upon the regiment, which had no need for such cowardly officers. In his defense, Oakfield responded that dueling was "daily falling in the estimation of all except its natural and proper advocates—fools and cowards" and that his reputation was in no way diminished by being affronted by Stafford, a "practiced insulter."[8] Oakfield, a character steeped in Christian ideals, emphatically stated that he paid no attention to the common opinions of men and would instead rely on his personal sense of right and wrong, which had been finely calibrated by his education at Rugby.

Oakfield/Arnold thus adhered to a very different set of values from those highly valued in British India at the time, and Oakfield, passionate in his defense at his court martial and admired for his ability to "preach," was merely reprimanded. Stafford, however, was reduced in rank, so that Oakfield benefited from the bully's fall by advancing up the ranks at Stafford's expense. Yet in the court of public opinion, Oakfield would be censured by Anglo-Indian society, as he soon found out while on leave at a hill station when he was "cut" and socially ostracized by strangers who only knew him by reputation. While "eating the air" during his late afternoon promenade, when all of Anglo-Indian society turned out to see and be seen, Oakfield was deliberately snubbed by an officer who refused to speak to him. Oakfield's redemption would only come in battle during the Sikh Wars, when the royal colors of the regiment were almost seized by the enemy, only being saved by the heroism of Oakfield, who retained the colors and killed his enemy, thereby expunging the black mark that Anglo-Indian society had previously bestowed upon him. Oakfield's reputation rose with the accounts of the battle, while poor Stafford was mortally wounded in the battle, but in true Victorian melodramatic fashion, he would make his peace with Oakfield, asking for forgiveness for his bullying and then dying with "red florid blood rush[ing] from his mouth."[9]

Oakfield's exploits eventually led to a prestigious civil appointment with the "honorable" East India Company, the de facto rulers of much of the subcontinent. His honor restored, Oakfield could now be trusted in Anglo-Indian society to display exemplary character and uphold the dignity of Company rule. His courage was of the

quiet and steady kind, not the loudmouthed and freebooter style of Stafford, and Arnold's attempt to fuse honor and ethics for Anglo-Indians helped establish ideals that would guide the Raj to the end of imperial rule. More broadly, the men who won the empire (like Stafford) were giving way in India to the men who would rule it, and Oakfield represents this change and the set of virtues needed not to subdue an alien race, but to lead them by exemplary moral character.[10]

Frank Richards–BOR

Yet India would always need men willing to keep an alien race subdued and assert the dominance of the Anglo-Indian male, and some fifty years after *Oakfield,* an episode of real violence between two low-ranking Anglo-Indians had very different consequences. Frank Richards, a British Other Ranker (BOR, or nonofficer) serving the Raj from 1900 to 1908, witnessed the hanging of one of his brother soldiers who had murdered another British soldier. None of the men disputed that the soldier was guilty of murder and deserved hanging, yet the nature of the execution caused the men to question the right of nonwhites to inflict punishment on Europeans. The murderer of a white man had to be punished, even when the murderer was himself Anglo, yet all the men agreed that they would rather kill the condemned soldier themselves rather than let a "dirty black soor do it." Richards was incensed that although all such executions were "supposed to be done by a half-caste, if he [the executioner] had even a splash of white blood in him it must have been hidden by the seat of his pants." And all agreed, Richards wrote, about what a "damned disgrace it was for a white man to be hanged by a native."[11] White prestige now had to be maintained even in the execution of a lowly BOR, who was usually grouped with Eurasians and "fallen" whites in the rigid hierarchy of the Raj. The only consolation for the men lay in that all Indians, save the executioner and his assistant, were barred from witnessing the execution of a white soldier, and to make sure of this, no Indians were allowed within five miles of the scaffold.[12] Indians were not supposed to witness the legal execution of a white man, lest they begin to believe that they could kill whites with relative impunity, which conjured up images of the Indian Revolt of 1857–1858, and this vision of rebellious Indians haunted imperial society until the last days of the Raj. For Richards, as well as all Anglo-Indians, there existed a great deal of fear in living surrounded by Indians, but such legal and social codes helped mitigate this fear.

By the end of the Victorian era, such codes were solidly in place, having hardened into racial, legal, and social custom in the fifty years after the Mutiny. Above all, these protocols of the Raj were designed and sustained to retain the prestige of the ruling race, and the apparent easy camaraderie between the races of the early nineteenth century in India disappeared along with the voluptuaries associated with early rule in the subcontinent. Although this contrast between early imperial society in India and that of the Victorian era is somewhat simplified, late Victorian and Edwardian Anglo-Indians typically believed that they were somehow different from their imperial predecessors, and ultimately, somehow better at ruling India as well.[13]

The Question of Reputation

Both *Oakfield* and Richards's book *Old Soldier Sahib,* though very different in message and tone, therefore reveal the preoccupation with reputation in British India. Arnold was much more concerned with the lax morals of pre-1857 Anglo-Indian society, and though he claimed to not care about his reputation in what he saw as a degraded European society living in India, his reputation was only secured and accepted as moral by his military heroics. As Kenneth Allot pointed out in the introduction to the modern edition of *Oakfield,* Arnold suffered from a type of "romantic malaise," in that Anglo-Indian society, though nominally Christian, exemplified few traits deemed acceptable to Arnold. Mars and Mammon were their gods, and for someone who inherited his father's ethical bent, Arnold believed that European society in India needed more sincerity in its religion and more morality in its somewhat dubious behavior, especially because the temptations thrown at Anglo-Indian society tested the moral fiber of upright Englishmen. Yet Oakfield's reputation was important mainly to other Europeans and not to Indians. Indians are there in the background, as is India, but Arnold spends little time on them. Richards, on the other hand, is concerned with his reputation, and perhaps more importantly, the reputation of his regiment, but his most singular obsession is that Indians pay him proper deference and respect. He has a heightened sense of race that is absent from *Oakfield* (although the novel generally disparages the accomplishments of Indians), and although Richards's temperament differs from that of Arnold's, he generally reflected the inordinate pride in white skin that characterized the "high tide" of racist thought under Curzon. Arnold speaks little of race, his obsession being with Anglo-Indians and how

they behaved. Richards, however, was preoccupied with keeping the natives down using whatever methods he deemed appropriate.

For Richards and most Anglo-Indians, the "new" imperialism of the late nineteenth century had more sharply defined the relations between the races, replacing the élan and romance of the days of sail with steam and the machine gun. Generally, there was a fierceness and distance about the late Victorian empire absent from the more sybaritic early days of the English in India, the group attacked by Arnold for their dissolute ways. The nabobs (the term is derived from *nawab*, perhaps revealing an over-familiarity with Indian customs), depicted reclining in Indian dress with hookahs in hand, were replaced by the end of the century with pictures of upright rulers, no hookahs in sight, but still retaining any number of alert servants ready to attend to their needs. Not only in their dress but in their relations with women, the Anglo-Indians of the late Victorian era had very different relations with Indians. The concubines had mostly disappeared, and the "official" community in India had little to no contact with Indian women, while the lower Anglo-Indian men like Frank Richards knew primarily prostitutes. The exploitation of the latter era was more regular, more defined, and decidedly less "romantic." This moral rectitude, however, masked the darker undercurrent represented by Richards, who symbolized the coercive force behind imperial rule and the exemplary violence meted out to those who opposed the Raj.

And yet, both Arnold and Richards were concerned with the honor of their particular segment of Anglo-Indian society, as well as the role of the individual within that society. Though they had very different views of what constituted honorable behavior, both men seemed to recognize the importance of reputation to establish one's "place" in India. Oakfield, to be sure, swam against the tide in this regard, but society and the enormous pressure to conform in an imperial setting reveal the importance of the perceived homogeneity—at least according to one's status—of Anglo-India. The individual in British India possessed a heightened sense of his own power, but also faced enormous social pressure to conform to the dictates laid down by Anglo-Indian society. For both men, the code of honor dictated how they should act and what behavior should be taken as an affront to their honor. The heightened codes of morality and prestige of the late 1800s came at the price of more intimate relations between the races; however, the usefulness of these codes lay in their ability to assure Anglo-Indians of the essential justness of their rule, and such codes were thought necessary to keep the Raj

functioning smoothly, or at the very least, to maintain the prestige of the ruling race.

The Bitter End

While it is always dangerous to assert the death of some particular ideology (or its apogee), the honor of the Raj was under great strain in the twentieth century.[14] The conformity of imperial society in India and the fussy protocols that seem so alien to the modern reader—such as dressing for dinner in the jungle—only made sense if they conformed to and propagated imperial ideology. Such customs, however, lent themselves to mockery if they fulfilled no higher social function. In Anglo-Indian society, such traditions notoriously survived well into World War II, when the Japanese invasion of Malaya and Burma and the sinking of the battleship *Prince of Wales* (which had taken Churchill to meet FDR for the signing of the Atlantic Charter) shattered the myth of British invincibility in the East. The Raj had been under enormous strain since World War I, and the interwar years marked the beginning of the end for the British Raj, and World War II the deathblow.

It is perhaps no surprise that the solar topi also went out of fashion in India during World War II, with the large influx of men, both American and British, who refused to wear this symbol of imperial status.[15] In many ways, the end of the topi marked the end of the empire, yet while old hands tried to follow the old ways, the elite character of the Raj was changing with the war, and the loss of imperial prestige spelled doom for the dominion of the white man in the Far East. Old habits died hard, especially when tied so closely to an elite, but what Orwell called "smelly little orthodoxies" became untenable as the Raj underwent a triple assault—from the Japanese enemy, from its Indian subjects determined to break free of imperial rule, and from ostensible American allies who sought out markets for the postwar world. The old traditions no longer held mythic status, since they no longer compelled loyalty, and imperial prestige was shattered by the shameful defeats suffered by the empire in the Far East. Imperial swagger depended on the belief that the actions of imperialists were consistent and principled and done in the best interests of the imperial subjects. "Fair play" was never merely a motto for the empire, it was a way of life, and Anglo-Indians never much doubted either their dominance or their conviction that it was in the best interests of Indians not to question this dominance. The actions of the soldier described by Frank Richards are difficult to construe as "fair play," but underlying

such brutality lay the willingness to assert one's dominance if prestige was threatened. Although the archconservative Anglo-Indian society constantly talked of decline and threats to prestige throughout the history of the Raj, World War II irrevocably shattered the imperial façade of invincibility, which could no longer be maintained in the face of the determined and successful Japanese enemy. It was all but impossible to assert and maintain dominance with one's back to the wall, or more damning still, if large numbers of the imperial race had turned their backs to the enemy while in flight.

Moreover, Indianization had lessened the prestige of imperial society, and the influx of Indians into the Indian Civil Service and into the clubs knocked Anglo-Indian society from its seemingly secure perch. World War II hollowed out any ideas about prestige that depended on racial prescriptions—ideas that had been carefully cultivated over decades by Anglo-Indians who constantly had to find ways to trust one another for the good of the Raj. Internal and external hierarchies of power now seemed increasingly fussy and archaic, and though many clung to these protocols to the bitter end, after the disaster of Singapore in which whites had panicked and been defeated by inferior numbers of Japanese, it was clear that the old spells no longer worked.

Cultivating an imperious manner had brought comfort to a society that was not always sure it was doing the right thing, and hardliners and diehards refused to recognize this salient point, and instead many spoke of the drop-off in talent of those coming to India after World War I. Those with experience in India believed that these newcomers did not know how to rule, and the freer relations with Indians and the admittance of Indians to clubs seemed to reflect the weakening of prestige. Perhaps more importantly, the rise of Gandhi marked a semantic and historical shift, now that the men of noble and lofty character often seemed to be on the other side, and for a society that had prided itself for so long on its moral and ethical rectitude, Gandhi's popularity likewise revealed the rhetorical emptiness of imperial ideology. In retrospect, General Dyer's massacres at Amritsar in 1919 (covered more fully in Chapter 1) were the actions of a man driven by fear and of a government determined to quash revolt no matter the cost in lives. Yet, even General Dyer's actions at Amritsar could be made honorable if such actions were believed to have prevented another Mutiny. Even the term "massacre" to many Anglo-Indians meant the murder of a few Europeans in Amritsar prior to Dyer's arrival, thereby justifying General Dyer's restoration of "order," no matter the cost in Indian lives. Still haunted by the idea of revolt, Anglo-Indians

congratulated Dyer for crushing what would surely have developed into a full-scale revolt. Additionally, the passage of the Government of India Acts in 1919 marked another epoch in the history of India, as well as the continuing decline of prestige. The chairman of the Burma Chamber of Commerce marked 1919 with the obvious observation: "It is no use attempting to disguise the fact that things are not going to be the same in India in the future as they have been in the past."[16] Taken together, these changed circumstances became irreconcilable with honor, for when a population begins to see through things, one of the first ideologies it sees through is honor, "whose essence is the preservation of appearances."[17] Thus it became increasingly difficult in the twentieth century for Anglo-Indians to justify their prestige, as Margery Hall quickly learned.

Margery Hall

Just as Arnold "saw through" the cult of honor in his Company unit and recognized the essential immorality of imperial society, one hundred years later a similar process occurred. Increasing numbers of Indians saw in Anglo-Indian society a corrupt hegemony that maintained its perceived honor at all costs, even with the Japanese poised to invade India. The rigid protocols of the Raj now seemed more ridiculous than ever and might even lose the war. In *Oakfield*, Arnold had proudly pointed out that the English "make a servant of the Ganges with a steamboat, while the Indian, with shouts and screams, worships the same river."[18] Arnold's contemptuous reference to Indians now seemed applicable to Anglo-Indian society during World War II—it honored the wrong things and prized the wrong values. Neither progressive nor enlightened, it was instead fossilized and focused on maintaining status and respect, much as it had always been, except that voices of doubt were stronger and more vibrant and articulated by increasingly powerful enemies. Confidence and prestige had been slowly replaced by doubt and insecurity, which could never be imperial virtues. Still, many imperialists saw no need to change their methods, which was a lesson that Margery Hall, who lived in India in the 1940s, absorbed with much bitterness. Hall fit very lowly into the Anglo-Indian hierarchy, and she recalled the snobbery with much resentment:

> I went out of every door last, because my father was nothing in India. And I was nothing. . . . I was next in caliber to the Anglo-Indians [Eurasians]. When I'd been there [in India] a week, my friend said, "there's

> something I've got to tell you. I'm sorry about it, but you must know. You must not walk out of doors before people more senior to you." So for those two months I went out of every door last, and as I said, I knew everybody's behind better than anything else in Simla. And that also came to using the lavatory, which were thunderboxes, and I had to go and use the lavatory when everybody else had finished. . . . People were obsessed with status. They'd built the whole pattern of Indian life on protocol. The snobbery was absolute. The integrity was equally absolute. You didn't have British officers doing anything but a splendid job. I think myself that they were very cruel.[19]

In this oral history, Hall recounted that she once attended a party at the house of someone very much her senior, and the hostess never spoke to her because of her social inferiority. The protocols of British India were meant to uphold the sanctity of the Raj and ensure that all understood their place in the grand hierarchy that made all lives public lives. Such ideas of etiquette were inherently conservative, and in such a small community, stories were in constant circulation and gossip regulated social behavior, marking the limits and boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable conduct. During the war, however, such protocols came under withering assault, much like the Raj itself. Hall recounted that she had become accustomed to seeing the backsides of her superiors, but at one party, while the ladies were waiting to use the "thunderbox" or toilet, all were lined up in order of rank, but an American girl in the line decreed, "Well I'm busting, you will all have to wait."[20]

For the protocols of the Raj to have relevance, imperial society had to deem its actions moral and try to enforce them through informal networks. Much like the India of *Oakfield,* reputation depended on the individual, but it was the group that determined acceptable imperial behavior and sought to regulate society in order to preserve imperial prestige and dignity, without which no empire could last. Hall had been exposed to the negative effects of a society that was obsessed with status and belonging. The importance of the hierarchy was made clear to all and constantly reaffirmed as the correct approach to empire, since deviations could have catastrophic consequences. In carefully ordering a visible hierarchy, Anglo-Indians had convinced themselves that their rule depended on exemplary lives lived in public. The notorious Warrant of Precedence even stipulated the seating at dinner parties. But the shame of the defeats in Burma and Malaya would never be avenged, since the war there was won by the dropping of the atomic bombs by America. The American girl who refused to wait for the thunderbox likewise revealed the darker

side of the obsession with precedence, and other Americans believed that many Britons were more concerned with their own prestige than with defeating the Japanese enemy.[21] Nehru reported that Indians delighted in seeing Americans refuse to conform to imperial customs by "wearing the wrong clothes, disregarding procedure and cheerfully ignoring distinctions of rank."[22] Without honor to sustain it, the Raj more closely resembled what it had, in part, always been—a despotic power obsessed with precedence and prestige.

The Raj had felt reasonably secure that it had been directing the development of India, but now these beliefs no longer seemed tenable. This sense of nemesis can best be seen "as the dark side of the British belief in their legitimizing genius for rule," and the emphasis on prestige could "invite, at times, a panicked fear of an inability to maintain it."[23] While this sense of nemesis could be found throughout the history of the empire, the writing could finally be seen on the wall, and this sense of nemesis was in part a plea for clemency for a host of imperial sins. Reminders of imperial duty revealed the fear that the empire could be lost and that prestige had to be accompanied by a sense of honor and belief in the imperial mission. Prestige, however, had hardened into caricature by World War II, and although one's reputation still determined one's "place" in India, just as it had in the 1850s, the norms were quite different now. Margery Hall was "cut" by her social superior, not because of her actions but primarily because of her background. Like Oakfield, the American girl who refused to wait in line for the thunderbox represented the changes on the horizon for India. Brash and with no regard for custom, she dared to take on the imperious protocols of a society frozen in Victorian custom. But only during the war, with prestige already lessened, could she act this way and not be completely ostracized. Honor had to accompany prestige for prestige to have a legitimate foundation, but once honor was stripped away, prestige looked more and more hollow. Competence now seemed much more important than status, yet it appeared to the outsider that the former had been sacrificed to the latter.

The Sacred Center of Honor

William Arnold, Frank Richards, and Margery Hall mark the limits of this historical study. The prescriptions—both formal and informal—that were initiated in the 1850s (and to some extent, earlier) would carry the Raj through almost to the end. Although clearly anecdotal, *Oakfield, Old Soldier Sahib,* and the oral history with Margery Hall

represent some of the notions of proper and improper imperial behavior, as well as the difficulty in making blanket assertions about imperial ideology during those years. The Raj meant different things to different people at different times, but some common themes can be traced with certitude. What links a romantic and emotional middle-class Christian soldier serving in India prior to the Mutiny and a coarse working-class BOR? What do these soldiers have in common with a woman not at all fond of imperial customs? All those residing in India experienced the shock of two identities—Anglo and Indian (or even "imperial"), and all had to reconcile their personal beliefs with their perceived right to be in India. Moreover, both the character Oakfield and Margery Hall were "cut" by Anglo-Indian society for their heretical beliefs or their status. Although such social ostracism happens in any society, in British India the small size of the Anglo-Indian community and the perceived nobility of their work meant that all imperial lives were public lives; being ostracized kept the customs in place and the empire secure. The three persons mentioned here shared common experiences and serve as diachronic and synchronic snapshots of imperial honor in the years 1853 to 1945, though this work will focus more on the apogee of this system in the late Victorian era. The customs of Anglo-Indian society carried enormous weight for a people surrounded by a potentially hostile population, and empire depended on prestige and the *izzat* (or "face") of imperial rule. Once lost, this "tyranny of face" was all but impossible to regain, as World War II and decolonization amply demonstrated. Anglo-Indians came from nearly all walks of life, and they shared in these customs and in the sense of being aliens under one sky in India. Various strategies were employed to make them feel more secure, and the hierarchies of the Raj, thought notorious for their inflexibility, were at times riddled with contradictions and constantly being negotiated by an Anglo-Indian society that was never as homogenous as it believed itself to be. Still, if imperial thought coalesced around a single theme, it was the ideal of honor. Those not measuring up in some way felt the cool reproach of a society that rarely seemed to doubt its judgment, yet even those lower in the hierarchy could usually find some prominence in imperial society, especially when there were usually Indians much further down in the pecking order. W. D. Arnold, Frank Richards, and Margery Hall therefore reveal both the shifts in the discourse of honor over time and how different levels of society could believe in the honor of the Raj, which in turn legitimated their reason for being there. Most Anglo-Indians had to believe in the mission of the empire, and even the lower ranks who

typically performed the dirty work of empire that was far from exemplary could construe their actions as moral if such actions forestalled further violence, or at the very least kept the Indians "in their place." Even Margery Hall spoke with pride of the stately memsahib and her children ("memsahib" is a contraction of English "ma'am" and Hindi "sahib," the general term of respect used by Indians to refer to most Anglo-Indians). The sexual honor of the memsahibs will be explored in Chapter 1, but it is important to note that these terms all but died with the Raj in 1947. Still, though she fit uncomfortably into the imperial hierarchy, Hall was herself a memsahib who was entranced by the spectacle of the viceroy and of a society that knew equally well how to govern and how to display their power comfortably. She was overawed at seeing the viceroy surrounded by "beautiful Gurkha soldiers" and admired the ability of the memsahib to train Indian servants to "such a degree of perfection." She likewise expressed her admiration for Indians, "who had adapted so wonderfully" to European customs and manners. There was an enormous satisfaction in "doing things right," and even those who chafed at the protocols of the Raj, like Margery Hall, still admired the splendor of imperial rule and the benefits it bestowed. Though meaning different things to different segments of imperial society, then, the Raj was generally thought to bring about honorable rule to the subcontinent, and conversely, most Indians were thought to be far from being ready to control the complex levers of imperial power.

The discourse of honor and shame always existed to some degree in British India, but this system underwent radical changes with the establishment of the Raj in 1858. Ideas (and ideals) of empire changed over time and varied according to the individual, but Anglo-Indians tapped into the system in unique ways, as any individual does who belongs to any social group. In *Old Soldier Sahib,* for example, Richards described an argument between two Indian servants and how they resolved their argument, not by fisticuffs, but by a verbal exchange in which each contestant traced the other's lineage back 200,000 years. One finally triumphed by declaring that his antagonist's ancestor had cohabitated with a diseased bullfrog and another had lived with a pig during her widowhood. The victor "strutted off, as proud as a man who had just won the heavyweight championship of the world."[24] While disdaining the methods used by Indians to assert their status, Richards's own preoccupation with prestige rested on the sorts of beliefs that were a kind of people's theology among Anglo-Indian society at the time. Although Indians were essentially "different" from Anglo-Indians, Asians did understand

the language of power and dominance, and such beliefs about the inferiority of most Indians to properly sort our their own affairs in honorable ways—whether settling minor disputes or ruling themselves—elevated the sense of prestige that characterized almost all levels of imperial society. Richards mocked Indians for the ways they settled their disputes, through words, and not with manlier fisticuffs. In his view, such shameful resolution of a minor affair was a metonym for the problems of India, and such actions justified the continuing rule of India by the British. Even Margery Hall, for all her problems with the Raj, still spoke in terms of the prestige of the Raj and the order imposed on India by the British. These Anglo-Indians therefore framed their arguments, whether consciously or not, in terms of prestige and honor.

Overview of the Book

The production and dissemination of such beliefs about honor are the focus of this book. Briefly, Chapter 1 will define some of the descriptive aspects of honor and how such a system circulated in the British Raj, especially in relation to Indians. Chapter 2 will survey the changes in the administration of India after the Mutiny of 1857 and how these changes brought increasing numbers of middle-class men to India. Yet honor also worked within imperial society to establish a pecking order, and this chapter examines the social system from the inside. Chapter 3 considers some of the contemporary histories produced by British society. Such histories were important because of the imperial lessons that could be learned from studying British and classical history. The decline and fall of the Roman Empire served as a cautionary tale of imperial hubris, enfeeblement, and the dangers of effeminacy and luxury for an imperial people. Chapter 4 focuses on the bungalow and its perceived importance for the just governance of the Raj. Taken together, these sources linked the past, the present, and at times even the future of India into a discourse of honor and shame that justified the continuing British presence in India. Honor was therefore cast aside with disastrous consequences. The texts justified and perpetuated imperial rule by seeking to establish and maintain superiority over Indians while simultaneously convincing Anglo-Indians of their right to govern India. If honor is not always directly mentioned in such texts, it often lurks unacknowledged in the sources as something so ingrained in the imperial mentality that it does not have to be mentioned directly. Many Anglo-Indians seemed to instinctively know, or soon learned, how not to be taken advantage

of by Indians and how to maintain prestige, yet these texts explored the establishment and maintenance of the moral lessons that won (and lost) empires, including how they should be run and maintained, so at least some reminders were necessary for Anglo-Indian society. These texts sought to remind imperial society that past, present, and future were all linked into a discourse of honor and shame that legitimated their rule, which would only end when honor was irrevocably lost.

This work therefore examines Anglo-Indian society and, to a lesser extent, British culture. While the past twenty years have seen an explosion of work in such cultural approaches to empire, sufficient historiographical space remains to be filled, especially in regard to overlooked sources and what they reveal. In examining oral histories, imperial manuals (the "how-to" books of empire), and imperial histories, these texts can be linked in a systematic manner to imperial ideologies and mentalities, and an explicit method of rule can be found in these microsites of empire. Such texts allowed many of the themes of empire to be plotted and carried forward, and these sources reflected prevailing attitudes about imperial India that were not always articulated in more circumspect, official documents. Central to this work is the question of ideology as it was lived or imagined by Britons living in India and how this ideology was transmuted into social codes that regulated much of Anglo-Indian life. Barbara Fields offers a useful definition of ideology as being "best understood as the descriptive vocabulary of day to day existence, through which people make rough sense of the social reality that they live and create from day to day." Ideology therefore operates as a filter through which social relations are understood and made relevant, in which individual and collective identities are constantly created. As such, "ideologies are not delusional but real, as real as the social relations for which they stand . . . [and] must be constantly created and verified in social life."[25] Without constant reinforcement, stereotypes can wither and die, but when successfully enacted and reenacted, such stereotypes are among the subtlest and pervasive forms of propaganda known to mankind. Lastly, though these imperial mentalities and stereotypes were often rebutted by Indians, the focus of this book is on the attempt by the British to justify their rule through such powerful images of themselves as an honorable race, and not on the Indian response.

This work is therefore grounded in the lived experiences of the Raj and in the dissemination of imperial ideas. In India, the sanctity of empire was almost always emphasized, and the need for honorable gentleman to meet imperial needs never wholly died out there. This work therefore seeks to examine the "furniture of the mind"

of Anglo-Indians and the dissemination of their beliefs, which were based in individual notions of honor. No historian has examined the construction and circulation of these "honorable" ideals in an Indian setting, and I hope this work will open up new methods of studying imperial history. In the Raj, a heightened awareness of personal authority became the basis for the rule of India, which was the natural inheritance of a people who ruled in the name of justice, if not necessarily democracy. Born "booted and spurred" to rule others, Anglo-Indians conceived of most Asians as "yoked and bridled" and needing the firm but benevolent hand of the Anglo-Indian for guidance. In this noble endeavor, ideals of honor guided their actions and made the Raj—and its rulers—moral.

Chapter 1

The Cult and Maintenance of Honor

The citizens of India are citizens of the British Empire, which extends to all parts of the earth, so that the sun never sets upon the whole of it. Whatever fame and honor belong to this empire now belong to us as its citizens. We all share in the peace and freedom which God has granted to it subjects. East and West, India and England, are joined together, and while it is the right of every citizen of India to enjoy the liberties of the British subject, it is also his duty to take his part in preserving those liberties and handing them on to his children.

—*William Lee-Warner,* The Citizen of India[1]

The ethos of honor is fundamentally opposed to a universal and formal morality which affirms the equality in dignity of all men and consequently the equality of their rights and duties. Not only do the rules imposed upon men differ from those imposed upon women, and the duties toward men differ from those towards women, but also the dictates of honor, directly applied to the individual case and varying according to the situation, are in no way capable of being made universal.

—*Pierre Bourdieu,* "The Sentiment of Honor in Kabyle Society"[2]

Studies of the British Empire have always had to deal with the ambiguity of the term "empire" and the somewhat amorphous nature of the system built by England to administer its scattered possessions. Although the empire was held together by various means, few imperialists during the apogee of empire in the late nineteenth and

early twentieth century questioned the benefits of British dominion over palm and pine. Even if methods of rule may have differed greatly throughout the empire, the British generally sought to impose rule that was more regular and more defined than the perceived inferiority of "native" rule.[3] Yet, for all the various methods of coercion and rule employed in ruling the empire, at least one common thread of imperial thought could be found wherever one traveled in the empire. Most simply, the superiority of British institutions and customs was rarely publicly questioned, at least not by those who served in any official capacity.[4]

Although Thomas Metcalf has linked the ideologies of the Raj to medieval notions of honor, and Uday Mehta has similarly written of the link between the empire and medieval notions of honor, no historian has systematically traced how the idea of honor circulated in the Raj and how it was strategically deployed to sustain the imperial mission.[5] Nor have historians explained how such ideas may have guided imperial behavior. Thus, tracing some of the genealogies of honor in British India reveals not only the idea of honor as it was embedded in Anglo-Indian society, but also the ways in which this ideal regulated Anglo-Indian behavior and channeled imperial thought in ways that justified empire. No ideological system can ever be complete, but ideas about honor shaped imperial thought at a national and imperial level as well as in the everyday lives of the men and women charged with running the Raj. Making blanket assertions about imperial behavior is always precarious, and empire had its homegrown critics, but what has been missing from this historiographical debate is the role of honor in regulating Anglo-Indian behavior, both within imperial society and in its relations with Indians, as well as its prominent role in the national narrative. Honor was both an ideal and a reality in the Raj that had to be lived out and demonstrated. In understanding how this ideal worked, this book examines a combination of primary and secondary texts to assess how discourses of honor circulated in the Anglo-Indian community. The emphasis is not, therefore, on new primary sources but in grouping these sources into a system that produces a new pattern and a new way of looking at Anglo-Indian rule—through the prism of honor.

Civilized society, by which Britons almost always meant their own, was clearly a superior society, as the winning and keeping of the empire seemed to demonstrate. Even prominent liberals like J. S. Mill "could not conceive of applying their critique of political oppression to the various peoples across the globe who lived under Britain's authoritarian colonial rule."[6] This judgment concerning what was civilized and what was not lay at the very core of imperial

thought, and care was taken to ensure that constraints were placed on potentially dangerous and liberating ideas like relativism, "to ensure that it did not erode the boundaries between themselves [Britons] and those they regarded as less civilized."[7] Likewise, only "civilized" persons could be fully trusted with imperial authority, and imperialists of all classes almost always had more power than Britons of equal status back home. Imperial lives, with their heightened sense of power, seemed to be much more dramatic because of this preeminence. This prestige was dutifully cloaked, however, in Kiplingesque terms of the burden of ruling others fairly for little reward, especially in India. Because of this somewhat autocratic power and the apparent predisposition of many "natives" toward hero worship, one of the greatest imperial temptations was an individual tendency toward despotism, which ran against the increasing liberty of hundreds of years of English history. Yet failure to preserve one's authority was also the gravest of imperial sins, since Indians were ostensibly liable to revolt on the slightest pretext. For small communities of Britons living in India, especially after 1857, the tendency was therefore toward a homogenous culture that was always wary of another revolt, and the feeling of camaraderie that bound the "aliens under one sky" together was also believed to preserve the very sanctity of the Raj. This of course meant that a certain narrowness of outlook could be justified because of the fear of another revolt. Thus the "tyranny of face"—deemed so important in ruling in the East—should belong almost exclusively to the British. But this tendency toward despotism also had to be mitigated by English customs, or the whole imperial enterprise (as well as the justifications for it) would be undermined, since the regenerative powers of imperialism had to be emphasized as part of a legitimating ideology.

Power, therefore, had to be embraced in ways that were not too "nakedly illiberal,"[8] using methods that preserved the somewhat delicate balance of ruling others despotically while still claiming to be morally superior. Conquerors could renew their sense of liberty and of British traditions by occasional trips back home, and for most Anglo-Indians, Britain meant a place of renewal that kept degeneration at bay, since previous conquerors like the Aryans and the Mughals had ostensibly lost their imperial grip because they lived in India year-round. The British likewise sent their children back home for an education and also retreated to the hill stations during the hot weather, helping them to maintain this sense of "difference" from India. This sense of balance ostensibly kept them from decline and from straying too far from the habits of a conquering but civilizing

race, something that, in their view, was historically unmatched, even by that other great civilizing power, Rome.

Yet, what was the basis of this superiority? Where did this perceived superiority spring from and what was its foundation? How was it learned and maintained? What was the danger in abandoning or changing such a belief? Who could claim imperial power based on such notions of supremacy and who could not? How much of this power rested solely with the British and how much could be shared? The answers to these questions (to the degree that they are answerable at all) are not straightforward, but this sense of superiority was keenly felt by Britons ruling abroad during the apogee of empire, especially in British India. Superiority could be made moral, however, when linked to ideas of honor, which aided in resolving the contradiction of freedom and tyranny found in the Raj. In order to work out this epistemological uncertainty, notions of honor sutured over the contradictions and ambiguities of imperial rule. This chapter therefore analyzes and defines the discourse of honor and shame, including how it circulated and was understood by those who belonged to the "honor group" who could claim this essential right denied to most Indians.[9] As such, this chapter will be the most theoretical and wide-ranging, while later chapters will examine more specific events in the history of the Raj and link them to the nexus of honor and shame. Put simply, the Anglo-Indian almost always assumed that his (or her) honor could not be questioned and, armed with this unshakeable belief, he entered the subcontinent already carrying these assumptions, which would be enhanced and strengthened while there.

Still, imposing an honor system onto the Raj when Anglo-Indians did not always explicitly talk in such language has obvious drawbacks, especially the risk of creating a false mosaic of how Anglo-Indians thought of themselves and their rule. "We live in honor's churchyard," wrote J. E. Lendon, in a book on honor in the Roman Empire, and though "honor's bones are still with us . . . the muscles that drove them and the tissues that joined them have rotted away."[10] This work will mirror Lendon's account of ancient Rome, and the focus is not necessarily on how the levers of imperial administration worked, but rather on how things were expected to work. Like Lendon's book, this is a work of political culture rather than political history and the aim "is not to discover why individual events occurred, but (ideally) to discover how a whole political world worked by studying how a range of people expected it to work."[11] The representations of the British Empire are another focus of this work. How was it imagined, represented, and justified? What did the empire mean to the British,

and specifically, to the British in India? In this sense, my book is not necessarily a work of imperial history but instead focuses on British perceptions of empire and imperial texts. Exploring these perceptions in an imperial setting such as the Raj should produce an approximation of what administrators and other Anglo-Indians believed about themselves in relation to the Indians they encountered, and how and why these beliefs evolved over time.[12] Like all governments, the Raj had common perceptions and expectations, and though individuals came to it from various backgrounds, Britons were expected to fit into it in certain ways, without too much fuss or bother. Recent scholarship has focused on this form of cultural history in which buildings, paintings, music and novels, street plans, and public rituals are analyzed and linked to empire, in an attempt to recreate the mental and physical universe of the imperialist. At the height of empire, imperial discourse developed into a system of communications and thinking in which the institutional myths, signs, and metaphors of an imperial people legitimated their claim to rule others, and imperial ideology thus represented an "imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence . . . by which ideas such as empire [were] understood by its subjects."[13] The danger in such an analysis lies in wrenching examples from their historical context, but I will attempt to link quotidian Anglo-Indian domestic life to the theory of honor, and I will argue that the dominant mode for Anglo-Indians to relate to these physical conditions was by thinking of imperial institutions (and the men and women who ran them) as honorable, though in many ways, the embrace of honor was an attempt to ignore the physical reality of India, including its dirt, its noise, its disease, and oftentimes its people.

On an individual level, the sense of superiority had to be cultivated and made to appear natural for those who claimed authority over other humans. Although many theories about class, race, and gender have been offered to explain this British sense of superiority, what has been overlooked is perhaps the most crucial piece of the imperial mosaic—honor. If there is a single word that encapsulates the complexities (and simplicities) of the ideological foundations of the Raj, it is this sense of honor that emanated from imperial rule, both on a collective and on an individual level. Honor could be distributed and shared in ways that at times superseded categories of class, race, and gender, yet it could still preserve the status quo of the Raj and the "honorable" intentions of the ruling race, who were thankfully spared from sharing power with those who possessed flawed or noticeably absent conceptions of honor.

The Centrality of India

The Indian subcontinent existed at the very core of nineteenth-century imperialism, and British India increasingly loomed larger in the British imagination as the century wore on. India likewise lay at the heart of assertions about national honor, and geographically and mythically, the Raj was the sacred center of empire that had to be protected at all costs. Consequently, one of the most important aspects of British imperial history during this era was the spectacular growth of the British Raj and the empire in Asia, as well as the corollary assault on Africa, which was in many ways precipitated by British interests in the subcontinent. India now had to be protected at all costs, and this policy caused the British to take seriously threats to India, especially those from Russia. Some of Britain's most humiliating losses of the century occurred in Afghanistan, and the two disastrous campaigns there were meant to check Russian advances that threatened the Jewel in the Crown.[14]

More broadly, the extent and legacy of empires during this era expanded rapidly as European powers, which had controlled 35 percent of the world in 1800, controlled 84 percent of the globe by 1914.[15] Much of this expansion occurred between 1860 and 1914, when the equilibrium in Europe began to break down. During this time, Britain added to its empire much of sub-Saharan Africa, Egypt, Persia, and southern China, as well as Burma, the Malay Peninsula, Borneo, and the Pacific islands, and even gained a sphere of influence in the Arabian Peninsula.[16] Therefore, if a uniformity of thought about empires ever emerged during the imperial era, it is likely to have been during this time, as European nations sought to justify their empires both to themselves and to each other.

During the late 1800s, imperial culture also increasingly found its way to London, and conversely, increasing numbers of people of all classes made their way to imperial posts, and the public soon adapted to "empire as a way of life." After the Revolt, India was transformed from a loose confederation or conglomerate of affiliated provinces and territories into the Raj, and a more cohesive vision of empire emerged. Imperialism subsumed many internal differences of class, gender, and race, and sought to unite Britain by linking imperial greatness to national greatness. Everyone with a British heritage had a principal role to play in the imperial epic, and even the lower classes—concerned as many of them were with gangs, territories, and masculine status within a group—seemed naturally to gravitate to the stories of empire. In railway factories in England, "anyone who was

unpatriotic was mocked."[17] Frank Richards also spoke of the lure of India in *Old Soldier Sahib* and of the stories retired soldiers spun in England that made India out to be a paradise for soldiers.[18] Taking part in the imperial mission meant gaining power and honor when one went overseas, and such narratives sustained the vision of the British as an imperial race with a place in the imperial hierarchy for all Britons.

For all the other conquests in the latter part of the century, however, other imperial possessions never matched India's importance to the British, especially economically. Even Africa was never as important to England as India for imperial trade.[19] In addition to offsetting the negative balance of trade for England, India also provided a military barracks for the East. Indian troops were sent to snuff out global conflicts, but could also be used in India in a pinch, and all this was paid for by Indians, theoretically in return for the good governance they received from the empire. India was likewise a warehouse, a depot, a brothel, a recruitment center, and a sporting ground of empire. In addition to these tangible benefits, India provided psychic well-being for a tiny island ruling over a vast land. Moreover, the subcontinent was often the cog that drove imperial policy, and the development of India provided the blueprint for the development of other far-flung possessions.[20] In 1895, Joseph Chamberlain declared: "I believe in the British Empire, and . . . I believe in the British race. I believe that the British race is the greatest of governing races that the world has ever seen."[21] Much of the psychological sense of well-being for British identity was rooted in the control of India, making it a wellspring of national identity as well. As is often the case, Kipling expressed it most succinctly: "What can they know of England, who only England know?" If Kipling referred to the empire here, India was his spiritual home, and the British could be most proud of their achievements there—of all the children of empire, India shone brightest and was the most jealously guarded, its honor retained against all external and internal threats.

Honorable Intentions

By definition, empires are built and maintained by such notions of superiority, which are carefully cultivated in as many different realms as possible, in political, economic, cultural, and martial domains. Consequently, studies of empire must account for the basis of the superiority of British institutions—both perceived and real—since empires rely on an unequal distribution of power, and the Raj was

no exception to the rule. While the wielding of power has long been a concern of both imperialists and imperial historians, until recently power has been measured in political, military, and economic terms.[22] More recent approaches to empire focus on social and cultural power and the microprocesses of everyday rule, but as Dane Kennedy shrewdly points out, all approaches to empire must take into account the systematic effort by the British to "impose their will on other peoples."[23] Power is never employed without emotion, and Anglo-Indians[24] spent much energy trying to convince Indians, the British back home, the rest of the world, and even themselves that the interests of the subcontinent were best served by Anglo-Indian rule. Like a suitor wooing its prize (or a potential father-in-law, with continual protestations of benevolence and innocence), the Raj sought to proclaim its honorable intentions toward the subcontinent and that the relationship could be beneficial for both countries, provided Indians understood the superiority and benefits of British rule.

At its core, then, imperialism typically rested on the claim of the superior civilization to rule an inferior one, whether the method of rule was formal or informal (or any of the other bewildering array of methods of imperial rule in between). These claims had to be manufactured and deployed in the empire and somehow made to guide imperial thought, which, for a nation whose imperial successes confirmed its superiority, did not prove difficult. This sense of superiority found outlets in the ideas about class, race, and gender that guided imperial thought, and much recent work has focused on these categories as historians have begun mapping the gendered and racial and hierarchical visions that informed Anglo-Indians in their affective relations with Indians.[25]

While honor historically has been built upon a core value of masculine, aristocratic power, in India it could be more widely distributed to males and females of most classes, since British soldiers and memsahibs grew accustomed to supervising large numbers of Indians, and honor typically is associated with power over a "lower order." Yet honor also was internalized in Anglo-Indian society, and it was employed to keep the white herd of Anglo-Indian society together, delineating the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable imperial behavior. If externally, honor was thought to regulate contact with Asians, such beliefs ensured the precedence and prestige of the imperial race. This imperial race, however, was itself finely calibrated and hierarchical according to the perceived honor of its individual members. This internal honor (sometimes called "horizontal" honor) is the striving for individual prestige within the

imperial social formation, for honor can mean nothing without some form of hierarchy. External honor (sometimes referred to as "vertical" honor) is more closely tied to rank, and is typically dependent on a strict separation between the honor group and some proximate social unit who live beyond honor's reign.[26] Internally, honor therefore drew all Anglo-Indians into very small orbits, regardless of their rank, but externally, it sharply delineated most Britons from Indians. Within Anglo-Indian society, honor established the group norms that kept Anglo-Indians in power, while externalized notions of it defined the relationships to Indians. I will further discuss the internal aspects of Anglo-Indian honor in Chapter 2, and though this chapter will touch on the internal dynamics of imperial society, my focus is on establishing a definition of honor and its use as a discourse in regulating contact between ruler and ruled.

Despite all the recent emphasis on the iron triangle of class, race, and gender in imperial studies, honor provides perhaps the best and most complete framework for understanding how Anglo-Indians thought of themselves in an imperial setting. While the importance of colonial masculinity and the importance of gender in constructing an ideology of rule cannot be belittled, and ideas about British blood and race informed much of the Anglo-Indian outlook, ideas about honor were intertwined with those of class, race, and gender. The story of the Raj is not simply a tale of white over black, male over female, colonizer over colonized, and upper over lower class, although all these explanations have merit. It is instead a story of carefully constructed imperial identities formed out of British history and customs and proper and improper modes of imperial behavior. To give a brief example, the dignity and moral worthiness of the Raj could be upheld by stately memsahibs or it could be upheld by a lowly Indian *bhisti* (water-carrier) like Gunga Din, demonstrating his loyalty by dying nobly for the imperial cause, having absorbed enough of the honor code to die for it. Though Kipling's Tommy has previously "belted and flayed" Gunga Din, as the Indian lay dying of wounds he had received in a battle, he is most concerned about quenching the thirst of the Tommy. At this moment, the *bhisti* has transcended his race, and "for all 'is dirty 'ide, 'E was white, pure white inside." The trope of the loyal Indian would be repeated in myriad colonial texts, but this reaction was considered to be the proper response to the just rule of the Raj. Conversely, the heroic-romantic imperialists enshrined by Kipling and myriad imperial writers were ideally ready to sacrifice their lives for empire or for the good of the colonized, and Kipling reminds his readers that the "grateful native" at times

reciprocated, ostensibly recognizing the merits of imperial rule and the greater honor of the Raj and its men.

Imperial Identities

Gunga Din was most certainly an ideal, but Anglo-Indians constructed their imperial identity through such texts, and this identity depended on Indians for much of its cultural resonance. Though David Cannadine recently argued in *Ornamentalism* that class and visions of hierarchy informed much of the imperial outlook (and arguing that ideas of race were much less influential), he failed to account for the prevailing ethos of British India, which was largely set down by the middle classes. The group that would not, however, find a congenial home in the Raj was the aristocracy. India lost much of its appeal for them after 1858, and they came to prefer service in Africa, where patronage still determined membership in the Civil Service. Aristocrats like Winston Churchill still managed to visit India on their grand imperial tour, but such men were merely sojourners and not there for careers. On the other hand, viceroys were drawn from the aristocracy, but they were never the heart and soul of British imperial governance in India. They served brief, five-year terms and needed no political experience in the Raj. Moreover, becoming a viceroy was the political and administrative kiss of death for any ambitious politician, since such service seemed to mark politicians as being unfit for work in London. Many of the mid-echelon Anglo-Indians saw the viceroy as a beautiful ornament—he was the flower and they were the plant, and they did decidedly not care for viceroys who interfered. Curzon, for example, was one of the few great reformers who served as viceroy during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, mainly because he was one of the few viceroys willing to take on the Indian Civil Service (ICS) and the army, something which most chose not to do.[27] The middle class in India, partly through separating itself from the viceroy and other aristocrats, would eventually associate itself with honor and hierarchy, which enabled them to claim both bourgeois virtue and aristocratic honor. Viceroys might hobnob with Indian princes, but those performing the quotidian tasks of empire typically had very different views from those of viceroys, whose power was usually checked by the defragmented nature of the ICS and the "tyranny of distance" that allowed those on the ground to rule as they saw fit, since the ICS and the army were both firmly entrenched Anglo-Indian institutions. As one early-twentieth century chronicler of the ICS wrote, "If you ask the man in the street, or, for the matter of

that, your own stay at home brother, who governed India, he will no doubt say 'the viceroy' . . . viceroys and governors, like constitutional monarchs, reign, but they do not govern."[28] Lord Linlithogow, viceroy at the outbreak of World War II, admitted that he had never seen a rupee.[29] He was so far physically removed from India that he could not possibly know the "real" India. Essentially, viceroys weren't the "real" India, and the ones who tried to change imperial institutions were rarely trusted.[30] The dominant ethos of British India after 1857 was therefore set by the upper-middle classes who came to dominate the ICS, claiming that their professional training as disinterested civil servants made them the fittest rulers of India. If viceroys came and went, members of the ICS spent entire careers in India, and their views were often decidedly different from those of the highest elite.[31] Yet, although the Raj was riven with strict protocols and hierarchies, as Cannadine rightly points out, Anglo-Indian society still thought of itself as ethical and likely to be the best hope for governing India. While Cannadine's vision of the Raj as hierarchical is correct, what has been missing from the historical picture is the role of honor in regulating and sustaining this hierarchical society, and honor equipped the Anglo-Indian, usually in spite of his class, with an exalted vision of himself as a benign overlord belonging to a dominant race and able to inspire loyalty among his Indian underlings.

Although aristocratic viceroys and the middle classes might possess very different ideas about their mission in India, both groups, and even the lower classes, still believed that they ruled India better than Indians could rule themselves. All British classes in India were ruling classes, but the middle and lower orders became something quite different in an imperial context. The middle class, who in England had been associated with limited government and liberalism, transformed themselves into autocrats in India who ostensibly ruled as enlightened despots. The Anglo-Indian hierarchy was, moreover, seen as meritocratic and just (in spite of the viceroy, perhaps), while the caste system in India was never viewed as favorably, since it was thought to be flawed by priestcraft, superstition, and warped notions of how to run the country. If the Anglo-Indian hierarchy was tangible and strict, the Anglo-Indian administrator was not always constrained by it, and while Cannadine's provocative work reminds the reader that blood was not all in the empire, neither was class, partly because of this tyranny of distance that made many of those in the *moffusil* (backcountry) virtual free agents. Especially in the ICS, the Raj resembled an unabashed autocracy tempered by the rule of law, yet even the rule of law could be ignored at times. As Philip Mason pointed out, there

was "no use being a king unless you can't break the law occasionally."[32] The "man on the spot" remained a powerful vision for the ICS and the males charged with running India, and Anglo-Indians as rulers subscribed to this ideal of honor, for autocracy could be made compatible with progress—if not democracy—if it was enlightened and just. It is no accident that Mason titled his history of the ICS *The Guardians,* since this platonic ideal increasingly informed the Anglo-Indian vision of themselves as "natural" aristocrats after 1858. In addition to the renowned writers like Kipling or Mason, this vision of the Raj in which "honorable" rule from above was met by deference from below can be found in oral histories, Anglo-Indian novels, domestic manuals, journal articles, and in other nonfictional works produced by imperial authors, to name but a few. For most Anglo-Indians, the honor of the Raj, as well as the prestige that was a logical by-product of honor, had to be preserved, seemingly at all costs.[33] As a system, honor was hierarchical according to status, so Cannadine is essentially correct in his description of this hierarchy, but each segment of the Anglo-Indian community could still make a claim to honor and have it recognized by their peers or even force Indians to do so. Anglo-Indians believed they were ennobled by the work of imperial rule and by the moral grandeur that made even mundane tasks exalted and dignified, and such attitudes tended to make the Anglo-Indians "aristocrats by nature," and not by mere birth.

Admitting that some Indians and Britons shared similar traits, as Cannadine points out, is a far cry from admitting that Indians could run India, something that would appear ludicrous to the majority of Anglo-Indians, who did not believe that India could be modernized without British help. Moreover, Cannadine's claim that the hierarchy that Indians and Britons supposedly shared served to "eradicate the differences and to homogenize the heterogeneities of empire" is unmerited.[34] Understandably, many Britons sought to understand India in terms that were familiar to them, especially in viewing India as feudal, but this analogy rarely brought the races closer together, since the Indian present was seen as being the European past, and thus, on the evolutionary scale, "the British were far ahead."[35] Britons represented progress, enlightenment, and modernity, while Indians, with few exceptions, represented chaos, superstition, and backwardness. And yet, even this Orientalist formulation of the separation of white and black cannot always be sustained, for Anglo-Indian identity was intimately connected with Indian identity, and, as the book will demonstrate, both races were bound up in the honor nexus, continually at the mercy of the judgments of their peers and of the Raj itself.

Still, the carefully wrought superiority of Anglo-Indians all but automatically implied the inferiority of imperial subjects. Inequality was built into the system, but inequality could be justified if it also implied that those at the bottom would be better off under imperial rather than local rule. The honor of the Anglo-Indians was upheld by looking out for the best interests of India, even when Indians failed to do so, and the demeanor of the British closely resembled that of gods whose benevolence was often taxed by the backwardness of their charges. Imperialists might occasionally feud among themselves, but there was very little doubt concerning the interests of colonizer over colonized. A serious enough threat would always cause Anglo-Indian society to band together—perceived threats would produce the cohesion necessary for an embedded society surrounded by potentially hostile subjects. Anglo-Indians in this era metaphorically and defensively took to the heights, where they viewed Indians with an almost Olympian detachment. They were a race above who deserved to rule those inferior in power to themselves, although they were constantly asked to sort out the problems of those underneath them, rarely thinking of the misery they might impose in their solutions. Thus, the solution to almost any imperial situation required constancy, courage, and the will to stand by one's decisions, even if wrong. Occasional mistakes could be admitted, though apologies were extremely rare from Anglo-Indians, who constantly reminded their critics that their rule was the most benevolent and enlightened ever experienced in India, far surpassing that of previous conquerors like the Aryans or Mughals—once "honorable" rulers who were subsumed by the enervating effect of living in India. Such diachronic comparisons comforted Anglo-Indians with the perception that their rule was just and honorable and for the good of India, but also reminded them that India seemed to constantly tempt its rulers. To Anglo-Indians, the great power of India had always been its ability to erode and eat away at civilization (including its earlier conquerors), like a continual monsoon that always seemed to overwhelm her rulers. Clinging to honorable intentions allowed the imperial narrative to be plotted and carried forward by men who would not fall prone to the temptations of India. If India seduced her previous conquerors, the Anglo-Indian remained above India (and Indians), at least if one believes the mythologies produced by Anglo-Indians obsessed with demonstrating their superior techniques for occupying and ruling India. More glory was accrued by the British race for maintaining the "just" governance of the Raj in the face of this continual temptation. Yet honor typically thrives in such an environment in which a society

believes itself to be under continual threat from those who would shame it. For all the defensive posturing of the Raj in the nineteenth century, especially toward Russia, those who follow honor's dictates often prefer not to defend themselves if the basis of their rule is called into question, but to instead attack the moral fitness of those who question their legitimacy or threaten their rule. Honor needs both a target and an arena for others to see it being enacted, and Anglo-Indians typically saw threats to their honor and power continually lurking in the darkness of the Indian heart, which, despite its protestation of loyalty, might be secretly plotting or at least hoping for mutiny. If Indians were ostensibly always probing for weaknesses in imperial society, Anglo-Indians would need to assert their honor at all times, like a loaded gun perpetually aimed at the Indian breast, waiting for the anticipated—and ultimately dishonorable—revolt.

Defining Honor

Honor, like all other ideological entities, is an elusive concept, and its use here needs to be carefully justified because of the risk of adding yet another theoretical layer to imperial historiography. All societies have notions of honor and shame to judge individual conduct, but some societies invariably make more constant reference to honor than others, and in specific discourses to produce ideal types. For British India, it is impossible to ignore the continuing preoccupations of imperial society and their constant emphasis on fair play, just rule, and the White Man's Burden, though these "ideals," when viewed by Indians, seemed to be something else entirely. Honor represented the highest ideal of rule, and it was at the apex of the pyramid of social values found in the Raj, from whence it conditioned the rest of the hierarchical order. It is arguably the most important theoretical framework for understanding how the British conceived of their rule in India—especially since control of "the Jewel in the Crown" seemed to represent the most noble and lofty work of the empire. On a more cautionary note, I am not arguing that ideas about gender, class, and race were unimportant, but that honor, like a well-tended vine in a latticework of imperial ideologies, can be found intertwined in all of these categories, linking them all in an overarching theme of imperial rule. Such a model is naturally ambitious and somewhat difficult to prove conclusively; nevertheless, though the recent emphasis on race, status, and gender in imperial studies has broadened our knowledge of the Raj, ideas (and ideals) about honor overdetermined how Anglo-Indians thought of themselves in an imperial setting,

since imperial society tended to divide the people around them into two groups: those who possessed honor and those whose honor was circumscribed or perhaps totally absent. Anglo-Indians likewise made their decisions about trusting Indians based not simply on ideas about class, race, or gender, but to what extent an Indian was honorable, whether they were servants, soldiers, merchants, or administrators. Thus, honor allows us to understand how Anglo-Indians were able to trust some Indians implicitly even while conceiving of the subcontinent as a place filled with intrigue and verging on chaos. Most simply, some values could be shared and some Indians could be trusted; however, the race that had the *most* honorable members and the *most* honorable institutions deserved to rule the subcontinent, and thus paramount power always rested with the British, since only they could be trusted to rule fairly. This vision was of course never absolute, but the discourse of honor and dishonor informed the Anglo-Indian vision of themselves and their mission in the Raj. This sense of superiority was cultivated and nourished in many different realms of imperial thought, including history, ideas about masculinity, notions of whiteness, and accepted wisdom about traditions and customs, to name but a few that will be explored in this work. What linked all these broad categories was the sense of honor derived from the noble history of the British race (heavily mythologized), which in turn individually equipped the imperialist with his heightened sense of power—but power that was wielded responsibly by men who could be trusted with despotic power.

Defining honor is notoriously difficult then, especially for the modern reader, but its malleability was part of its appeal. Anglo-Indians could speak of it in very vague terms and tap into this system as they saw fit. At times, it could obscure more than it revealed, but it kept hands and bodies, and even ideals, perpetually clean. Cognitive dissonance could be minimized by believing in the "honorable" rule of the Raj, no matter how despotically one behaved, and such "principles" could be hazily asserted as benign ideals that did not have to be questioned too closely, making them a shortcut to more intellectually rigorous assessments of imperial rule. Honor, in the words of J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers, is "too intimate a sentiment to submit to definition: it must be felt, it cannot be analyzed except by the anthropologist [or in this case, the historian]."[36] As such, it was more code than abstraction, and rather than giving a prescriptive definition of honor, honor is perhaps best defined by its descriptive characteristics, for it is not a single concept, but represents a conceptual field in which people can express their self-esteem

or their esteem for others.[37] As described by Pitt-Rivers, honor is incompatible with weakness and is derived from a specific set of cultural norms and social practices most easily found in small communities. For example, Hamish Blair, writing in *India: The Eleventh Hour* (published in 1934), cautioned that "if you go down in India, the instinct of every bystander is to kick you."[38] Blair cited Macaulay for this "enduring truth" about Indians, demonstrating that the best approach to India was conservative and cautious, since its people could not be trusted with power. The "shame" of India lay in this exploitation that had ostensibly marked most of its history. Its people had been debased by centuries of misrule, warping notions of honorable and dishonorable behavior, and this seemed to be the obvious lesson to Blair. Externally, honor thus also required some group nearby to live in a dishonored state (or possess irredeemably flawed notions of honor) as demonstrated in Blair's "moral" lesson. The occasional high-handed acts of Anglo-Indians could therefore be justified because of the dishonorable nature of Indians, who were prone to become violent only when assured of the weakness of their rulers, whose small numbers made them perpetually vulnerable to mass movements or riots.

Much of the internal cohesion of Anglo-Indian society rested on its separation from India and Indians in such easy binaries, most famously in the clubs, which were the preserve of the rulers of the subcontinent well into the twentieth century.[39] Honor therefore operated as a unifying concept for Anglo-Indian society—much like the clubs themselves—and worked within a social hierarchy so that honor could usually be claimed by those with a British background, bringing most Anglo-Indians into the honor group.[40] The club marked Anglo-Indians as "clubbable," acceptable, and culturally "white." In *Burmese Days,* Orwell called the club the "spiritual citadel" of imperial society, and the Kyauktada Club of the novel has only one redeeming feature to most of its members: it has allowed no Indians or Burmese as members. With increasing Indianization of the 1920s and 1930s, however, most clubs integrated, and the Indian doctor Veraswami knows that if he can become a member of the club, "no calumny can touch him. A Club member is sacrosanct."[41] Alternatively, Europeans who either tenuously belonged or did not belong at all in the honor group were those at the fringes of society, like missionaries or critics of empire who were cast beyond the circle of honor. In this regard, honor regulated Anglo-Indian society by laying down norms for appropriate behavior, thereby providing ideals for how Anglo-Indians should behave while residing in the Raj, and

one's "place" in this hierarchy was all but fixed once one's occupation became known. Highly visible Anglo-Indians were those who sat atop the apex of imperial honor, while British soldiers—excluded from clubs and largely invisible until a crisis arose—remained near the bottom. The British soldier might represent the lowliest rank in imperial society (other than "fallen" whites), but his sense of duty and commitment to the empire, as well as his race loyalty, could not be questioned, for the soldier belonged to a race that built and retained empires, and his loyalty was not for hire. As such, honor possessed a concentrated racial element, and while British soldiers were not "clubbable," one never had to fear revolt or mutiny from them. Yet their lowly status kept them all but invisible until a crisis arose, since they were uncomfortable reminders of the true power of the Raj. As Orwell caustically described imperial society in the subcontinent, the British there were a "dull, decent people, cherishing and fortifying their dullness behind a quarter of a million bayonets." Orwell, disgusted at his actions while a police officer stationed in Burma (then a part of British India), astutely caricatured the code of the "pukka sahib."

> It is a stifling, stultifying world in which to live. It is a world in which every word and every thought is censored. In England it is hard even to imagine such an atmosphere. Everyone is free in England; we sell our souls in public and buy them back in private, among our friends. But even friendship can hardly exist when every white man is a cog in the wheels of despotism. Free speech is unthinkable. All other kinds of freedom are permitted. You are free to be a drunkard, an idler, a coward, a backbiter, a fornicator; but you are not free to think for yourself. Your opinion on every subject of any conceivable importance is dictated for you by the pukka sahibs' code.[42]

For almost all Anglo-Indians, then, their sense of duty and honor was almost a given, and their claim to honor allowed the rulers to think of their service to India in noble terms. Orwell also captures how the honor code limited the "freedom" of the imperial ruler, who cannot express his thoughts if they are at odds with those of the "pukka sahibs." Orwell condenses the "chief beatitudes of the pukka sahib" down to "Keeping up our prestige/The Firm hand (without the velvet glove)/We white men must hang together/Give them an inch and they'll take an ell, and/Esprit de corps."[43] Yet other freedoms were allowed to the Anglo-Indian, to be "idlers" or "drunkards or "fornicators," but Orwell knew that Anglo-Indians were fundamentally different from their peers who stayed home.

Orwell, however, reverted to the idiom of honor and shame in his bitter diatribe, decrying that in imperial rule "there is nothing honorable."[44] Much more so than the metropole, the subcontinent existed as a land of honor and shame, even for its most bitter critics.

Most Anglo-Indians would not see their rule through Orwell's jaundiced eyes, but instead saw themselves as inherently decent and just, primarily because one's honor was not thought to be overly restricted in India, since obedience limited honor. According to Orwell, a young Englishman could come to India and immediately "kick grey-haired servants."[45] Thus one's ability to rule "fairly" while unfettered by the legal and cultural restraints typically found in English society marked imperial society as superior, primarily because it inspired them in the manly art of governing other humans fairly, even when Indians did not really deserve such "splendid" rule. Anglo-Indians could therefore occasionally take out their frustration on Indian servants with no perceived damage to the integrity of themselves or the Raj, and the right to impose violence was a characteristic of almost all Anglo-Indians. Honor therefore worked to convert prestige into status and to make this claim permanent. However, wielding such despotic power had to be made ethical, and the codes that regulated the Raj (both formal and informal) were sanctioned by the larger community of Anglo-Indians; Orwell notwithstanding, honor concealed the harsher realities of the Raj and strategically lessened imperial exploitation, "permitting the efficient exercise of brute power under an unobjectionable veil."[46] Honor, for Anglo-Indian society, translated into a dogged belief in the honesty and integrity of one's own beliefs or actions, and thus implied with few exceptions that Indians were incapable of honorable behavior, or at least of ruling their land honorably.[47] Honor was thus intimately linked to power, as Orwell intuitively realized, for it disguised brute force and enabled other forms of imperial power to operate, and perhaps most importantly, it animated Anglo-Indian life and gave life to the laws of customs of imperial society. These customs were deemed more important than the laws, especially in times of crisis, and "kicking grey-haired servants," however distasteful to the modern reader, could be made moral and just if such actions were deemed necessary in letting Indians know that the Raj would not be taken advantage of. "No man may harm me with impunity" was an ancient theme of the European aristocracy eagerly embraced in India, where honor condoned and sanctified Anglo-Indian rituals, connecting them with status, power, and authority.

The Honor Code

This right to respect and deference had deep cultural roots in England, and in the eighteenth century, ethical philosophers like Hobbes took the question of honor seriously. Hobbes considered honor to be "the opinion of power."[48] In this sense, honor legitimated self-aggrandizement, and perhaps the kicking of servants. Mandeville, another early modern critic of honor, thought it inconsistent with virtue "which, after all, required self-denial."[49] The man of honor was unfortunately, according to Mandeville, impelled by a neopagan ethic to seek fame rather than salvation, and he followed a code that was superior to the laws "of God and the laws of one's country."[50]

Yet there existed a long history going back to Aristotle of those who have linked honor and virtue. Since all men were susceptible to praise, men regulated their behavior to seek approbation from the group according to the rules of virtue. Honor thus led inevitably to virtuous actions, as Aristotle believed, and even "men of little virtue" were, according to the sixteenth-century philosopher Frances Hutcheson, "excited" by honor "beyond their inclination, [and] made subservient to a publick interest."[51] This is the fundamental historical split in the notion of honor, between those who would link it to virtue and those who see it as divorced from such ethical considerations. After 1857, however, Anglo-Indians attempted to link honor and virtue, muddying the concepts in the process, for however much they defended their right to precedence and respect, they justified this status through the perceived virtuous rule they had established in India, which far surpassed any previous conquerors in its efforts to rule India fairly.[52] Imperial authority in part emanated from the moral authority of Anglo-Indians, bent on "improving" India for little in reward, and any revolts against this "virtuous" rule were construed as dishonorable acts. Acts of Indian political resistance always brought a swift (and typically brutal) reaction from the Raj, and Indians were thus placed in a double bind of being unable to honorably resist British power even while their continued acquiescence in the Raj betrayed their lack of honor. A truly "honorable" race would have kicked off the shackles of British rule at some point, just as England had apparently absorbed the lesson of Rome before emerging as a prouder and stronger nation. It was inconceivable for most Anglo-Indians to imagine themselves being ruled by a foreign power as they themselves did in India ("For Britons never shall be slaves"). In British India, there could be little virtue in submission, and throughout this work, I will argue that honor, especially imperial honor, was divorced from

virtue, at least virtue as it is understood in the modern sense, since Anglo-Indians often had to justify actions that would have met with censure in England (and often did). Though many Anglo-Indians would equate their rule with virtue, virtue could be too close to weakness, and Asians, as seen in their predilection for "kicking a man when he is down," were notoriously likely to prey on frailty, which also excluded them from the Western sense of honor. Yet, as Orwell saw, Anglo-Indians rarely seemed capable of admitting that they preyed on weakness themselves, and Orwell was shocked on his first journey to the East when he saw a coolie being kicked while aboard a liner bound for India (though Orwell himself would later strike at a number of Indian boys at a railway station). The fact that Indians were prepared to endure such treatment only confirmed their status as shameless, casting them beyond the moral pale of honor. As an ideology then, honor may have been abstract and ill defined, but its benefits were not, especially if the status quo was kept in place.

Conversely, an Anglo-Indian could never imagine being kicked by an Indian, unless perhaps as prelude to some larger revolt. In *Leviathan,* Hobbes had defined honor as the demonstration of power or precedence, but honor is more than Hobbes contended, for "honorable" governments (or men) seek to impose and control the very definition of honor. In medieval Spain, the church and the nobility had long disputed what constituted honor, the honor owed to God versus the honor owed to military prowess and courageous rule.[53] Ever since treatises on honor began appearing in the sixteenth century, the church had emphasized the basis of true honor in virtue, yet they rarely convinced the protagonists in the struggle over the meaning and interpretation of honor. Even in the "lower orders," respect and precedence "are paid to those who claim it and are sufficient powerful to enforce their claim. . . . On the field of honor might is right."[54]

This conflict between honoring God and honoring self can also be seen through the actions of the men mentioned in the introduction—W. D. Arnold and Frank Richards. Although both men thought of India as possessing a flawed and inferior culture, defining imperialism for such disparate types of men can be difficult. Both men defined themselves in relation to empire, and the "imperial" aspect lay at the very core of their identity. Yet each man needed to see empire in his own particular way, which justified and rationalized the actions of each—actions that were constituted as being honorable on both an imperial and an individual level. Both men had reputations to maintain among their peers (obviously more so for Richards, since Arnold "scorned the world's report"), but their actions were likewise

couched in the idiom of honor and shame. There is also a fundamental distinction to be made here at the beginning of this work, since Oakfield's actions are more akin to character and Richards' to honor. In this sense, character is internal and not dependant upon the values of the group, as Oakfield attempted to demonstrate with his refusal to duel. In the modern Western world, character has historically been associated with Christian ethics and is based on a reputation for personal honesty and integrity. It is in this moral sense that Dr. Samuel Johnson defined honor as the "nobility of soul, magnanimity, and a scorn of meanness," meaning that honor should be derived from "virtuous conduct."[55] Societies based upon honor, on the other hand, are typically those in which the members are prepared to fight to defend their reputation, and "virtuous conduct" and "nobility of soul" become much less important than one's willingness to avenge any insult. In the honor code, one's reputation within the group becomes paramount, and honor situates the individual within his or her social group and determines a right to precedence.[56] As such, honor typically drifts away from a Christian ethos to embrace more pagan values in which a man's strength and power and his ability to impose his will on others is more important than his good character. Honor demands retribution for a perceived slight, while Christian character, ideally, has been more prone to turning the other cheek. Though Oakfield possessed "character," the instant that his character—or what was thought to be his character—was displayed, it was inevitably transformed and understood by other Anglo-Indians in terms of honor or, in Oakfield's case, shame. Throughout this work, I am using honor and character in these senses in which character is internal and honor external, though at times the terms were used interchangeably to describe similar virtues. To return to Arnold and Richards, since their roles in the subcontinent were so different, as were their backgrounds, each man needed to reaffirm empire in his own specific way, but neither man doubted that his deeds were done in the best interests of empire. Yet depending solely on one's internal character would never be enough in British India to rule the subcontinent, and one eventually had to display this character before the group to demonstrate the merits of the ruling race.

To serve in India in almost any capacity (save some of the lowest of the poor whites) all but necessitated that one believed in the good intentions of the Raj. To this end, the *izzat,* or honor, of the Raj was the central tenet of Anglo-Indian society, and it was always carefully protected and nourished, while those who questioned the honor of the Raj felt the full wrath of the Anglo-Indian community.

Like ancient cultists, Anglo-Indians believed that their rituals had to be precisely followed and they were a profoundly conservative society who believed that most change was bad, which meant that they were superstitious about these rituals that sustained the Raj. Thus the regular rhythms of imperial life were ennobled and made to be the sacred center of their rule. Following the prescriptive texts of empire, such as the domestic manuals or books describing the reasons why Rome fell, allowed the Anglo-Indians to conceive of their rule in honorable terms and to believe that no other society could rule the subcontinent better than they did. The ancient Roman (but Greek-born) poet Publilius Syrus had once asked: "What is left when honor is lost?" The answer, of course, for Anglo-Indians was nothing, for there could be no empire without honor, and there existed very little scope for honor without empire. Though they might debate what constituted honorable and dishonorable behavior, almost always, honorable rule meant British rule, and a general consensus eventually coalesced in the nineteenth-century Raj in which such ideals and notions sustained and justified imperial rule. Honor was the stout heart of the Raj, and it resided at the center of imperial life for nearly all Anglo-Indians, who let their prestige falter with potentially disastrous consequences.

At their simplest, these ideas about honor marked Britons as different from Indians in ways that were simple yet effective. Honor and prestige determined acceptable behavior in relations between Britons and Indians, and without honor, the carefully built edifice of imperial rule in India would crumble, since empires could never be maintained with dishonorable rulers, at least not for the duration envisioned by those who believed in the permanence of the Raj.[57] These ideas about honor had sharpened in the late nineteenth century, and it was commonly believed that the nabobs could never have retained the empire for England, since their degenerate lifestyles led them to oriental debauchery and decadence, since these men had become overly familiar with India and its customs. In the mid-to-late Victorian era, India would instead be ruled by men like Richards and, much less so, Oakfield, who were ready to provide correction and comfort as needed—one holding the whip hand of empire and the other the shepherd's staff. This was, of course, the fundamental contradiction of the Raj, whether India would be a Colony (represented by Oakfield), in which case the Britons living there needed moral reform, or Conquest (represented by Richards). Increasingly, however, the Raj was fully neither, since the dominant ethos became one of benevolent authoritarianism in which all Anglo-Indians were expected to be ethical yet powerful beings whose status was connected to their moral

probity. Though they were Christian, they were not *too* religious, for honor was their chief god and the central preoccupation of most of their rituals.

Significantly, a number of other words have, at times, been substituted for honor, and many of them were in use in British India. Even though Anglo-Indians did not always speak in terms of honor, they resorted to other euphemisms like prestige or force of character, but all were, in one sense or another, derivatives of honor, which was the basic concept for Anglo-Indians to understand how the Raj functioned, as well as giving Britons a framework on how to think of themselves in an imperial setting. There were other words that deputized for honor as well: esteem, respect, or some other combination of words could, at times, be substituted. Honor could also mean integrity, or strength, or courage, or even be linked to the sense of moral worth a person possessed in the eyes of the society to which he belonged, and therefore meant that person had a right to respect.[58] Having conquered India and established "honorable" rule, Anglo-Indians felt entitled to a claim of respect by Indians, but occasional reminders of this power were at times necessary. In this sense honor was a contract, and Anglo-Indians demanded that Indians display deference to the more "honorable race," who could appreciate their freedom and power all the more, since they fully realized what they were withholding from Indians. All these words, however, aimed at a common conception of the honorable rule of the subcontinent, and honor constituted not merely one word, but an embedded vocabulary of ideas that co-opted these words into system of signs that signified the continuing good intentions of imperialists.

If defining these terms is slippery, imperial society has also been described as being aristocratic, chivalrous, bourgeois, or respectable, and while all these terms have merit, in British India after 1857 such terms were more closely associated with masculine honor than with anything else. Honor (and its close synonyms) therefore provided cohesiveness for a compressed society bent on maintaining its dominance, as well as its internal order and rigid race discipline that kept Anglo-Indians from "going native." In this sense, Bertram Wyatt-Brown (writing about the American South, another society obsessed with maintaining race prestige and making it moral) has described honor as resting in the evaluation of the public and consisting of three main components, all connected. First, honor is foremost an "inner conviction of self-worth."[59] Frank Richards came from a working-class family, yet he knew that he was important in India because of his white skin and his role in protecting the Raj. He could not fathom that

another BOR would be executed by an Indian. His claim to honor was also made public through his book, as well as his actions while in India, and this constituted a second component of honor, the "claim of self-assessment before the public."[60] At some point, the internal claim of self-worth had to be brought before the honor group and made legitimate. The third element is the assessment of that claim by the public, meaning that honor was in part reputation and "resides in the individual as his understanding of who he is and where he belongs in the ordered ranks of society."[61] This is where Oakfield stumbled, for he had strayed from the ethos of an East India officer, no matter how ethical he might believe his behavior to be. In an honor/shame society, the conventions of society are crucially important, more so than whether they are right or wrong. The murder of the British soldier was quickly forgotten by Richards and his colleagues, and the outrage is quickly transferred to the violation of custom that occurs when an Indian executes the guilty soldier. Richards is tied to the hierarchy and knows no other good or evil "except that which the collective group designates."[62] In India, Richards demands that his power, honor, and respect be recognized, and he is incensed when these privileges are not followed. The guilty soldier has been shamed by the nature of his execution, and it is not his execution that is questioned, but who performed it, since the soldier's claim of self-worth and racial prestige has gone unrecognized, albeit posthumously. It is also important to note that few of these ideals would have been accorded him while the soldier remained in England. Richards was outraged that the collective honor of the soldiers had been compromised (and by extension, his own), since his inner conviction of self-worth meant little if it could not be validated before the public. Yet he could not revolt against his own government, and because he was a lowly cog in the imperial hierarchy, he could only rail against Curzon in his book, written twenty years after his service in India and Curzon's reign. Curzon, on the other hand, would not have to assert his honor and defend it like Richards, and this paradoxical sentiment lies at the heart of honor, for those whose honor is greatest typically feel least obliged to defend it.[63] Richards's honor is thus somewhat limited, though he can take out any frustrations on his Indian servants, who have little recourse against his brute force, just as the young man mentioned by Orwell feels no guilt in kicking a man twice his age. Curzon's path in India was of course much smoother, and he would never have to worry about asserting his dominance—the Raj made sure of it. At some level, however, the sense of honor for Richards remained intact, notwithstanding the shameful execution of

his brother BOR. If Curzon did not understand how to rule India, he did, and he and the other soldiers ensured that their own claim to prestige would be recognized by their servants. Still, Anglo-Indians of all classes were typically most prickly about their prestige when it was threatened by those outside the honor group, though of course criticism from "real" aristocrats like Curzon (or other reforming viceroys) obviously rankled all Anglo-Indians, and not just soldiers.

Although precisely defining honor can therefore be difficult, honor in the Raj had fairly specific connotations regarding proper and improper behavior. In honor/shame societies, according to Pitt-Rivers, honor works to regulate society through the formal and informal judgments of the group. Honor depends on reputation and stands "as a mediator between individual aspirations and the judgments of society."[64] Honor can be claimed by an individual based on status or rank, and it almost always reflects the values of the honor group, which, as noted, is typically an embedded society surrounded by those who possess no honor, for belonging to an elite means little without such distinctions and without someone nearby living in shame, since those without power rarely possess honor. Some of the constitutive elements of honor in British India therefore rested on the integrity of the family and clearly understood hierarchies of leadership, and in ideas of race, color, gender, physique, and physical skill.[65] These categories will be discussed in detail later, but what I would like to establish in this chapter is the foundation that honor rested upon in British India after 1858. After the Mutiny, honor was not confined to one rank of society, as it was in more "traditional" honor/shame societies like ancient Greece or even England in earlier centuries, when honor was more closely tied to rank, but it was more widely distributed among a ruling class that included men like Frank Richards.

The enduring lesson of the Indian Revolt of 1857–1858 seemed to be that all Anglo-Indians must be prepared to be loyal to each other, which overrode almost all other concerns due to the "volatile" nature of Indians. Other crises like the Ilbert Bill of 1883, which would have allowed Indians to sit on juries and convict Anglo-Indians (subsequently heavily revised, due to a "white mutiny"), and the Amritsar Massacre revealed this preoccupation with race prestige that bonded all Anglo-Indians together, whether they liked each other or not. Still, though the Raj underwent long period of administrative quietude, the flame of revolt was never thought to be entirely snuffed out, and chronic mistrust of Indians meant that eternal vigilance was necessary in almost all facets of imperial life. Small humiliations could quickly escalate into potentially larger problems in the subcontinent, and

honor lost was extremely difficult to recapture. Britons remembered that Rome fell, for example, with the relaxation of Roman discipline and when the "formidable *pilum* which had subdued the world, insensibly dropped from their [Roman] feeble hands."[66] Similarly, the British in India believed that the Raj could be maintained only so long as honor was maintained. White prestige (which itself rested on an ideal of honorable rule brought by Anglo-Indians) therefore demanded that any perceived slight be dealt with quickly and rigorously, since any enfeeblement by Anglo-Indians could cause a corresponding increase in Indian demands for self-rule, or minimally, make them much more intractable.

As noted, Anglo-Indian society was most comfortable in places where their authority, prestige, and honor went largely unchecked—the cantonment, the bungalow, and the club—and most uncomfortable in native bazaars or in any situation or area in which supremacy could not be maintained.[67] Of course this marked a great fear among Anglo-Indians, a fear that there were dark, occult places in India beyond their reach. Prescriptive texts of empire reveal the preoccupation and anxiety over the inability of Anglo-Indians to impose order on parts of the subcontinent, but this anxiety was in part justified by deeming most Indians as belonging to such shameful locations, where the heavy tread of the European had not yet imposed order, and where it had little hope of doing so.[68] In mapping an honorable space for imperial rule, the zones of contact where colonizer and colonized did meet became that much more important and central to Anglo-Indian identity, which had to be construed as being above the masses of India. In affective relations with Indians, in conceptions of imperial space that marked ruler from ruled, and even in its internal divisions, these discourses of honor and shame could be found in most any domain of empire, material or ideological.

Modern Spartans

Imperial society was easily caricatured as being philistine, since there were few symphony concerts and little contemporary art.[69] Artists, philosophers, and intellectuals rarely found a congenial home in the Raj, and its distrust of intellectuals and cultural interlopers was legendary. Instead, the Anglo-Indian "gift" lay in an ability to govern others, which involved following the "pukka sahib code," and since the Anglo-Indian seemed forever to be on stage playing a role, this left little time for more contemplative arts. In honor/shame societies, "the relationship one has with others takes precedence over the

relationship one has with oneself."[70] The smaller the honor group, the more trenchant the criticism of the imperfect imperial replica, and Anglo-Indians were always aware that they performed in front of Indians (as well as Anglo-Indians) who were their audience. The sentiment of honor was lived openly before others, and individual acts and words involved the whole group, so that the "point of honor is the basis of the moral code of an individual who sees himself always through the eyes of others, who has need of others for his existence, because the image he has of himself is indistinguishable from that presented to him by other people."[71]

Kipling was the master in providing this sense of self for the Anglo-Indian, and "In India, where you really see humanity," he wrote, "raw, brown, naked humanity—with nothing between it and the blazing sky, and only the used up overhandled earth underfoot, most folk came back to simpler theories."[72] As Kipling knew, Europeans learned something of themselves in India, usually reverting to "simpler theories" of human existence in interactions with Indians, since imperial life tested one's stamina and endurance almost constantly. There was no official space in this society for hermits or monks cloistered away from the imperial social formation, since almost all Anglo-Indians were, in one sense or another, rulers in a foreign land. Imperial life therefore amounted to a daily drama almost as ritualized as court life in the reign of a Bourbon king, and one in which the naked exercise of power was exercised on a daily basis with Indians and Anglo-Indians as the potential audience, who were both witness and judge of the defining characteristics of the individual.

Examining these displays of power in their nineteenth-century context reveals the beliefs that guided individual and group behavior in the Raj, and a fairly complete picture emerges of the individual and group values that comprised part of the legitimizing ideology of the Raj. As noted, honor was typically more a code than a philosophy, since philosophy did not seem to be a natural attribute of Anglo-Indian society. Like ancient Sparta, the Raj was not noted for its profound thinkers, perhaps because Anglo-Indians could not afford to become a self-reflective society, which might lead to doubt and decay and the questioning of motives for being there. If Spartans were always concerned with helot revolts, Anglo-Indians took a similar tack, and one young civilian wrote that "out here one feels that one lives on the crust over a volcano and regards with distrust anyone who pours water through the cracks, even if it's only for fun, to see what will happen."[73] Because of this constant fear, imperial society saw itself as a society in which actions were simple, direct, and

authoritative, with no place for glib-tongued Athenian outsiders. If living in India was thought to require these traits, India would find its ideal sahibs in army officers, civil servants, and engineers, who often found India to be a fitting imperial landscape upon which to exercise their manly virtues. India therefore did not seem to be a land congenial to speculative philosophy, and although he was well educated, the Anglo-Indian seemed to possess very few ideas, and instead relied on strongly held beliefs. Many spoke of the anti-intellectual tendencies of the Anglo-Indian and his overreliance on his own expert opinion, and too much philosophy, in fact, reminded the Anglo-Indians of many Hindus, too steeped in the mysteries of ancient Indian thought. Although the Raj was notoriously anti-intellectual, the continuing presence of Anglo-Indians had to be justified and made moral using theories adapted on the spot. Intellectually, then, this is where honor made its entrance—in this realm where philosophy ended and the imperial code took over.

More focused on ruling than pondering philosophical abstractions, imperial lives were usually simplified lives, shaped by a coherent vision of one's place in society and the unique traits needed to thrive there. For all the talk of dichotomies of barbarism and civilization in the empire, imperialism closely resembled a barbarian cult—a choice made between mind and instinct.[74] It was the lament of British reformers in India that most civilians thought that "no one but an Englishman can do anything" and that the Indians were "dependent on Englishmen for everything."[75] The imperial ideal was thus typically antitheoretical, and Anglo-Indian society doggedly ignored (if possible) all criticisms, preferring instead to focus on the distant goal of an Indian autonomy impossibly lodged in the future. Those yoked to this imperial ideal usually kept their head down buried in work and rarely questioned the destination, and instead they focused on the direction of India. It was still crucially important to believe in the imperial mission, since doubt led to a crippling loss of imperial faith, yet it was obviously more comforting to deny the ability of India to rule itself than to admit swaraj (self-rule). By thinking of Indians in easy stereotypes as incapable of ruling themselves, Anglo-Indian society found solace in its professed virtues, and as a socially and politically closed society, Anglo-Indians always preferred to fraternize with like-minded people who knew the proper imperial codes and protocols, which reaffirmed their own carefully cultivated values and kept them culturally isolated and stagnant. Again, like the Spartan, late-Victorian Anglo-Indians had a reflexive distrust of new ideas and institutions.

Thus, even though Anglo-Indian society was regulated by notoriously strict protocols, the British coined few explicit ideologies of empire, yet the sense of superiority had historical roots, and its effects could be seen in the noble works of empire and the flowering of British manhood—and womanhood—that the empire seemed to produce. Whenever possible, this sense of superiority was made to appear effortless, like a clock that had been sent out from England that would produce predictable and regular results once set up. For example, G. W. Steevens wrote in *Egypt in 1898* of traveling up the Nile and disembarking along a dusty, ramshackle station to find the "same little subaltern whose cabin" he had shared on his voyage to the East now supervising the "coolies" along the wharf: "The round peg dropped straight into the round hole; he [the subaltern] walked and watched and gave his orders, energetic, ready, and resourceful, with no theory, but any amount of practice—a pocket edition of the British Empire."[76] Wherever the Englishman planted his foot, orders were issued, chaos was tamed, and a higher form of civilization was thought to emerge. This is what honorable races did. In British India, colonial administrators were praised for their impartial decisions based on solid interpretation of British laws and understanding of local custom. Businessmen were lauded for their methods and ability to exploit local resources for the greatest profit, and the military ensured that justice could be backed with force and the businessman would have his profits protected. Like all societies, but especially those embedded and surrounded by potentially hostile people, it was difficult for Anglo-Indians to imagine India run without them, and their continuing success with such small numbers only confirmed this sense of superiority. Burdensome theories were for other races; the British gift was for ruling other people honorably.

Honor also defined gentlemanly conduct, and the gentlemanly mode was the dominant model for the ICS and other bureaucracies staffed by Anglo-Indians.[77] Fair play, justice, loyalty, a dignified demeanor, status, and chivalry were the Anglo-Indians' ideals. Moreover, they believed that they had chosen their conduct, not because it was enforced upon them, but through their own free will and without servility. Conformity to a code, which might in other circumstances limit one's honor, could be made legitimate if the code increased one's sense of moral purpose. Their sense of honor led to increased power, but the power was usually thought to be wielded honorably, and thus the circle of logic was complete. The Anglo-Indian was morally superior, he thought, to those who surrounded him, and this was the basis of his rule. He ruled India, but in ruling, he served, though

he was not servile. Especially in the ICS, the most honored group in the Anglo-Indian hierarchy, honor increased because of their fairness and their lack of exploitation of India, unlike "teak-wallahs," or those involved in trade. Atop the imperial hierarchy, Viceroy Curzon, echoing this Kiplingesque mantra of rule, said in a speech that he regarded India as not only "the land of romance, but of obligation. India to me is 'Duty' written in five letters instead of four. All the servants of Government, European or native, are also the servants of duty. The viceroy himself is the slave of duty as well as its captain."[78] In this sense, the nature of honor imposes duties rather than bestows privileges. Anglo-Indian administrators imagined themselves as honor bound to rule India, and this model of gentlemanly rule, in which "good form" was the motto and creed, those who fell short were those who lacked a gentlemanly demeanor and temper. Fortified by his schooling and his traditions, the ICS officer's courage sprang from his masculine identity, and as a ruler—often surrounded by teeming numbers of Indians—he was often alone and unarmed, yet his façade was that of sangfroid and imperturbability, and in this he differed from his Indian subjects, who were almost universally portrayed as volatile and overly emotional. Ideally, the Anglo-Indian radiated calmness amidst chaos, and he was the rock upon which the waves and foam of the Indian multitude broke.

Despite Curzon's inclusion of "natives," for most of imperial society honor was defined as belonging primarily to Anglo-Indians, meaning that other groups were safely debarred from claiming a right to rule India (and of questioning the integrity of imperial rule). Thus, the debate over who did and who did not possess honor marked the decisive ideological conflicts of the age, since such disagreements represented the striving of groups to "impose their evaluations of behavior."[79] Many imperial texts were thus a theater in which the British staged the ideal form of imperialism, and Anglo-Indians drew enormous emotive power from images that whitewashed imperial rule and set down appropriate behavior, thereby removing much of the ambivalence of empire. "We do nothing great without the help of warmly colored and clearly defined images which absorb the whole of our attention," wrote Sorel, and such images helped the imperialist in fulfilling his own possibilities.[80] However, meanings were not imparted only by such texts, but also in the rituals of Anglo-Indian society itself, so that honor was both a discourse for producing meaning in India and a deeply felt individual emotion. The Anglo-Indian operated in a land already heavily mythologized, where his actions could one day potentially save a province, like the heroes

of the Mutiny. The texts of empire established theaters of honor in which the intentions of the Raj were rarely questioned. The recurring emphasis on such ideals was in part a rebuttal to the nascent Indian nationalist movement in the latter part of the nineteenth century and to the Indian vernacular press, and such sources represent both the psychic need and the ability to demonstrate the virtues of imperial rule. These were ideals, to be sure, but ideals that found common currency in Anglo-Indian discourse and were often repeated in imperial texts. Philosophy was for other races, especially the "logic-chopping" Bengali babus. Viewed from within the ramparts, honor did not appear to be a philosophy at all—merely a truth that was lived out by men (and to a lesser extent, by women) whose gift was for ruling others. Such ideals could never be fully lived out, but the basic pattern was laid down and expected to be followed, and these ideas justified the continuing presence of the British in India.

Strategies of Exclusion

The debate over the justness of empire was therefore often couched in moral terms in which the honorable race deserved to rule over a people mired in a dishonorable state. In *The History of British India,* James Mill wrote that the degradation a European would feel in being ruled by others was a foreign sentiment to Indians, since "the Hindu, like the Eunuch, excels in the qualities of a slave."[81] Even his more judicious and even-handed son, J. S. Mill, in *On Liberty,* believed that liberty was restricted to mature adults and had no application in backward societies, although "imperial" liberalism, according to J. S. Mill, could rectify the "deficiencies of the past for societies that have been stunted through history."[82] In *Considerations on Representative Government,* the liberal J. S. Mill considered what circumstances made a people unfit for democracy. Those who would not fight for liberty or would give up their liberty to a "great man" required a more "despotic" regime to govern them. The "Hindoo," Mill wrote, was "more likely to shelter a criminal than apprehend him."[83] Barriers to democracy were not easily hurdled, especially by a people inured to suffering and unlikely to give up provincialism and village life and fashion for themselves a true nation-state. The question, naturally, became one of whether Indians could ever rise above this condition, and although some liberal reformers believed that Indians could reform themselves, the latter half of the nineteenth century seemed to confirm that India would continue to need the firm hand of the British for self-rule to ever become a

reality. In 1885, James Grant-Duff drafted a memorandum for the new viceroy, Lord Dufferin, that laid down these two contradictory principles. Duff described "one school" that sought to educate the natives to govern themselves," but also another that decreed that "you must act as if Great Britain were to govern India for all time, doing nothing which in your judgment has any tendency to undermine the foundation of British power."[84] Duff went on to assert that the liberal ideal of self-government for Indians was illusory and dangerous, and that the British role was to "create and uphold an enlightened and beneficent despotism." The only way to uphold any liberal ideal, of course, was through authoritarian government, since the British could not allow power to pass out of their hands.[85] By conceiving of themselves as the morally superior class and the only ones capable of transforming India, Anglo-Indians identified themselves as virtuous, and their jobs in India were conceived as noble enterprises for which they were rarely rewarded, at least in the usual perquisites of power—wealth. Anglo-Indians in the ICS, not without merit, thought of themselves as powerful men with the ability to dispense justice, collect taxes, keep the peace, and adjudicate a variety of disputes, while simultaneously conceiving of most Indians as thoroughly conservative and lacking in the ability to rule over others. While this hardened judgment of Indian customs had not always been the predominant view, late Victorian British authors increasingly sought to justify the empire by resorting to such analogies and the nobility of their task, which "seemed to throw a moral grandeur over their lives that might otherwise have been commonplace and even ignoble in their dullness."[86] Anglo-Indian society was notorious for seeing issues in simplified form, especially since narratives of power "lose their effectiveness in proportion to how complex they become."[87] Even though honor was therefore a complex concept that had many manifestations, Anglo-Indians tended to believe in the simple story of empire in which India would continue to need British rule indefinitely, since teaching "honor" to a race was difficult, if not impossible, especially when ideas about honor were so closely tied to skin color. In Kipling's "The Head of the District," for example, the pretensions of a Bengali babu to rule a district are mocked, since he lacks the resolve to stare down the "hard men of a martial tribe," and he pays for his cowardice with his life. The babu might be filled with knowledge of English customs and sports, but his "extraordinary effeminacy made it unnecessary to treat his political declamations."[88] Only the Englishman, possessor of manly self-control, could "legitimately rule the peoples of India."[89]

Anglo-Indians therefore needed to justify autocratic rule, which seemingly contradicted the constitutional rights embedded into English politics. How could a "liberal democracy assert a claim to imperial dominion based on conquest?"[90] Anglo-Indians resolved this contradiction, as seen in the texts of the era, by denying the Indians any capacity for self-rule and generally asserting the inferior status of Indian society. Resolving this paradox rested on claims, made repeatedly and in various ways, of British superiority and Indian inferiority. Weakness was the "hallmark of an inferior race," and Victorians, "with their emphasis on physical strength and martial prowess, [were] not inclined to consider a propensity to be conquered only a minor flaw."[91] During the late nineteenth century, a common view held that inferior societies produced inferior products (not to mention people) that could not compete in the epic Darwinian struggle for mastery over nature, society, and industry. The best-organized societies naturally deserved to be at the top of the food chain. This dominance was brazenly asserted, and many of the justifications of empire likewise confidently avowed this right to rule over "primitive" peoples who did not know how to best order their society. Defined this way, honor belonged almost exclusively to Anglo-Indians.

As an example, Major-General Lionel (the original of Kipling's "Stalky"), in a paper he read to the Kipling Society in 1933, articulated the ideal Indian, at least according to him. Noting that the Raj passed laws aimed at the betterment of life, Dunsterville pointed out that "they don't thank us for it." What the Indian truly wanted, according to the general, was to be governed, and he continued by describing a fictional dialogue with his "ideal" Indian: "Let me [the Indian] understand that you really do rule me, that your orders are orders, that you mean what you say, and that you mean to be obeyed, and let me get on with my farming. 'Constitution' is a word I cannot pronounce and I shall never know what it means, so please don't worry me about it any more."[92] Ideally for Anglo-Indians, Indian contentment meant the freedom to continue farming without intrusive interruption, and the Raj, first and foremost, claimed to protect these peasants from exploitation from other Indians and from the misrule or meddling of previous governments, even if it was the rule of the East India Company. Dunsterville went on to claim that though the Raj benefited the empire commercially, the officers of the Raj, "both Civil and Military, have reaped nothing, and have desired to reap nothing, of these benefits. I claim for them the honor of working for the love of the work and of the people among whom their lot is cast."[93] Like a shade plant, the Indian could ostensibly only

thrive under the long shadow of a bigger and more powerful specimen, yet if imperialism represented an unequal relationship in power, the Anglo-Indian comforted himself that he loved Indians more than they loved him back, much like a parent with a stubborn child.

Though many early modern writers spoke of honor as a universal, in practice honor was necessarily limited and exclusive to the men who preserved the laws and liberties of the nation. Honor could only be reconciled with public duty by principled men who subordinated their own interests to the larger good by "grafting public principles on private honor."[94] In an imperial context, the "sacrifices" made by late Victorian Anglo-Indians—of their health, their families, and their exile from home—only increased the honor of the rulers who imposed law and order on a people without honor. Once honorable rule had been established in the subcontinent, it was up to current and future Anglo-Indians to preserve it at all costs, since the Raj was foundational to liberty, which did not mean liberty in the more expansive sense of self-rule, but liberty brought about by the benevolent institutions of imperial rule that protected Indians from both internal and external threats (and from themselves). Honor could not be democratic, but it would at least preserve liberty in this more limited sense, and adhering to honor helped to suture over the contradictions of bringing material and moral progress to India without the requisite political advancements associated with English traditions. Liberty, in this stricter sense that it existed at all in India, was preserved through an "aristocracy" who were essential to liberty's preservation and transmission.[95]

To return to Europe, in Burke's formulation, the revolutionaries in France lacked honor because they allowed everyone to have it. Burke, witnessing the dismantling of the system of honor in France, looked with dystopian horror at a world without honored nobility. The "noble pride" and "all the prizes of honor and virtue" had marked the ancient regime of France, but the "present confusion, [the French Revolution], like a palsy, has attacked the fountain of life itself," so that all Frenchmen "actuated by a principle of honor" had been disgraced and degraded, and can "entertain no sensation of life except in a mortified and humiliated indignation."[96] To Burke, honor necessarily implied a hierarchy, and it would be this notion that impelled Anglo-Indian society into its hierarchical ideal, in which honorable men who resembled the French aristocracy of the old regime ruled over the "tallow-chandler" or "hair-dresser." The National Assembly, in Burke's view, pursued self-interest, and being "lost to shame," their government descended quickly into anarchy. Anglo-Indians would

find such hierarchical formulations based on distinctions of honor congenial in the post-1858 era, since the Revolt had almost ushered in Indian (and therefore dishonorable) rule. Anglo-Indians of the late nineteenth century also had to imagine that Indian self-rule was somehow illegitimate. The disorder of the French Revolution had led to tyranny, and Anglo-Indians almost experienced a similar fate to that of the Old Regime during the Mutiny. Latter-day imperialists, however, could speak of the lessons learned from the Mutiny and the better government installed in its aftermath. The French Revolution had led to the tyranny of one man; the Mutiny would instead lead to the thousand little tyrannies of the ICS, but just rule would be preserved.

Burke and the other eighteenth-century moralists agreed that gratitude was the proper response to honorable rule, and ingratitude to benefactors represented a rejection of honorable ideals, meaning that those at the bottom who did not compete for honor could never preserve the liberty of others. Rebellion against such "superior" rule was construed as an unnatural act and a rejection of what Hume called the "gentle dominion over the breasts of men."[97] Such gentle power ideally elicited natural affection from those below, and because the ruler was concerned about his reputation, he moderated his rule accordingly, fearful of opprobrium of his society. In India, this system "worked" in places like the bungalow, where the relationship between ruler and ruled existed as a harmonious ideal in which the Indians willingly obeyed their masters and remained loyally with families through several generations.

Such ideas elevated the prestige that accompanied imperial rule. Indians, for example, were thought to attach supreme importance to the English king or queen, and since the viceroy symbolized this sacred person, "any attempt to lower his office would tend dangerously to weaken the prestige of the Crown, which, to put it on the lowest grounds, is one of the greatest assets of the British Raj."[98] Feudal societies—and India was seen as being a feudal land—still venerated and worshipped power, which was another sign of their immaturity as a civilization. In this sense, India was more typical of societies throughout history that rested on such carefully layered distinctions in society. Democracy was still new, and while nineteenth-century England was moving away from hierarchical distinctions of honor, India in the same century headed astern, back to an "aristocracy" in which prestige became the guest guarantor of liberty. Historically, government by honor had therefore been more common than democracy, and though the Enlightenment, with its

theories of limited government and the perfectibility of mankind, might have "worked" for England, the same happy effects were not possible in India. Honor could rarely be reconciled to the Enlightenment, but it did provide an alternative code for Anglo-Indian society that could never fully embrace the liberating ideas of the Age of Reason, since such dangerous beliefs could lead to Indian self-rule. Operating as a filter, honor thus checked the Enlightenment in India and screened out most Indians as being unworthy of ruling themselves. Honor (ideas of which led inevitably to prestige) became all but a political necessity in India, since without it, the tyranny of the multitude would overwhelm the honorable rule of the Raj (the tyranny of the multitude, as Burke wrote, being a "multiplied tyranny"). Liberty in India therefore vanished without imperial honor to sustain it.

Anglo-Indians were willing to concede that some Indians did possess honor, however limited it may have been, and many such judgments centered on questions of acceptable and desirable masculine behavior, and imperial administrators most admired societies that were deemed to be "honorable" and decent. The "martial" Pathans, for example, possessed honorable men and were therefore respected. The masculine affinities of the two societies were based on similar notions of honor and on a grudging respect for a people who fought and died willingly for a cause (unlike the notorious babu, whose boldness was ostensibly wielded primarily with his pen). Thus, although no single set of ideas underpinned imperial ideology, the logic of honor was in constant circulation, at least as an ideal. In a guidebook for new soldiers to India, the author of *Indian Empire* reminded the troops that many Indians met only a few white men during their lives, and that their opinion of Europeans would be based on a few brief encounters that would form his opinion of the entire race. The author reminded his reader that "every one of us by our conduct can do some little good—or harm—to our national reputation, let us therefore put the honor of Old England above even our personal dignity."[99] This was a reminder that British troops needed reminding that their "personal dignity" might suffer at times from Indians, and that since soldiers were considered likely not to take such provocations lightly, the needs of empire at times overrode the reflexive honor of the soldier, whose unwillingness to take insults might escalate into larger confrontation between the races. The collective honor of the race had to be triumphant over the individual needs of the troops, who shared with the Pathan a hair-trigger temper that could get them into trouble at the slightest provocation.

Honor, then, could be taken too far. The weakness of the Pathans (and, at times, that of the British soldiers and other so-called martial races who still followed a more medieval and reflexive honor) was their lack of restraint. If societies focused all their energy on individual honor and neglected the development of governmental institutions, they failed to develop what J. S. Mill considered to be the "first lesson of civilization, that of obedience."[100] In a state of constant war, either with nature or with others, such societies were kept from developing the habits that characterized the civilizing process, and any leader, or group of leaders, from within that society would prove incapable of developing democratic institutions, due to the "turbulent insubordination" of its peoples. Conditioned only to follow military leaders (or at times prophets), this type of society marked time and failed to develop, in the sense that Victorians considered to be "real" progress. The potential disorder of "knightly honor" would have to be contained by nineteenth-century ideas of "civic honor" (or gentlemanly honor) that seemed to mark the apotheosis of imperial rule in India.

In Anglo-Indian society, great emphasis was placed on the need for conformity and gentlemanly conduct, and the effective administration of India required men of great moral character, expressed in terms of gentlemanly (or civilized) honor. In another context, Uday Mehta has described such tactics as strategies of exclusion. The relative inability of Indians and Eurasians to become "honorable gentlemen" marked them as incapable of mastering the noble art of government, and the two dominant stereotypes of Indian men—warlike or effeminate—both implied that Indians lacked gentlemanly honor. If Muslims were violent, despotic, and masculine, Hindus were indolent, passive, and effeminate: "One fought by the sword, the other by cunning and litigation."[101] Neither could represent all of India, however, since each had flawed conceptions of honor. The Muslims' primal (or reflexive) honor and overdeveloped masculinity spilled too easily into blood feuds, marking them as unfit for bringing progress and civilization to the subcontinent—the "martial races" simply lacked the gentlemanly code needed for just and progressive rule. For the babu, on the other hand, an underdeveloped sense of honor and flawed perceptions of prestige caused his class to prize intellectual achievements and verbosity over the simple code of ruling others fairly.

Such beliefs were all too clearly revealed under times of duress, like the Ilbert Bill, which would have allowed Indians to judge Europeans in courts of law in the *moffusil*. The bill was ultimately stripped of its intent, provoking a furor among those Anglo-Indians

most preoccupied with maintaining their cultural and political power. The Ilbert Bill revealed that rational explanations were typically less important than explicit rituals that confirmed the shared values and common principles that upheld Anglo-Indian society. The challenge of the bill, as Sinha points out, "had less to do with the Bill itself as with the general challenge it posed to the principle of Anglo-Indian racial exclusivity in India."[102] Fitzjames Stephen had clearly articulated a vision of the Raj based on conquest and not the consent of the governed. Yet many Anglo-Indians, according to Sinha, were more disingenuous in their defense of the Raj, preferring to shift the debate from a straightforward defense of racial privilege to "a question of the fitness of native civil servants."[103] Sinha aptly describes the threats to colonial masculinity in the Ilbert furor, yet ideas of honor were never far below the surface in this debate. The Ilbert Bill would have allowed Indians to sit in judgment of Europeans, an intolerable situation to many Anglo-Indians, since "when shame was imposed by others, honor was stripped away."[104] Such ideas led in turn to the guides and manuals of empire in which dominance was based on Anglo-Indian cultural and political superiority, revealing the reflexive fear Anglo-Indians had of being judged by Indians. Most simply, to be dominant, Anglo-Indians had to dominate. Imperial texts—often laboriously—spread a powerful message of supremacy that had to be carefully sustained through hard work, yet made to appear almost effortless and natural, as the birthright of an imperial race. Since the Raj possessed "dominance without hegemony," the resort to honor in part disguised the true weakness of the Raj. Rule by honor, in fact, is usually associated with government where the power of that government is relatively weak. Instead, authority flawed from Anglo-Indians men (and women), whose judgments could not be taken as arbitrary, but had to be carefully qualified as constituting the moral power of the dominant race.[105]

Honor in Anglo-Indian society was therefore not simply an ethereal ideal but was instead acted and reenacted in everyday life, since the "outward presentation of self in a highly competitive status system are [honor's] constitutive features."[106] Honor, for Anglo-Indian society, was derived from a specific set of cultural norms and social practices and as a cluster of ethical rules that was "most readily found in societies of small communities, by which judgments of behavior [were] ratified by community consensus.[107] Like many other ideals thought to be associated with a particular race, honor was riddled with "hierarchical and exclusionary" terms that were "far from abstract and universal."[108] Pitt-Rivers has described how honor

circulates in such a group, in which honor and shame are the constant preoccupation of individuals in small scale, exclusive societies where face-to-face personal (as opposed to anonymous) relations are of paramount importance and "where the social personality of the actor is as significant as his office."[109] Inequality was fundamental to such distinctions between honorable and dishonorable behavior. Anglo-Indians never had to look too far in India to find someone living in a shameful or subservient state, given that most Indians theoretically stood outside a moral code built on honor, or they subscribed to a code of honor that was hopelessly and irredeemably flawed. Anglo-Indian honor therefore depended upon the degradation of the Indian, and the Anglo-Indian also lost no prestige within his own group by treating most Indians rudely, since one could not debase the already debased—those who could not claim honor could not be humiliated.

In fact, Anglo-Indians prided themselves on their restraint, because of the many imperial temptations India offered. The policing of boundaries was largely an informal system but nonetheless rigidly maintained by convention and custom. Being supposedly surrounded by darkness, priestcraft, and superstition meant that Anglo-Indian civilization had to demonstrate its innate superiority forcefully and publicly. Behavior that in England could be overlooked might have potentially disastrous consequences in India, and dignity and prestige were cultivated whenever possible. A society besieged by the "threats" that India represented sought comfort and safety in rigid protocols. Anxiety over status and the need to maintain "face" was an effect of such fears, since such anxiety status seemed to make Anglo-Indians cling that much more forcefully to their carefully cultivated sense of honor. Orwell captures this brilliantly in his essay, "Shooting an Elephant": "He wears a mask, and his face grows to fit it." Orwell must also shoot the elephant against his will, since the honor of the empire, his own honor, and that of whites in general became achingly apparent (to Orwell) as soon as he picked up the gun. The sahib with a gun must behave in harmony with all the imperial values. He must not run and he must not shirk his duty to shoot the elephant.

Honor rested on a number of such social prescriptions that were all but impossible for Indians (or Eurasians) to navigate, and non-Europeans usually revealed themselves as inferior through the mangling of some such protocol. One Eurasian, an assistant surgeon, was recognized as being extremely competent, but was accused by a superior of not using a pocket handkerchief when sitting at tea with a major. The surgeon's acceptance among Anglo-Indian

society was not a question of his skill but having his claim as a gentleman recognized by other Anglo-Indians. For Eurasians in general, "few doubted their technical ability, but 'Were they gentlemen?'"[110] Eurasians, like Indians, were seen as having book knowledge but were unable to navigate the protocols of the superior society. More damning still, they knew these protocols second hand, partially and imperfectly.[111] Certainly there were exceptions to this harsh view, but those who were considered to be most like the Anglo-Indians were inevitably those with a similar disposition and "force of character," and such honorable Indian gentleman remained the exception to the rule.[112] These strategies of exclusion reassured Anglo-Indians that no matter how technically proficient an Indian might become, he could stilled be marked as inferior, even if his knowledge or technique in a specific field outshone that of an Anglo-Indian.

Sexual Honor

Though many of these imperial mentalities solidified in the late Victorian era, Anglo-Indians were especially prickly in questions of sexual honor, especially that of women. In the 1700s, Anglo-Indian society had been somewhat more fluid and open, yet what constituted misrule of the land, even if that rule was English, was expressed in terms of sexual honor by one of the great critics of the East India Company, Edmund Burke. Burke couched his criticism of the first governor-general of India, Warren Hastings, in this favored idiom of those who are honor's disciples, and in his impeachment trial of Hastings in 1787, Burke linked the mistreatment of Indian women by the governor-general with disorderly rule in the subcontinent. This line of attack would eventually become a favored tactic of Anglo-Indians, who, with increasing ferocity in the latter years of the Raj, depicted Indians as mistreating their wives and daughters. But in the eighteenth century, Burke repeatedly charged Hastings with "destroying the honor of the whole female race" in India and of violating the "respect paid there to the female sex." Burke, revealing his usual obsession with status, was most upset that Hastings had "undone women of the first rank."[113] In speeches, Burke spoke so often of nude Indian women that it became a great joke in the House of Lords, but he pressed on, describing in obsessive detail the humiliation of Indian women, stripped bare before Indian peasants by agents of the East India Company. Burke, it should be pointed out, was apparently envious of Hastings's more unrestrained sexuality, and he continually contrasted his own sexual restraint with Hastings's

perceived licentiousness. Yet Burke's vision for "honorable" rule in India appeared to have triumphed by the late 1800s, when Britons began to emphasize their own "manly" restraint, and by that time it would be difficult to imagine a prominent Anglo-Indian being denounced in public or impeached for mistreating Indian women, since the honor code bound them to safeguard the women under their "protection."

More generally, for the purposes of this work, those who defend the sexual honor of women, either in word or in deed, typically feel ennobled in the process, and appeals to honor represent age-old methods of seizing the moral high ground and casting one's opponents as being either incapable or unwilling to protect women, as Burke no doubt recognized. This mentality would also lead late Victorian Anglo-Indians to expand their circle of protection from women to all of India, and the "brightest jewel" would always be jealously protected from those nations like Russia who would ostensibly attempt to take her by force. Russia only had to feign interest in northern India to set the Raj into paroxysm of rage and denunciations of the malign intent of the czars, and honor typically linked the ability to protect one's women to an ability to protect one's territory. To watch over India and the women who lived there required the Anglo-Indian male to be fit and alert to all threats, and if the highest ideals of imperialism often found articulation in the Anglo-Saxon male, who generally believed in his intellectual and physical prowess over Indian males, then, as a corollary, effete males could never run an empire, since they would prove incapable of protecting women.

The logic of masculinity is therefore one of the most revealing of imperial ideologies, but it has not been systematically linked to sexual honor. The personal sense of "escalation dominance" of the Anglo-Indian sprang from his sense of masculine self-confidence, which was itself rooted in a number of English institutions and racial prescriptions. Honor therefore accrued to those most responsible for bringing India out of its medieval past—the Raj run by the Anglo-Indian male—which meant that honor possessed a core value of masculine power. Yet this power could be distributed to Anglo-Indian males and females alike, since the memsahibs took a very active role in running a household in India.[114] Although the ICS never had any female members, the memsahibs were still seen as being integral to the maintenance of rule, though on a somewhat lower plane, making them sexually subordinate in imperial society but racially dominant in India. Women in British India, especially those who came from middle-class homes, had far more power than women back home,

if power is measured as the ability to give commands to others. Yet their roles there were curiously circumscribed, since they were limited in their behavior in ways that were allowed in England, and if the male retained his honor by protecting the women in his family from sexual threats, the women retained their honor more through sexual purity. However, few solid divisions existed between public and private spheres in the Raj, and women were charged with upholding the dignity and prestige of imperial rule, meaning that their actions had to conform to imperial ideals as closely as possible.

Women also added to the luster of imperial rule by their sacrifices made in the name of empire. Though they never held positions in the ICS, they were still intimately connected to the system of honor, and their high losses because of health problems were prized by Anglo-Indians. Richard Cust, whose wife followed him to India in the 1850s, composed the following epitaph for his wife after her early death:

> For in that Orient land, whose annals show
> The price paid yearly of domestic woe;
> Where many a blooming wife and mother lie
> Who left their native country but to die.[115]

Duty and sacrifice were not the sole preserve of the imperial male, and though women never held official positions of power, they were still expected to run the bungalow efficiently and deal with the Indian servants, who were overwhelmingly male. The subordination of the memsahib appears in a quite different light when one considers the amount of power she wielded in the household, especially since the link between running the bungalow and running an empire was commonly made.[116]

These gendered relations of imperialism have been closely examined by Mrinalini Sinha, Mary Procida, and Ann Stoler, and all have shown that ideas about gender (and race and class) were unstable entities built upon shifting relationships between colonizer and colonized, as well as relations within the imperial community. Sinha's work is central to understanding the explicit constructions of gender in the Raj, as is the work of Procida. Stoler, similarly, has noted that colonialism was more than the importation of "middle-class sensibilities to the colonies"; and instead colonialism shaped some ideas about class, often to the detriment of Indians, poor whites, and Eurasians.[117] More flexible than class and race, gender roles were also potentially more unstable, especially since the memsahib could easily bring

dishonor upon her family or husband by improper sexual liaisons with Indians. Even Viceroy Curzon, who sought to punish Anglo-Indians who casually beat Indians, did not like Indian men marrying white women, and he kept one Indian prince from attending Queen Victoria's funeral lest the prince find an English woman to marry. Curzon, when asked why he treated Indian princes like boys, responded that "this [boys] is precisely what they are."[118] Anglo-Indians had to preserve their authority through proper masculine/feminine behavior that was appropriate for those of a ruling race, and whose visible hierarchy ensured the just governance of the Raj. Sexual honor was therefore most closely associated with the noble and virtuous memsahib, and just as Caesar reputedly said that his wife must be beyond suspicion when divorcing her, the Anglo-Indian male, so intimately acquainted with the classical world, understood that the honor of the country began with the protection of his family and the sexual honor of the women under his roof. For all the power of white women in India, their sexual honor had to be preserved and their reputation pure, unless perhaps they were taking leave in one of the hill stations, where protocols were certainly more lax.

In England (the most remote hill station of them all), as news poured in of the massacres of women and children at Meerut, Delhi, and Cawnpore during the Mutiny, Charles Dickens wrote, "I wish I were commander-in-chief in India. I should do my utmost to exterminate the race upon whom the stain of the late cruelties rested."[119] Dickens, a domestic defender of the oppressed, obsessed over exactions of revenge upon an alien and dishonorable race. Still, one anonymous poet warned the British soldier not to embrace his enemies' tactics:

> Upon the wretched slave their vengeance feasts;
> There stop; let not his guilt their manhood stain,
> But spare the Indian mother and her child.[120]

The Raj would see itself as a protector of Indian woman and children, but the memsahib was inviolate and sacrosanct in imperial society. The furor over the Indian Revolt eventually subsided in England, but tales of rape and the violation of women would not die out in India, or with those concerned with Indian matters. Lord Malmesbury told the Lords of Parliament in 1858 that, contrary to the inquiries admitting that rape and torture had not been the prelude to the murder of European women, he had private evidence that women had been raped and tortured, but he refused to give the

source of his evidence.[121] These rape narratives quickly developed into cautionary tales, making the fears of Anglo-Indians concrete. Some eighty novels between 1857 and 1947 dealt with the Revolt, and the legends of rape and of fates worse than death were a constant theme in them.[122] The "fate worse than death" tellingly reveals the discourse of honor and shame being enacted, and another Anglo-Indian of the era wrote that forty-eight English women and girls were raped in Delhi and exposed "naked in the streets, and left to die."[123] For this imperial myth to have its full effect, it was not enough to merely have the memsahibs killed—they had to be exposed and left "naked in the streets," as a rebuke to the men who failed to protect them. A society that had been through the Mutiny did not fear death as much as it feared the loss of power and control that the Mutiny represented, and ultimately, the shame to sahibs of their wives and daughters being raped. This vision haunted the colonial male, for his reputation in part depended on his ability to keep white women sexually unavailable to "lascivious" Indian men, and it also required that they see Indians as a continual sexual threat to European women. The mutiny had, at least, produced heroes and martyrs for empire, men like John Lawrence or the victims of Kanpur, respectively, but rape represented this loss of control most graphically, and in a manner that made such deaths dishonorable. After 1857, Anglo-Indians routinely returned to the trope of shame, and during the "white mutiny" over the Ilbert Bill, the letters of Flora MacDonald described the dread of a young, maidenly memsahib being dragged before an Indian judge, while the audience of Indians "laugh and jeer." The girl endures an "agony of shame" and emerges with a "blighted name. . . . It cannot be that Englishmen renowned for chivalry are willing to subject even the humblest of their countrywomen to dishonor."[124]

In virtually all aspects of rule, then, the effect of the Mutiny on the Victorian mind was long lasting and powerful, and the successful protection of the memsahib enhanced the honor of the Raj. Because of this, Victorian reformers did not want any nude pictures of English women circulating in India since they feared such images "would set off another Mutiny in which all the white women would be ravaged."[125] And in the 1930s, some seventy years after the Revolt, no films were made about the Indian Mutiny because of the feared effect on Indian audiences, and these fears were seen in gendered terms. As Claude Brown obsessively cautioned, the idea of "white women posing, even in photos, before colored men is extremely repugnant to all right thinking people of whatever nationality. It is particularly objectionable in India, where the white race rules more by example than

by anything else."[126] These gender politics also exalted the role of the Anglo-Indian male, since he ideally controlled Anglo-Indian women and India, and W. O. Horne, a member of the ICS, wrote that white men had to make white women "aware of their special responsibility for upholding the prestige of the white race in India."[127] Horne believed that all Anglo-Indians belonged to the "ruling race . . . ruling principally by prestige and it is up to us and to our women to do nothing to lower that prestige. The women may not understand but their men ought to."[128] The position of white women in India, which depended on the ability of white men to protect her, distinguished civilization from barbarity and allowed Anglo-Indian men to believe that their motives were imbued with a nobility of purpose. After the "rape" of white women during the Mutiny, Anglo-Indian men were determined that such outrages would never be repeated, and the chief aim of such ideas of honor was to "protect the individual, family, group, or race from the greatest dread that its adherents could imagine."[129] After a mutiny, the "greatest dread" to Anglo-Indians was the threat to white women that Indian rule represented, which justified the denial of equal rights to Indians. Moreover, by framing the question as one of protection for English women, honor could be reconciled with the occasional brutality perpetrated on Indians, without Anglo-Indians suffering any loss to their own sense of honor and dignity.

Imperial masculinity, then, much like the empire, always needed careful cultivation, and MacDonald's letter mentioned above appealed to the perceived chivalry of Anglo-Indian males and their preoccupation with reputation, and imperialists typically spoke of the "right to rule in gendered terms, [so that] much of the foundational ideology of the Raj rested on masculine assumptions about Indian men, and the treatment of women."[130] Noble and virtuous women deserved to be protected, and this view could easily be contrasted with the debased or almost invisible position of women in Indian society. Anglo-Indians saw mistreatment of Indian women by Indian men as symptomatic of a flawed culture, blithely ignoring the treatment of women back home in England. In fact, the mistreatment of "native" women justified the need for colonial authority, since Anglo-Indians claimed that colonial peoples "sold their girl children into prostitution or domestic servitude, or married them off at alarmingly young ages without a qualm."[131] Socially, British men never cared for functions in which their wives attended mixed affairs of Indian and Britons, since many Indian women remained in purdah, sequestered from the public and all but invisible to

males outside their own family. Anglo-Indian society preferred their women to be above political affrays, but they argued that at least the memsahib was visible and involved in social work or other imperial endeavors, thus making a contribution in imperial India. If the Indian woman was modest, she apparently was allowed to face few temptations, compared with the more open area of social relationships of the memsahib. Though social intercourse occurred between Anglo-Indian women and Indian men at mixed events, Anglo-Indian men rarely if ever met the wives of Indian men, and imperial society retaliated against this disparity by decrying the unacceptable methods used by Indian men to subject Indian women.

Both societies therefore attempted to maintain the purity of their women but did so in very different ways. In Kipling's story "Beyond the Pale," a European man named Trejago has an affair with Bisesa, an Indian girl already widowed at fifteen. Bisesa is kept in isolation by her uncle, but her house overlooks a dark alley, into which Trejago stumbles one day. After an exchange of love notes, which have to be deciphered by Trejago, demonstrating his perhaps too-rich knowledge of things Oriental, the two begin the affair but are eventually found out. Trejago arrives one day for an assignation, only to find his Bisesa holding out her arms in the moonlight, with both hands cut off at the wrists. Trejago is assaulted by the men of Bisesa's family and stabbed, appropriately, in the groin, an injury he carries with him for the rest of his life. Still, he returns to respectable Anglo-Indian society after the incident, and there is "nothing peculiar about him, except a slight stiffness, caused by a riding-strain, in the right leg." For all the emphasis from both societies in maintaining the sexual purity of women, there were dishonorable ways of enforcing such purity. Because of their prestige, however, Anglo-Indians typically had much further to fall, and Trejago has dabbled with sexual dishonor and been damaged, though he returns to the dull world of imperial society. An Anglo-Indian woman, of course, could fall even further, especially since she was much more visible than her Indian counterpart.

The policing of collective honor for Anglo-Indian society was therefore fundamental in the maintenance of the Raj, since dishonored Anglo-Indians lessened the prestige of the ruling elite and threatened the sanctity of the Raj.[132] In all societies that have developed strong schemes of honor, the preservation of it is (ironically) always fragile and jealously guarded. Once lost, it is all but impossible to regain. Like a woman's virtue, when honor "fell," it could not be restored, although extreme measures could be attempted to avenge its loss, which also justified extreme violence against those who

had dishonored the ruling race and their women. Still, though the Mutiny was rife with stories of rape, these actions could be charged to the indolence and the perceived flaws that characterized East India Company rule. The mantra repeated in post-Mutiny Anglo-Indian society was "never again," meaning that imperial society would never again be subject to such terror or the mistreatment of their women. In 1906 Sir Bampfylde Fuller, the Irish lieutenant-governor of East Bengal, was determined to show Bengalis that the Raj would punish protestors, and he linked political protests to the status of the memsahib and the ability to protect her from attacks upon her dignity. Fuller was growing alarmed that the "glory of England is dropping from us. There is no Englishman who should not blush for shame to know that in many places our women cannot venture outside their houses without fear of insult."[133] Such thoughts about the sanctity of Anglo-Indian women would lead to one of the ugliest episodes of violence of the Raj, the Amritsar Massacre of 1919.

Amritsar

In April of 1919, Brigadier-General Reginald ("Rex") Dyer led soldiers of Gurkhas and Sikhs to the Jallianwallah Bagh, where a meeting was being held "in defiance of his proclamation banning such meetings."[134] Without warning (Dyer believed his earlier proclamation was warning enough), the soldiers opened fire, killing hundreds of Indians. Even Winston Churchill, the secretary of state for war at the time, was incensed, calling it an episode "without precedent or parallel in the modern history of the British Empire . . . an extraordinary event, a monstrous event, an event which stands in singular and sinister isolation."[135] To Churchill and other of Dyer's critics in England, Amritsar seemed the aberrant actions of a bloodthirsty fool, but to Indians, the massacre marked a decisive shift in Indian opinion against the Raj; Dyer's actions, however, were met with much more approval by Anglo-Indians, and attempts by Churchill and others to deem Amritsar a singular event missed the point entirely, for they misunderstood the code that led Dyer to the massacre. Honor always looked different from the inside than the outside, and those who had internalized its logic justified their actions, especially if violent, by linking their deeds to some higher cause. In fact, Dyer was dubbed the "Savior of the Punjab" by Anglo-Indian society, and in Bengal 6,250 British women petitioned the prime minister, protesting Dyer's treatment in the Commons, and another group of women sought to give the "Savior" a "sword of honor" and expressed their indignation

at their domestic government "pandering to a small band of disloyal agitators whose noisy mouthings the deluded British public are mistaking for the voice of the loyal millions of India."[136] A land of millions of loyal villagers was, of course, the India that most imperialists wanted to see and inhabit, and the discontent and revolt of Amritsar represented a false consciousness that could never be the "real" India that they so desperately wanted to believe in, one that recognized that their prestige was merited.

Yet the harsher realities of Indian life were ignored by most Anglo-Indians. After supporting four years of the war effort, inflation was still affecting India and the monsoon failed in 1918, ushering in a famine. The influenza epidemic of 1919 killed about three million Indians, and new taxes were being levied, in addition to the oppressive Rowlatt Acts that limited the rights of Indians to free speech, with no right of appeal and no jury trial. Indians could now be held for up to a year without charge, and Indian politicians fought a bitter campaign against the Rowlatt Acts, with many demonstrations (in fact the protestors at Amritsar were sparked by the Rowlatt Acts). World War I had increased expectations for Indians, and the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms promised a larger voice for Indians in the Raj, but the Rowlatt Acts undercut the hard-won advances being made toward self-rule. India was unfortunately being rewarded for its loyalty during the war with an increasingly despotic government determined to increase its imperial power. The massacre at Amritsar would, however, smash some of the ethical buttresses of the Raj, revealing the force that Anglo-Indians proved all too willing to use in times of crisis. The Viceroy Chelmsford and the Secretary of State for India Montagu might dream up liberal reforms for the Raj, but Anglo-Indians would once again be at odds with their government, and if Montagu-Chelmsford granted rights to Indians, the Rowlatt Acts took them away, thus revealing the schizophrenic nature of imperial rule, whose rhetoric was that of liberation and freedom and eventual self-rule for Indians even while its acts were more often despotic and tyrannical. Helen Fein, a sociologist, later dubbed the Amritsar massacre "a prototypical instance of a repressive collective punishment practiced by the British in black and Asian colonies."[137] Gandhi incisively noted that Indians had no desire to punish Dyer, but instead wanted to change the system that produced him, for Dyer, to many Anglo-Indians, embodied the ideal type of man. Faced with a revolt, Dyer displayed the fortitude needed to rule in the East, and any aspersion on his perceived honor and power was taken as an assault on the Raj itself. Dyer, then, was "forcibly cast in the role of

his group's protagonist."[138] If he had not opened fire and the town continued to riot, Dyer's actions would have met with censure in imperial society. Dyer's insecurity forced his hand, and the Raj itself appeared to be tottering as well, but Dyer knew that he was "the man on the spot" and expected to live up to the court of public opinion, or he would otherwise be hounded out of Anglo-Indian society as an unworthy protector of imperial security.

The Anglo-Indians, however, believed in their rhetoric, claiming that Dyer's actions were noble and thwarted a repeat of 1857, happily preserving the sanctity of white women in the process. British soldiers believed that Gandhi had sponsored circulars "inciting Indian patriots to murder European men and ravish European women."[139] Though the riots that preceded Amritsar took five European lives (and when Anglo-Indians used the term "massacre," they were referring to these deaths, and not the murder of hundreds of Indians), Dyer himself was most incensed by the attack on the manager of the city Mission School, Miss Sherwood, who was beaten and left for dead but eventually given first aid by Hindu shopkeepers. Dyer, like many other Anglo-Indians, saw himself as a righteous and chivalric defender of imperial womanhood, and, in a later statement, he wrote that "the attempted murder of Miss Sherwood was probably the most dastardly outrage in the whole rebellion."[140] Dyer saw Sherwood lying on a pallet, swathed in bandages after her attack, and his reprisals were committed with Anglo-Indian womanhood in mind, since, as he stated, "we look upon women as sacred, or ought to."[141] Another European woman, Mrs. Easdon, the doctor in charge of the Zenana Hospital, was also sought out by the mob but managed to hide in the hospital with the help of her *chaprasi* (messenger).[142] In the aftermath of the massacre of Indians, Dyer erected a whipping post in the narrow alley where Miss Sherwood had been dragged from her bicycle and beaten. Such punishments were often preferred for Indians since there could be little chance of appeal—the punishment was inflicted immediately and considered exemplary to other Indians, and as noted earlier, honor demands swift justice, for it cannot wait too long to be asserted. Dyer also enacted the infamous "crawling order," which required Indians to crawl by the location of Sherwood's assault. This was clearly meant to shame Indians for their insubordination. Other collective punishments were likewise designed to humiliate Indians, and in Lahore, students were expelled from college, not on the basis of their status as rioters, but by quota. Some peasants were forbidden from harvesting their crops, and the RAF was even brought in for aerial bombing.

One captain made Indians "skip, recite poems and touch the ground with their noses." He also made all males perform the work of sweepers (untouchables), thereby making Hindus break caste tradition. He issued another order that decreed:

> Whereas it has come to my notice that certain inhabitants of the Gujranwalah District are habitually exhibiting a lack of respect for gazetted or commissioned European Civil and Military Officers of His Majesty's Service, thereby failing to maintain the dignity of that Government: I hereby order that the inhabitants of the Gujranwala District shall accord to all such offices, whenever met, the salutation usually accorded to Indian gentlemen of high social position in accordance with the customs of India. That is to say, persons riding on animals or on or in wheeled conveyances will alight, persons carrying opened and raised umbrellas shall lower them, and all persons shall salute or "salaam" with the hand.[143]

As demonstrated in the captain's decree based on "the customs of India," Anglo-Indians could (and would) defend their actions as being consistent with Indian traditions, making the defense of prestige somehow "typical" in India and no cause for complaint from Indians.

Anglo-Indians who strayed from the imperial herd in this time of crisis likely faced ostracism for their actions. Malcolm Darling, then a magistrate in Lahore, condemned Dyer at his club, and fellow members suggested he should be court-martialed for speaking out against Dyer.[144] In Paul Scott's *The Day of the Scorpion,* the memsahib Mabel Layton has lost two husbands in India and is having second thoughts about the Raj, becoming increasingly sympathetic to Indians (and of course increasingly ostracized by Anglo-Indians). To Layton, it was not a question of choosing between Dyer and the "bloody browns."

> The choice was made for me when we took the country over and got the idea we did so for its own sake instead of ours. Dyer can look after himself, but according to the rules the browns can't because looking after them is what we get paid for. And if it's really necessary every so often to shoot some of them down like ninepins for their own good the least we can do is admit it, just say Hard Luck to the chap who shoots too many, and see to it that the women and children who lost their menfolk, or the children who lost their parents don't starve.[145]

Amritsar, as the novelist Scott perceived, was no anomaly, and "shooting them for their own good" was a natural by-product of empire. Dyer, as the reluctant disciplinarian, consequently reflected

the norms of imperial society by recoding "European self-interest as self-sacrifice and native insurgency as ingratitude."[146] Dyer, whose paternalism runs through his version of the massacre, even asserted that Indians should thank him for his actions in "saving" India. In Lawrence James's apt description, he was the "bluff, no-nonsense sahib, the epitome of at type which was happiest knocking a frontier into shape. He once told a tribal chief that 'No Englishman ever makes war against women and children.'"[147] He had been called to restore order and admirably performed his duty, shoring up imperial prestige through his actions: "My duty and my military instincts told me to fire," he later claimed.[148] Montagu and Chelmsford debated recalling Dyer, but knew that his removal would be "bitterly resented by all Englishmen in this country [India]."[149] Amritsar was consequently not the actions of a government that spoke of freedom but acted tyrannically. Dyer represented a government that would restore order and contain any threats to itself above any other priority, but it would speak of such unfortunate events as necessary in order to save other Indians. The effect was meant to be salutary, and most Anglo-Indians saw no hypocrisy in Dyer's actions. In other words, honor made Dyer do it, and his actions were overwhelmingly endorsed by Anglo-Indians. Of course, today, Amritsar looks more like what it was—a massacre—but one of the paradoxes of honor is that it can lead to dishonorable behavior, since its brittleness and constant claim to respect led to Dyer gunning down Indians, children included, in the perceived defense of Anglo-Indian women and children.

Dyer's use of violence could therefore only be made moral within this context of honor, and he was clearly not alone in such beliefs. Only within the context of honor and shame could a massacre like Amritsar be lauded and justified as moral, and Dyer spoke of his actions as "my duty—my horrible, dirty duty."[150] When Dyer ordered his troops to open fire, they continued until the crowd dispersed, since the general considered this to be the "least amount of firing which would produce the necessary moral and widespread effect it was my duty to produce. If I was to justify my action."[151] Yet it was not enough to disperse the crowd, for Dyer wanted his actions to have a moral effect, not only on those present, but through the Punjab, since the survivors would spread the message that the Raj could not be take advantage of. Dyer even admitted that he could have dispersed the crowd without firing, but if he had done so, "they would all come back and laughed at me, and I considered I would be making myself a fool."[152] Instigating a massacre in order not to be laughed at seems remote to the modern reader,

but Dyer was merely "articulating the consciousness of a caste."[153] Even the "crawling order," Dyer claimed, was enacted to appeal to Indians' "moral sense" in a way they would "understand." The moral order of the Raj had to be preserved, seemingly at all costs, and its transgression had to be brutally and immediately punished. Though Miss Sherwood was not raped, the assault on her was construed as such, and order had to be restored by humiliating the Indian males who had beaten her. Still, the punishment inflicted on Indians after Amritsar reveals the psychic need, not so much to restore order, but to punish Indians in a way deemed suitable. As during the Mutiny, the charges (or hints) of rape also "provided the necessary pretext for ruthless counterinsurgency measures against natives."[154] When it came to punishment, the law could (and should) be suppressed in order to administer something much more profound and moral—justice. Just as order had to be restored, honor had to be reenthroned as well, and the actions of Dyer and others were meant to do just that. Sherwood later wrote a letter on Dyer's behalf in which she claimed that Dyer "saved India and us from a repetition of the miseries and cruelties of 1857."[155] Dyer meant to bring Indians back into the fold, as wayward schoolboys who needed constant reminders from their masters on acceptable behavior.

Always behind the use of force lay the imperial logic that justified it in the name of law and order, or at least order. Even though the ideal in the ICS was the man who went unarmed, any violence done toward him would be met with swift reprisal, for honor cannot linger or dawdle, as Dyer brutally demonstrated. Anglo-Indians could not bear to be insulted, and honor was asserted in the promptness and strength of the rebuttal to an insult. The Kabyle of North Africa claimed that a good family could "sleep and leave the door open," or that its women could "walk alone, with a golden crown on their head," without anyone dreaming of attacking them.[156] In the Raj, the bungalow and the women found that they were protected by imperial men always on their guard, yet even if they were not there physically, there was someone (or something) there, his honor, which made his family immune from attack. Yet there were none of the clan rivalries found in North Africa in British India, since most Anglo-Indians "belonged" to the imperial family, and Miss Sherwood, a bachelorette, would find her protector and "husband" in Dyer.

Amritsar also returns us to the distinction between Christian virtue and honor. Imperial honor was not necessarily opposed to Christian virtue, but it retained a worldly standard free of too much Christian charity; Dyer's conscience was clean and he could feel no guilt

over his actions. One's conscience, at any rate, pertained to one's relationship with God, being the internal filter that regulated guilt. Conscience leads inevitably to expiation of guilt, but Anglo-Indian apologies were rare. They could rarely be made to feel guilt for their actions, and clinging to honor ensured Anglo-Indians of the nobility of their task, and it silenced the small voices of doubt that surely must have occasionally surfaced. Dyer, though a military man with his own code of honor, was nearly unanimously approved for "saving the Raj." Understanding the system that endorsed his behavior and made it ethical requires understanding more than "character," since Dyer's ideals ostensibly regulated his relationship to other men in ways that character did not.[157] Honor, then, rarely feels guilt, especially in an imperial context. Dyer, reflecting on the massacre of hundreds of Indians at Amritsar, thought he "would be doing a jolly lot of good."[158] He likewise found great and overwhelming support from those long habituated to the realm of honor, like the House of Lords, Kipling (who donated to his fund), and Conservative members of the House of Commons. The House of Lords even passed a motion in support of Dyer, and the fund drive for his retirement quickly raised twenty-six thousand pounds.[159] Dyer later bragged of his "exploits" at Amritsar, pointing out to his brother officers that he had the town at his mercy and wanted to reduce the rebellious city to a "heap of ashes," but took pity on it and refrained.[160] Dyer saw the entire city as harboring and abetting the rioters, and he wanted to punish the city for its actions, especially because Miss Sherwood had been refused entry into an Indian home after she was beaten. In his view, the city had forfeited its honor. In essence, he was punishing the city for insufficient loyalty to the Raj, and the shouts prior to the massacre that "the Raj is at an end" surely rankled and "had" to be punished. In this instance, however, humans were not the only possessors of honor and shame, for an entire city could prove its disloyalty—and thus its lack of honor—by refusing to help a white woman.

Honor typically rests on such formulations and divisions of loyal and disloyal. One had only to criticize the good intentions of the Raj to be cast into the realm of the disloyal, and Anglo-Indians would be at pains to reward the loyal. Even in the ICS, similar protests saw one ICS officer using such evaluations to reward and punish villages. In 1921, the water level of the Godavari River fell rapidly, reducing the area of crop irrigation. The collector in this district, when awarding water rights, gave "preference to villages that had not joined the non-cooperation movement," demonstrating that it paid to be loyal.[161] Amritsar embodied this great fear among imperialists: that

Indians were disloyal. The Indian behavior prized above all others was that of loyalty, as demonstrated by Dyer's insistence on the "moral effect" of his actions. Edward Thompson, writing in 1924, described Anglo-Indians as seeing all relations with their subjects through this metaphor of loyalty. The British assessed the virtues of Indians "as a hunter assesses those of dogs. The great question is, Is an Indian loyal?: Is he true to his salt?" One chaplain, told of the literary merits of Rabindranath Tagore could only ask, "But is he loyal? That was the only point of interest."[162] Sir Richard Temple, writing in *India in 1880,* reassured his readers that "the Natives certainly are anxious to be considered loyal. Nothing wounds and irritates them more than imputation of disloyalty; and nothing gratifies them more than a frank and cordial acknowledgement of their loyalty."[163] For all the social distance and physical distance between the two races, Anglo-Indians preferred to see Indians as inhabiting the same moral system as themselves, only with much lesser status and in an obsequious manner befitting their rank. Tagore, like Orwell, would revert to the language of honor in resigning his knighthood, since those "badges or honor" made their "shame glaring in the incongruous context of humiliation," as he explained to the viceroy.[164] For this reason, Anglo-Indians "saw" India as the land of soldiers, villagers, and servants eager to listen to their betters, and one in which real affection could be shown when a master might sacrifice for the servant, or an officer for his soldier, but there was never any question of equality. In British eyes, Amritsar was therefore the firm hand of the Raj protecting Indians from themselves, and the actions there resembled those of a father inflicting corporal punishment on a child, all the while claiming that it hurt him to do so.

The Darker Side

Every overt display of dominance in British India therefore had to be justified and linked to the sacred cause of empire, and the cult of conduct prevalent in the subcontinent taught Anglo-Indians to find gratification in the rightness of their own actions and not in popularity. After Lord Mayo's assassination in 1872, Fitzjames Stephen described the viceroy's funeral and one Anglo-Indian who shoved any Indian who looked "insolent" or like he was enjoying the funeral:

> When Lord Mayo was stabbed I [Stephen is quoting the Anglo-Indian here] think every man in the country felt as if he had been more or less stabbed himself. . . . There was a dead silence nearly all the way; the

> natives standing or squatting in their apathetic way, and the Europeans as grim as death. All that was to be heard was the rattle of the gun-carriage, and the tramping of the horses, and the minute-gun from the fort and ships. . . . Troops and cannon and gun-carriages seem out of place in England . . . but it is a very different matter here, where everything rests upon military force. The guns and the troops are not only the outward and visible marks of power, but they are the power itself to a great extent, and it is very impressive to see them.[165]

No Englishman, he went on, would ever have a tender or genial feeling toward India, and though the work done there was "great and wonderful, the country itself was hateful." Force always found a justification among Anglo-Indians, for there was seemingly no other way to ensure stability, and blame could usually be put on theories of Indian rebelliousness. Stephen was, as usual, candid here in admitting the true power of the Raj, and even though imperial men ideally radiated restraint, Anglo-Indians rarely hesitated to assert their authority if threatened. Loss of control was associated with the rougher methods of the BORs, or Indian princes, or the Indian police who "softened up" suspected criminals (far away from Anglo-Indian eyes), but if the power to coerce vanished, then so did honor. Anglo-Indians could never entirely distance themselves from such methods, though they tried limiting social contact with the men associated with such methods. Yet, for all the talk of the nobility of the ICS, it fell to the police and to British or Indian soldiers, often using such brutal methods, to keep honor intact and Indians subdued. Frank Richards, in India from 1900 to 1908, wrote that his battalion annually marched through Agra (normally "out of bounds" for the British Tommy) with fixed bayonets to remind the natives that "the British Raj was still in force over India."[166] Those at the bottom of the imperial hierarchy were typically those most comfortable in such blatant displays of force to spread fear and respect among Indians. In the military, this view was common. Lieutenant Colonel Alexander George Stuart, author of *The Indian Empire,* a guide for soldiers stationed in the subcontinent, bluntly and arrogantly expressed the belief in his own superiority and the deference expected from Indians, even for soldiers: "We gave protection, and we exacted obedience."[167]

More generally, by the end of the century, Anglo-Indian society, and especially non-official society or British soldiers, could not abide any legislation or custom that lessened their prestige, such as the policy against hitting natives imposed by Curzon.[168] Curzon had ordered a review of interracial legal cases for 1900 involving the

all-too-regular "collisions" between British soldiers and natives, which soon established that jury trials in cases of Europeans versus Indians were a mockery: "If the British soldier knocks down a Native," Curzon wrote, "and he dies of the blow, there is not the slightest chance of his being convicted by any European Jury in this country."[169] There was no justice, Curzon believed, in cases where "European and Natives are concerned."[170] Moreover, Richards's belief in the biological inferiority of "natives of the plain" likewise symbolized the "scientific" racism of the late nineteenth century. Richards's fellow Other Rankers were also the group associated with such casual violence toward Indians; they were the group most likely to resort to such methods to ensure its own prestige. Richards lived in a much different age and came from a different world socially than Arnold, so his reputation had to be one of invulnerability; thus his actions were designed to make Indians cower in fear.

Even during the high tide of empire when Richards served, imperial thought was never homogenous, and Richards himself was near the bottom of the "caste" system for whites in British India. He professed little admiration for Viceroy Curzon, who had decreed that the British could not strike Indians, making him unpopular with many Anglo-Indians, but especially British soldiers. Aristocratic viceroys could casually decree an end to the harsh treatment of Indians, but the unofficial customs and protocols of the Raj prevailed, and Anglo-Indians of all ranks except perhaps the very highest were almost psychotically obsessed with status and not being taken advantage of by Indians. Honor rested on one's status, but it was construed very differently by Curzon than by Richards or other soldiers. Curzon believed that striking Indians lessened imperial prestige, while the BOR saw little harm in such actions. In fact, to the soldier, the striking of Indians was necessary and served the best interests of the Raj. Richards wrote that he first met one "old hand" when he arrived in India, while in the background a sweeper was pursuing his usual work of cleaning out a latrine. The grizzled veteran ordered the sweeper to perform another job, but the servant responded that he would do it after the current job was completed. In response, "the old soldier drove his fist into the native's stomach, shouting at the same time, 'you black soor, when I order you to do a thing I expect it to be done at once.'" The soldier next cursed the groaning native, saying, "My god, its scandalous the way things are going on in this country. The blasted natives are getting cheekier every day. Not so many years ago I would have half killed that native, and if he had made a complaint afterwards and had marks to show, any decent commanding officer

would have laughed at him and told him to clear off."[171] Curzon may have ordered that any man who beat natives be severely punished, but the experienced soldier explained that "if we punch them in the face they have marks to show, so we have to punch them in the body. Most of the natives on the Plains have enlarged spleens, and a good punch in the body hurts them more than what it would us." The old soldier also affirmed that Indians would never respond to kindness: "The more you are down on them the better they [natives] will respect you. Treat them kindly and they will show you no respect at all." Like many soldiers, he believed that what had been won by the sword had to be kept by the sword, and Indians would only respond to brute force, which is all they would ever understand. In a final salvo, the unnamed veteran blasted Curzon's meddlesome ways, saying that he was "no damned good, this country wants a viceroy who will keep the bleeding natives down. If I had my way I'd give him the sack and recommend him for a job as a Sunday School teacher among the Eskimos around the North Pole."[172] The soldier's rant was meant to show Richards, a griffin (a newcomer to India), that he had to be taught the customs of the Raj in order to "keep the natives down." This was usual in British India, where men and women had to realize the importance of reputation in regulating contact between colonizer and colonized. Those who did not measure up to this ideal, like the well-intentioned but ultimately dangerous Curzon, imperiled all Anglo-Indians if the "natives" realized the delicate fabric that kept the Raj intact had too many weak points to protect all at once. Such casual and everyday violence was therefore justified if it kept the Indians pacified and truculent. Occasional acts of brutality, especially those committed by BORs, served their purpose if they kept Indians from revolt, and since British soldiers regularly struck or cuffed servants, Richards was angry that Curzon's naïve actions could only lower the prestige of soldiers, who, like most segments of imperial society, tended to see their own group as the best bulwark of imperial rule and honorable in its own way, especially if such actions kept the Raj intact.

Richards's opinion of Curzon and of Indians also reveals the fault lines of class in British India. Imperial society was never monolithic and unchanging, and ideas about how to rule India were in constant circulation. Generally those lower down in the imperial hierarchy were more likely to approve of—and use—coercive force. Still, although different classes in India may have had differing ideas on the "how" of imperial administration, almost all Anglo-Indians shared in the belief that the British ruled India better than Indians could

rule themselves. Curzon and Richards obviously had very different approaches to empire, but neither could conceive of an India without British rule, at least not for a very long time, and each could believe that his actions preserved an efficient and just administration of what had been a backward country until the arrival of the British. Most Anglo-Indians preferred not to think of the implications of such tactics, or to somehow link them to Indians or lower class Anglo-Indians who performed much of the dirty work of empire. Ultimately, honor could only be maintained through fear coupled with respect, yet anxieties about such methods drove the sahibs to disavow the soldiers as somewhat less than honorable, especially when compared with their own "virtuous" rule.

In the *Raj Quartet,* Ronald Merrick represents these rougher methods associated with lower-class Englishmen (or the military) and the shadowy use of force needed to maintain what he perceived to be the honor of the Raj. His methods are brutal and he is not accepted socially by other Anglo-Indians, but he knows how to assert dominance, and he progresses steadily through the Anglo-Indian hierarchy of power until he reaches his apogee of power in *A Division of the Spoils.* Merrick believed "implicitly in the Raj, and its panoply of racial privilege and power," and he also thought that Anglo-Indians had "abandoned the principles [they] used to live by." According to him, "there aren't many 'real' white men left."[173] Merrick's one imperial gift, much like that of Richards, is his most crucial one: his ability to enforce obedience. When Teddy Bingham, far above Merrick in social rank, shares a bungalow with Merrick, the servants always carry out Merrick's orders first, for they recognize that he is not a man to be trifled with. Merrick increasingly becomes the villain of *The Raj Quartet,* but he can be relied upon by Anglo-Indian society in times of crisis though, in Paul Scott's lucid explanation, he oftentimes (like Dyer) "brings the tight spot with him." If prestige was confirmed through honorable rule, the maintenance of this race prestige brought potential dishonor to the Raj when it spilled over into bloody reprisal. After Amritsar, such notions of honor and the good intentions of the Raj were increasingly difficult to maintain, and the violence that had always been present in the Raj was now more widely exposed to the rest of the world. Linking fiction and fact, *The Raj Quartet* was partly inspired by the actions of Dyer at Jallianwallah Bagh, and the parallels between Amritsar and the novels are notable. European women are attacked by Indians, leading to brutal reprisals by the authorities, revealing, according to Scott, the roots of "brutality, vengeance and repression."[174] Honor always

demanded vengeance in such situations, since the Anglo-Indian body was supposed to be sacrosanct, especially the body of a white woman, as Dyer so lamentably demonstrated. Behind such actions, of course, lay a great deal of fear and paranoia, but without honor, such brutality could not be justified. As a last resort, Anglo-Indians could always resort to their steadfast belief that, however repressive their rule, self-rule by Indians would be far worse.

Dominant Symbols

Imperial images and texts that focused on imperial honor needed to be constantly created and verified in everyday life, or they could wither and die. Such propaganda and perceptions of empire worked through ideological simplicity and certainty, and—although the colonial encounter itself was murky and filled with ambivalence—Anglo-Indian texts apparently resolved these contradictions and produced mythic outcomes in the colonial encounter in which India's "progress" would be controlled by the Raj. The anthropologist Victor Turner has written of the dominant images that emerge from the forest of symbols in any society. These mythic and ritual processes, he says, are multivocal, ambiguous, diffuse, and sometimes downright incomprehensible, but the dominant symbol, the key ritual, stands out as pivotal and "by its emergence it makes possible an internal interpretation of the symbolic process on both the intellectual and the social level."[175] Narratives of empire could be explained through the symbolic act—Gordon's sacrifice at Khartoum, the siege of Mafeking, or the heroism of the Mutiny. The empire operated as a huge myth-making machine, producing and identifying individuals whose actions quickly reached mythic status. Empire occasionally demanded martyrs, but these deaths were quickly avenged, which reestablished British authority and redeemed the imperial enterprise in the process. The collective honor of the race and the nation was thus preserved, seemingly, by a series of thousands of small acts throughout the Raj—the well-run bungalow, the disciplined Indian Army, or the ICS officer carefully "dispensing justice" from atop his horse. Most importantly in the Anglo-Indian imagination, their backbone was not the flexible and malleable spine of the Indian contortionist, but was instead ramrod straight. It did not give with the prevailing wind, and national honor was rarely sullied with defeat (or at least unavenged defeats). Individually, one of the greatest virtues of any Anglo-Indian was his refusal to tolerate "nonsense" from Indians. Through such texts and their congruent images, the Anglo-Indian achieved a guiding

sense of self to remind him of his imperial duties and ways of responding with appropriate and manly imperial behavior.

In a description that cannot be bettered, A. P. Thornton wrote that the empire sought to represent the "highest aims of human society," and therefore demanded "a status and prestige shared by no other. It [empire] was to captivate the imagination and hold fast the allegiance of the millions by the propagation of peculiar myths." Empire was therefore "a faith and an emotion before it became a political program."[176] The codes of the Raj were expected to be followed, and not surprisingly, the late Victorian era in India was not known for its enduring artistic achievements or its radical new forms of art. Their gift was thought to be that of the Roman: to rule, to endure, to prevail. Kipling merely wrote what he saw, and his sense of realism was considered to be his greatest gift among Anglo-Indians. Additionally, his heroes conformed to a rigid and ethical code of behavior, unlike the heroes found in more glamorous or romantic imperial novels.[177] This was the real India, the India of hard work for little reward, while watching "heathen sloth and Folly/Bring all your hopes to nought." Such sources reveal the nodes—the connecting points at which ideology is exposed—linking them to the lived experiences of the Raj, which were then translated into object lessons of empire that needed to be digested by Anglo-Indians. India therefore "needed Britons," but what has not been explored enough is how Britons needed India for their sense of imperial identity. What India taught Britons was how to command, and somehow it worked. Some rich alchemy of customs and traditions and ideologies allowed Britons to have their orders regularly obeyed, and this could not help but enhance their own sense of masculine authority.

To return to the question posed earlier, the Roman poet Publilius Syrus had once asked, "What is left when honor is lost?" Anglo-Indians instinctively knew the answer, since without honor the Raj would fade, just as the Aryans had sunk into oriental "decadence" and the Mughals withered under the enervating power of India. Avoiding that fate caused the Raj to cling to its customs, no matter how ridiculous they might appear to outsiders or critics. A dishonorable race could never retain an empire, as the history of the former imperial powers seemed to show. Only by overcoming the tendency of India to cause degeneration among her conquerors, and by acting—or perceiving themselves to act—in the best interests of India, could the British hope to hold on to power. Thus, honor guided the beliefs of Anglo-Indians and lay at the mythic core of empire: it was the sacred center without which no Anglo-Indian could assert power

over another human. The power of the Anglo-Indian would not be abused, nor would the Raj abandon its sacred trust to India, unless "provoked" by Indians to do so. This strategy allowed the Anglo-Indians to justify their autocratic rule, since democracy only came to a people who deserved it. Thus the path of honor, of progress, and justice lay with the British. Down the dishonorable path lay India's past, and the choice was clear, or at least it was clear to most Anglo-Indians.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 2

A Middle-Class Method: Building the Steel Frame of the Raj

> *It is a law of nature common to all mankind, which no time shall annul or destroy, that those who have more strength and excellence shall bear rule over those who have less.*
>
> —*Dionysus*[1]

> *The State which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instrument in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished.*
>
> —*J. S. Mill,* On Liberty[2]

After the Indian Mutiny of 1857, visions of a transformed India run on European lines increasingly gave way to the more authoritarian rule of the Raj. Although Queen Victoria never traveled to India, she articulated the new relationship by proclaiming that "India should belong to me."[3] The Queen (and later Empress) also issued a royal proclamation after the Mutiny stating that "her strength would be in the prosperity of her Indian subjects, her security in their contentment, and that their gratitude would be regarded by her Majesty as her best reward."[4] Generations of Britons during the Victorian era (and well into the twentieth century) grew up with similar beliefs concerning their right to rule India, making this sentiment almost universal in British society. Few questioned the right of the British to rule India, and instead the emphasis lay in justifying this rule, for if India now belonged to the empire, the subcontinent could at least fulfill its higher purpose to be ruled justly, if not democratically.

As reflected in Victoria's proclamation, the sobering effects of the Mutiny ushered in a new mentality that would last until the end of the Raj. Now that Britain would focus on properly governing India, the more serious nature of imperial rule would require men bent on physical and moral reform but still cautious about changing too many Indian customs, since the efforts at reforming *thuggee* and *sati* and other reforms were partly to blame for the Revolt. India would find such "ideal" men in the middle classes increasingly attracted to India after 1858, who rapidly came to believe that they possessed a unique gift for ruling Asians. By coming to the subcontinent, the middle classes could become "instant aristocrats" charged with ruling India and Indians, and although their salaries were not excessive, the cheapness of living in India allowed them to be surrounded by servants, which freed them from many of the more mundane tasks of living in a subtropical climate—meaning that they could also devote more of their time to leisured, "aristocratic" sports like golf or polo. The middle class in India therefore replicated many of the mannerisms and habits of the English aristocracy as closely as possible, and they quickly developed a self-identity to match their elevated sense of self-worth. Middle-class Anglo-Indians, in fact, often described themselves as an aristocracy, and politically, they mirrored the function of the British aristocracy, "dominating the administrative and military system, deriving their incomes from a predominantly agrarian economy and playing a paternal role among respectful peasants."[5] They were in India to lead, either in the military or in the government (or even in industry), and though the new cult of the middle-class gentleman in India naturally had aristocratic elements and was based upon the earlier imperial (and domestic) codes of behavior, the "new" gentleman still gambled, but did not whore. He attended church, but still retained enough pagan elements to fight when needed. Above all, he ruled, not merely by force of arms, but also by force of personality, and he sought to match his virtues to the perceived needs of India, which needed a form of regeneration associated with the bourgeois. Medieval notions of honor had rested more closely on one's ability to fight and die in battle, but by the nineteenth century, honor was increasingly based on moral virtues as reflected in the embrace of it by the middle classes in Europe, for in the bourgeois atmosphere of the Victorian era it became a shadow of virtue.[6] Yet, in the national context, virtue always seemed to come in second place to honor. The nineteenth century was characterized by such ideals of national honor, and Schopenhauer asserted that "every nation must be prepared to defend its own interest," and that "the honor of a nation consists in

establishing the opinion, not only that it may be trusted, but also that it is to be feared. An attack upon its rights must never be allowed to pass unheeded. It is a combination of civic and knightly honor."[7]

In India, when honor was eventually—and somewhat begrudgingly—claimed from the servants of the East India Company, it became a democratized sort of honor that Wordsworth in another context called "the aristocracy of nature."[8] It combined the "civic" and "knightly" honor described by Schopenhauer, and if hierarchies in England were based on birth and a feudal conception of noble beings springing from superior lineages, the imperial hierarchy of the Raj was thought to be more meritocratic, and what aristocrats were supposedly born with, the middle class in India could—in typical fashion—develop for themselves. This meant that hierarchies in India could be reconstituted and power spread among a larger section of society. The instant aristocrat of British India was an ideal diffused through almost all levels of the imperial hierarchy and was signified by the "honorable" term "sahib."[9] As the new bourgeois morals spread across the empire, imperial codes of honor and masculinity changed as well, and "paternal responsibility and sexual restraint" became the "civilized standard against chaos outside and corruption from within the ruling community." Although this was only partially realized "as an idealized self-image, a strategy for psychic survival and as a part of imperial justification . . . such ideas remained important and compelling"[10] As soon as he stepped off the ship and onto Indian soil, the Anglo-Indian, whether he wanted to or not, became a part of a hierarchy of power that was already laid out for him, and though honor applied to most of Anglo-Indian society, it was distributed appropriately to status.

If the bulwarks of power in early nineteenth-century India were the army and the police, the perceived center of power in the latter half of the century became the dispassionate ICS officer, who helped establish the new codes of conduct in India (though the army always had more Europeans in it than any other social group in India, which tended to be downplayed by imperialist). In post-1858 India, the code of the greedy and lustful warrior had theoretically given way to efficiency and respectability, and these changes likewise caused a reshuffling of the imperial hierarchy, based partly on such distinctions of honor. With the days of outright conquest and annexation gone, the Raj assumed its new shape on the basis of shared power with native princes and—much less enthusiastically—the increasingly educated babu. With the influx of middle-class men, the aristocratic and warlike flavor of service in India changed, and the noble army

officer of the Company, once the pinnacle of Anglo-Indian society in India, was replaced atop the social pyramid by the ICS officer, who was more likely to be middle class. The viceroy and the "Heaven-borne" of the ICS also became the administrative right hand of the Queen. The officers of the army now came next in the pecking order, and mere businessmen, or *box-wallahs,* as they were known in India, occupied a lower rung, since prestige and honor usually sought to dis-associate itself from the vulgar gathering of money. The *box-wallahs,* with the taint of money clinging perceptibly to them, could not hold their heads as high as the ICS officer, who represented the disinterested ruler interested only in dispensing justice and ruling fairly, and was much more likely to receive a knighthood for a successful career in India. Historically, honor and venality rarely exist in proximity to each other, and the Raj was no exception to this rule.

For all the protestations about the clear superiority of British customs at this time, these prejudices echoed the divisions of Hindu society, with the "White Brahmins" of the ICS sitting atop a hierarchy with the military/*Kshatriyas* caste just below (and historically, the *ksatrias* and Brahmins of Indian society supported differing notions of honor, and how to attain it), with lower caste mercantile *Vaishyas/box-wallahs* representing the lowest caste of "those who mattered." Below them were persons of mixed descent who were thought to inherit most of the worst traits of each race.[11] For an administrator of the ICS, his sacrifices, his gift of just governance, and his feudal distance from those he ruled separated him from Indians and from the lower ranks of Anglo-Indian society. Anglo-Indians would at times admit these similarities, though they tended to make such comparisons in order to show that each society intimately understood the other, thus allowing Anglo-Indians to pose as insiders capable of plumbing the "Oriental mind" and posing as pseudo-Asians who understood what Indians expected of them. British power and authority, nevertheless, now rested on assumptions of Western cultural and racial superiority—in short, the claim of a superior civilization.[12]

Conformity to the code of "white caste" offered immediate and tangible rewards, however, since Anglo-Indians received instant gratification through displays of almost untempered power that were exercised in a cultural arena that approved of such assertions of dominance and even morally and ethically condoned them. Making such distinctions about imperial protocols allowed the middle class to make new distinctions about the claim to honor and who deserved it. Unlike a truly aristocratic society, therefore, in India honorific claims rested not on birth but on ability, at least according to members of

the middle class. The gradations of imperial society were ostensibly based on achievement and integrity, rather than on the artificial foundations of money, birth, and connections. The aristocracy continued to look down on the middling ranks in India, but the new gentleman of the late nineteenth century was proclaimed to be an "aristocrat of character, [and] not an aristocrat of birth."[13] Simple breeding, although always important in Anglo-Indian society, did not guarantee reputation in India (or as a more modern saying has it, "To be born a gentleman is an accident, to die one is an accomplishment"). Anglo-Indian society was therefore both timocratic and meritocratic in nature, and a man was likely to be judged on his reputation for honesty, loyalty, and his ability to assert his will as a man of honor, which gave him the ability to command others. If the previous generations of Anglo-Indians had therefore won honor (or at least fame) by conquering India, this generation would win honor by ruling it.

The cult of work so prevalent in India, especially among the ICS, became a badge of honor that reflected the nobler and purer intentions of the Raj in comparison with its forbears. T. H. Thornton, selected in the first batch of men chosen by competitive examination for India (and not by patronage), described the "business" of running an empire, and of "promoting the wealth and happiness of the people, in protecting them from disease and death, in redressing their injuries, and in a word representing the truth, justice and civilizing influence of England in her dominions in the East."[14] If Clive, the conqueror of India, had enriched himself several times over and won his battles by subterfuge and cunning, his successors would gain honor not by claiming loot or exploitation but by renouncing wealth and instead focusing on the "just" governance of India. From 1773 to 1857, the East India Company was a fiscal-military state in which "private and public financial interests were inextricably intertwined."[15] The new gentleman, however, now subordinated his private desires for the good of the Raj, and there was usually something of a religious temper to such beliefs. Middle-class Anglo-Indians renounced ostentatious displays of wealth and sybaritic living, yet gained the elusive things often denied them at home, prestige and power. What they would forfeit, however—the enormous wealth, the Indian mistresses, and the "Oriental" lifestyle—came to define them as a group in India.

On a more cautionary note, civil servants of the East India Company were already middle class by the early decades of the 1800s (and the EIC lost its trade monopoly in 1833), but the officers of the ICS in the late Victorian era, much like Burke in the late 1700s, preferred

to think of Company rule as a tyrannical despotism that had meddled too much in Indian affairs. Yet, if the middle classes eventually found paradise in nineteenth-century India—partly through their perceived ability to conform to notions of morality noticeably absent in others—it would sometimes take authoritarian measures to preserve their Eden. And since British India, unlike Europe, became more and not less authoritarian in the nineteenth century (and retained some of the aristocratic conception of honor in the process), this tyranny was described as being mild-tempered and just. However, India did have at least one thing in common with Europe in that the cult of the middle classes became predominant. Defining who or what can be termed "bourgeois" is naturally a slippery and elusive endeavor, but broadly construed, they are that "broad strata of urban society between traditional ruling elites (landowning or bureaucratic) and the popular masses."[16] The bourgeoisie entrenched their own particular values and attitudes into the national culture, and they established the norms and protocols of a "new" society, which required the one attribute that the middle class seemed to have in abundance—the ability to work. Their thrift, industriousness, and hard work had led England to prominence, and now they could properly turn their attention to the empire, which offered even more opportunities to those with the proper spirit, so that the middle class increasingly provided the social, political, and military leadership of the era, and their views "were accepted much lower down the social scale."[17] By equating their perceived strengths with those of the nation, they proved felicitous in "co-opting members of other social groups into their concerns."[18]

In the Raj and in the empire more generally, the middle class could now assert their fitness for rule through the evangelical influence of the "personal example" and the belief in the right to control other human beings, meaning that they had finally learned to rule in "the practical but also in inspirational arts of government."[19] Histories, biographies, postcards, newspaper accounts—all these proclaimed this moral right to rule India and demonstrated the exemplary behavior of the middle class, and these changes revealed not only what the middle class could do for India, but what they could do for themselves.[20] Not only were the middle class now an example to themselves, they were an example to others as well, and this moral example was itself rooted in the imperial honor brought by ruling India.

As the middle classes became increasingly important to imperial society in the nineteenth century, the manly characteristics of a "typical" middle-class Englishman were also most evident in the subcontinent. Now that careers and not plunder were the ideal, this

signaled the longer-term (and ultimately more honorable) commitment that Britain was making to India. Gone were the days in which one might go to India a pauper and return to buy a rotten borough in England and stand for Parliament. J. W. Kaye, the nineteenth-century journalist and historian, described the change in manners and standards that was already taking place in the 1840s. Kaye stated that "comfort and respectability seem now to be aimed at, and attained. There is little licentiousness to shock and less poverty to distress."[21] Kaye overwhelmingly approved of the change in morality, noting that "ruffianism had gone out of fashion. People drank less, gambled less, swore less, and talked less obscenity. . . . And to be a Christian no longer meant to be lustful, rapacious, and cruel."[22] Additionally, this called for a "better" type of ruler, and ideally, empire both produced and attracted some of the best specimens of British manhood, for one could go to India to meet the "satisfaction of desires denied at home," which usually meant ruling over other men.[23] In the empire, men, and to a lesser extent, women, could escape the constrictions of an England in which land and opportunities were controlled by an elite, and the Raj allowed them to establish their fiefdoms built to a "middle-class design."[24] According to James Fitzjames Stephen, India was the one place in which "an Englishman who is neither born in the purple nor minded to flatter mobs can hope . . . to serve his country in any serious purpose."[25] In virtually all facets of life and occupations, the empire allowed this burgeoning class to improve their lot, either in the army or in the civil service, in business or agriculture, in missionary work, or in education.[26]

Myopic Secretaries

The "new" men of the Raj who came to India after the 1850s, however, would face fierce criticisms from their British predecessors, who did not believe that they were up to the challenge of ruling the subcontinent. The newcomers were derisively called "competition wallahs," and older Anglo-Indians had a palpably negative reaction to them as well as to the women who increasingly came with them. The introduction of the competitive exam in 1853 in lieu of patronage could not help but attract a different type of man to the civil service. According to older veterans of the Company, these "new men" seemed to be deficient in the traits needed in India, and their shortcomings could be seen in their perceived lack of physical fitness and their inability to ride a horse or shoot—prerogatives of the aristocracy in England that had hitherto imbued them with mystical powers to

rule over men. This attack on middle-class men would last into the twentieth century, and as E. M. Collingham has pointed out, much of the debate centered on the physical body of the "new man."[27] These newcomers were said to be unable to stand up to rigorous work, were feeble and weak, and possessed inferior manners. Their inability to ride also debarred them from executing the duties of an East India Company officer (and later those of an officer of the Raj). Especially after the Mutiny, there was much nostalgia for the type of man modeled on John Lawrence in the Punjab—the quasi-despotic man who was able to quell mutinous Indians by sheer force of aristocratic character and charisma.[28] The "myopic secretary" produced by examination did not ride "with whip and spur," and British India was now in the hands of men "born outside the hitherto governing families of the land, into hands bred for generations to other work than man government."[29]

It would take many years before the competition wallahs could make their claim to honor stick, and ironically, the same charge that later generations of Anglo-Indians would level at babus was thus directed at the new men of the ICS. Their education and "book learning" were not considered adequate to make a gentlemanly ruler; as Sir Fitzjames Stephen wrote about them, the greatest difficulty in India would lie in "having to do first-rate work with second, third, fourth, and fifth-rate tools."[30] Trevelyan pointed out that between 1860 and 1874, 75 percent of recruits for the ICS came from professional, middle-class backgrounds, and that they lacked an aristocratic demeanor. They had few natural leadership abilities, they were socially and physically incompetent, and—perhaps most damming of all—they were overly concerned with official and social status. The aristocracy also challenged their commitment to empire and their preference for stability over innovation, which marked their biggest political deficiency.[31] Imperial government was a meritocracy tending toward mediocrity (at least according to later viceroys like Curzon), prizing the plodding worker over the flamboyant intellectual.

In the reorganization of British India after 1858, an even more caustic attack was directed at nonofficial Anglo-Indians, meaning those outside army and civil appointments or not employed by the government in some way. When new councils were formed in Bombay, Madras and Bengal, and in the Northwest Frontier Provinces and the Punjab, nonofficial members were named to such councils for the first time. Lord Canning, seamlessly transitioning from governor-general to viceroy, pointed out that there were few "gentlemen" fit for council work, and in the Punjab, he said, "I believe there are none

such."[32] There was a widespread belief, at least in the upper echelons of government, that such men, especially wealthy planters, would not safeguard the interests of Indians, and the nonofficial community was "still viewed with suspicion by the government, but the growth in its numbers, the rapid development of its economic importance to India and the Empire and its control of a considerable section of the press made it impossible for the government to ignore it."[33] Still, their lower status and lack of gentlemanly standing were partly based on their more limited honor. Planters and other "non-official" Europeans could not always be made to fit into the honor code that was being formed and articulated in this era, especially since many were associated with extractive industries. As noted, this kind of prejudice was long-lasting in British India, which denigrated the capitalist because he often stood outside the feudal codes of the Raj, and his activities could potentially undercut the claim that India and Indians were not being exploited by imperialism. Thus the technological innovation that was so closely associated with capitalism in Britain could not always be made to fit into the more feudal codes of the Raj, especially if such technological changes were tied to rapid social advancement.

The open exam was not, in fact, intended for the social advancement of any class, but was instead intended to bind Victorian society together more tightly. Prior to the 1850s, Civil Servants of the East India Company were appointed to "writerships" and then sent to Haileybury, where they spent two years studying law, political economy, and Indian languages before embarking for more language study in India before taking up their posts. This system changed in 1853 with the implementation of the competitive exam, and though it would eventually see the rise of more middle-class men into the ICS, most thought that the exams would be dominated by the upper classes, especially because of their superior education. If anything, it was hoped the exam would make India more appealing for the aristocracy, since the nature of rule there demanded men accustomed to ruling others as proconsuls and habitually accustomed to being obeyed. The Company, which picked its men through patronage, was not even considered to be rife with corruption at the time, but patronage was suspect in England and was slowly giving way to the professed meritocracy of civil service exams. It was also hoped that the civil service reforms would bind the classes together and provide a moral example for the lower classes, who could aspire to something better, improving their character in the process.[34] Even liberals like Gladstone believed the aristocracy would win any competitive examination due to their "immense superiority."[35]

In India, the reaction would be even more caustic, and old hands there were livid that an academic test was being used for jobs that required—to use the Victorian epithet—"breeding" more than anything else. In somewhat less snide tone, these critics would speak of the qualities of the gentleman, itself a coded attack on the class of successful examinees. Sir William Denison, the governor of Madras, believed that the competition wallah had "lifted himself out of the mud, and is like a beggar on horseback."[36] A "true" gentleman, on the other hand, was thought to transcend mere academic success, and his traits included a "capacity to govern others and control themselves," an aptitude for combining "freedom with order," as well as a "love of healthy sports and exercise."[37] Attitude was everything in India, and it could not be learned through an exam. Indeed, Dr. Birdwood, another fierce critic of the competition wallahs, prized tone over efficiency for the ICS, since efficiency "bored the natives desperately."[38] Critics like Denison and Birdwood claimed that the stability of the Raj depended on the charisma of its gentleman rulers, it being somehow taken for granted that Indians could tell the difference between the true English gentleman, "courteous, considerate and commanding respect, and those brought to the front from obscure corners of society, boorish, contemptible and disgusting."[39] Whatever their intentions, the civil service commissioners were swamped by applicants, not from Oxford and Cambridge as they intended, but from less prestigious institutions such as Irish Universities or Commercial schools, who were also more likely to employ the much-scorned "crammer," whose tutelage was geared toward passing the exam and nothing else. One could not produce a gentleman by "cramming," and the social manners of the competition wallahs were deemed inferior, the old hands seeing the new men as unfinished and unrefined, as walking "books in breeches" whose lack of athletic prowess and social varnish unfitted them for life in India.

By century's end, however, the middle class "myopic secretary" was being transformed through the cult of games and manliness into a ruler of men, and middle-class institutions had thus proved themselves capable of producing the type of man needed to rule an empire (and partly quelled the original doubts about such men by their own imperial forbears). Much of the perceived fitness of these men derived from their education, and especially in institutions like the ICS, the men tended to come from a homogenous group with similar middle-class and upper-middle-class backgrounds, and many started out in public schools before attending university. The finished product of this education was a gentleman versed in "classics and math, games,

teamwork, exaggerated masculinity, cold showers and the stiff upper lip—the fagging system was supposed to teach boys to obey, punish, encourage, and rule."[40] Generalists rather than technocrats, the primary duty of these men lay in the governance of others, and since Victorians prized "character" as one of the highest ideals, intelligence was less important than "the ability to deal with other people."[41] According to Philip Mason, school taught:

> hardness, self-composure, coolness in the face of pain and danger, and confidence in one's own decision—these were qualities required by the imperial class. . . . But the public schools claimed to teach more. . . . A boy learned to do as he was told without question; later, he learned to take it for granted that he would be obeyed. He learned to punish and to encourage. He learned in short to rule.[42]

Consequently, by the end of the nineteenth century, the efficacy of many national institutions rested on whether or not they forged vigorous men. Empire builders were themselves produced at public schools, and partly due to imperial needs, the British educational system during the late Victorian era became less concerned with godliness and good learning and instead stressed muscular Christianity and athleticism.

Officers and Gentlemen

Above all, being a gentleman implied a standard mode of correct conduct, and this code was dominant at the public school. Even if many public school boys were not gentleman, "those that entered gentlemanly occupations run by gentlemen made that mode they knew so well their own."[43] According to the historian Simon Raven, the gentleman was "an agent of justice and effective action, having the fairness and the thoroughness to examine facts and the integrity to act on his findings." Moreover, he had much regard for the old loyalties—to country, to kinsmen, to church—and he saw fit to "adapt a grave and somewhat aloof attitude of mind which was matched by a dignified demeanor and a superior, though not ostentatious style of maintenance." Most centrally for this work, the gentleman's rule and administration "were among the many obligations on which his honor was based," and this bound him to fair play and decency, chivalry and charity to the poor." His privilege was justified by rendering service to his Sovereign, to his superiors in office, and to his dependents, but in doing so he showed proper respect that was nevertheless "free of any hint of servility."[44] Being a gentleman sprang from one's

sense of honor, which constituted an ensemble of characteristics that saw such honor as being morally virtuous. The crucial qualities of the gentleman supposedly sprang from his ability to lead, especially when those under him were seen as being fundamentally flawed. Like the Roman then, the gentleman's sense of *imperium* endowed the Anglo-Indian with unique gifts to rule other people, particularly when they had failed to rule themselves honorably.[45] Thus this idea also implied hierarchy, since the gentleman lived in a world characterized by unequal distributions of wealth, power, and prestige.

For men, being recognized as a true sahib became one of the highest distinctions in a society continually obsessed with precedence and prestige, and amidst the perceived chaos of India, duty always stirred some of the most patriotic elegies of empire. Like the upper classes during the days of Cromwell, they "knew what they fought for and loved what they knew."[46] Lives of privilege occasionally demanded sacrifice, and talk of duty was rarely idle speculation, but rather a way to steel oneself in case another Mutiny broke out. Sir John Strachey, echoing Fitzjames Stephen, succinctly described this type of mindset: "The real foundations of our power do not rest on the interested approval of the noisy few but on justice and on the contentment of the silent millions. . . . We, to use Sir James Stephen's expression, are the representatives of a belligerent civilization which has to wage constant warfare against strange barbarism, horrid customs and cruel superstitions' ancient survival, ready at any moment to start into activity."[47] Posing as the protectors of this vast and silent majority, the sahib believed that he protected the lowly serf, which also allowed him to ignore the clamor from the "noisy few" who criticized the Raj. Only upright gentlemen could endure and prevail in this atmosphere, and "one who has received the education of an English gentleman will not wholly fail, however tight the place may be in which he finds himself," wrote J. E. C. Welldon, the onetime master of Harrow and later bishop of Calcutta. Moreover, when the gentleman is "put down in the face of duty, he will know what to do, and he will do it. It is this reserve power lying hidden in the British race which is, I think the hope of the Empire."[48] In such a sacred conception of duty also lay the path to political and moral leadership. The ICS, and to a lesser extent, the other Anglo-Indians, were foremost *servants* of empire who could be trusted with power. Knowing that a gentleman could be relied upon "in a pinch" to choose the honorable action carried great influence among Anglo-Indian society, which had to be ready to defer to bureaucratic leadership in times of crisis. Being a gentleman implied that this reserve power lay dormant until needed, but these

men were not primarily warriors who welcomed danger. Instead, for Anglo-Indians, the highest ideal lay in the gentlemanly ability to quell danger before it became lethal, thereby protecting their women, their children, and ultimately, the Raj. The bestowal of the term "gentleman" then was not the exclusive domain of a particular class, but referred instead to a particular lifestyle and an ensemble of social norms, beliefs, and patterns of behavior.[49] To be a gentleman, however, required a comfortable income plus leisure time, and the middle classes would find enough of both after settling in India.

For most imperial men, the true test of their gentlemanly character came during their first years in India, when they met people who showed little outward faith in these hallowed English codes. Actions always seemed to have direct consequences in India, and in the empire character would be tested, often brutally. A harsh and unforgiving empire therefore required men with more than just book learning. Arnold White, in his book *Efficiency and Empire,* set the tone when he wrote, "Young men on soft beds learning through books, which are a reflection of other men's ideas, can never become real men, or the efficient ruler of real men. Hardship, suffering, sorrow, communion with nature, [and] self-dependence are necessary to the formation of strong character among leaders of men in critical times."[50] As important as an English education was, the somewhat mystical process through which Englishmen learned the virtues that made them English was perhaps even more important. According to Sir Richard Temple in his book *India in 1880,* the men in the ICS were seen as "representative men in the eyes of the Native. According to their conduct, the character of England herself is measured by the mass of the Indian people."[51] The virtues of these men were "familiar to millions of men," and Temple avowed that when Indians thought of the government that ruled them, the manly visage of the ICS officer was what they pictured. Paradoxically then, the empire was the most obvious place to assert such typically "English" virtues, since the ICS attracted some of "England's best sons."[52]

Princely Prestige

India also had its gentlemen, who were brave, hardy and, at times, benevolent rulers—the princes of India. The Raj made its peace with these princes, and the government agreed to respect "the rights, dignity and honor of the native princes as our own."[53] As long as these princes remained loyal to the Raj, they were generally left alone. Native states also provided many soldiers to the Indian army, but

there was never any doubt as to who possessed paramount power: princes could never claim equality with the Raj and hope to keep their crowns. Yet, after 1858, these native states no longer appeared to be anachronistic, feudal holdovers, and in fact proved to be a bulwark against Indian nationalism, since censorship laws were much stricter in the these states. They came closest to resembling the ideal of the English gentleman, and, like the English aristocracy, their wealth came from the land. This was a social preference as much as it was a political tactic. Amar Singh, the Rajput who began his monumental diary in 1898, represented the new ideal of the loyal vassal of the Queen who embodied many aspects of the gentleman, in that he was known as a daring hunter and extraordinary horseman, reforming ruler, and member of the Jodhpur Lancers who fought on behalf of the empire in the Northwest frontier, in China during the Boxer Rebellion, and saw service in World War I.[54] Rajputs were by nature rulers and warriors, and it is no accident that such men were favored in the Raj, for they embodied the traits prized by the British and were integrated into the imperial hierarchy. This suited the socially ambitious ICS officer, "eager for deference from the exotic princes and aristocrats with whom they hobnobbed and from whom they expected compliance.[55]

Yet the political officers posted to the princes were not seen as being as "honorable" as those in the ICS or the army. The qualities needed to be a "political" in the "Great Sloth Belt" of Rajputana were vastly different form those needed to run a district, since a thorough knowledge of court etiquette was usually needed, plus an ability for flattery and subservience. Even the term "political" reflect the lesser honor of the post, for it implies maneuvering and constantly checking the temper of the prince, as opposed to a district officer, more bent on the just rule of "his" subjects. Instead, such men were viewed as being slightly suspect, and the Political Service quickly gained a reputation as being filled with refugees from the ICS who could not govern and castaways from the army who could not fight. Although Anglo-Indians looked with envy at some of the methods used in the "native states," they could never be as honorable as the "real" Raj, since they were associated too closely with Oriental methods of rule. The princes, however, received many honorific titles from the Raj, and the faux feudalism of imperial government could at times be used to diminish the prestige of the princes, whose affinity for "a bit of bunting" was well known. If imagining the honor gradient as running from one end of a line constituting honorable behavior and the esteem of the honor group, at the other end lay the excessive honorifics of

the princes, who were heaped with titles often irrespective of their behavior. Montesquieu, in describing the corruption of the principles of monarchy, believed that honor became corrupted when "it is possible to be covered at the same time with infamy and with titles."[56] Still, for all the medals given to Indian princes, it should be remembered that these medals were intended to cement their relations with the British crown and to associate them with the Raj, as members of the same order. These princes were theoretically honored and proud to wear the insignia of the imperial government, since it linked them to a rational and humane government, seeking to ensure loyalty from all its subjects.

Thus a new order of chivalry was also called for, and the Star of India was introduced in 1861, and by 1877 there were several hundred holders, both British and Indian. Queen Victoria, reflecting this new vision of empire, eventually became Empress of India, signifying an "invented, pseudo medieval spectacular of rank and inequality."[57] The British were laying down a more closely defined honorific hierarchy and were increasingly concerned with projecting an image of the Raj as a feudal order. In resorting to this faux feudalism, the British could not help expressing this vision in the language of honor. The Raj turned to the traditional rulers of India (and most honored in society), and spurned the nascent Indian middle class that they were in part creating, and this new cult underlay many of the newer arguments for the right of the British to be in India, which saw them look backward to the Middle Ages for symbols of authority and honor. The architect Lutyens declared that India left him feeling "very Tory and pre-Tory feudal."[58] In nineteenth-century England, there was much nostalgia for "the world we have lost" that was being overwhelmed by an age of industrialism, individualism, social upheaval, and laissez-faire economics. The Middle Ages represented stability over innovation, but the social order was secure, and chivalry, heroism, honor, and generosity, if they had been lost or eroded in England, could be the basis of imperial society in India, in which the strong would ideally protect the weak. Imperial ideology, now shorn of its more democratic impulses, was now more decidedly autocratic, and honor has always thrived in such nondemocratic societies with no pretensions to equality among the ruling group, and two of the dominant characteristics of late-Victorian empire were "its preoccupation with racial boundaries and its inherently cautious and conservative approach to indigenous societies."[59] The kind of relationship that had hitherto existed in England—between masters and servants, employers and employees, landlord and tenants—could be found in India in

abundance, as could a race who thought of themselves as inherently better and more honorable than those they ruled.

The penchant for medievalism also found expression in the buildings of the Raj, since the revival for Gothic architecture in England would reach its apogee in British India. Bombay had a "Gothic law court, post office, public works building, secretariat, university library, university convention hall, market, police court, school of art, [and] customs house."[60] Ruskin had been preaching in England that there existed a direct relationship between the material culture of a society and its character, and this could be easily seen in British India. Gothic buildings both represented the power of the Raj and sought to transform Indians into loyal subjects overawed by the power of the British government in India. These buildings, according to imperialist architect T. Roger Smith in a lecture delivered in 1878, would cow the Indian and cause him to regard the sahib "with respect and even with admiration," but would also ensure that "the English collector remains British to the backbone in the heart of India."[61] In India, power could be held and dispensed outside the realms of Western law, which is why the code of honor was indispensable in justifying such autocratic rule, since it appeared to violate the noble history and general development of the Anglo-Saxon race. The overwhelming Gothic architecture thus served as a form of what the modern historian Ian Baucom calls "visual therapy" for the imperialist, to remind him of his essential English (or British) character. The medieval world, built on rank and status, innately appealed to the Anglo-Indian, but this vision had to be tempered with the progressive spirit of the Victorian era. Such imposing buildings were reminders as well of the perceived longevity of the Raj, and that the men who ruled India were supposed to be like the buildings themselves: stately, imposing, and representative of a higher culture.

The Raj therefore represented a return to the old aristocracy of India, to the Mughals and other princes, while for Anglo-Indians, India would be run by the "new aristocrats," who were really not aristocrats at all. Only in India, however, was Victoria known as the Empress (and all coins from 1897 onward carried the abbreviation *India Imp.* or Empress of India).[62] Imperial stability now rested on her sacred name, since Indians apparently felt comfortable with a distant and grand sovereign. Durbars reappeared, which cemented the relationship between the English and Indian princes and provided stability for the empire, if not always progress. By allying themselves with the most conservative element of Indian society, the British admitted that stability was much more important than political

progress in India, and if the new rulers of India thought they represented anything, it was the golden virtue of stability.

The Death of the Duel

By the end of the nineteenth century, the imperial ethos of the gentleman was extended to and associated with the competition wallahs, which was reflected in many of the changed customs of Anglo-Indian society that separated those who had conquered India from those who would later rule it. During the eighteenth century, running torchbearers had preceded the litters that carried the British throughout Calcutta; however, gas lamps appeared with more regularity during the nineteenth century along the roads, and they replaced human torches, symbolizing the arrival of British scientific and technical progress in the larger Indian cities. More reliable but less prestigious, gas lamps foretold a British future in India built along more utilitarian lines, and imperial life seemed to become more regular but less glamorous.[63]

When the nabobs of pre-Mutiny India were not being carried in palanquins, they often rode in chariots, with servants running before and aft shouting their title. However, by the second half of the nineteenth century, such men were "becoming as rare as a mummy."[64] The new ICS officer seemed to be well equipped for his role as sober administrator, if unfortunately duller than his forbears in India. Thus the rise of the middle class effectively ended many of the older codes of behavior, or at least brought them into disrepute. Sexual affairs, for example, were now frowned upon and more heavily criticized than previously, although outrageous flirting seemed to be acceptable.[65] Many of these changes can be traced, at least in part, back to the 1780s. When Cornwallis, fresh from defeat at Yorktown, arrived in India, he instituted many reforms designed to keep India firmly within the empire, which meant that the Indian wives and mistresses of Britons, as well their mixed-raced offspring, were no longer welcome in imperial society. The full force of such changes, however, would not be felt until the mid-nineteenth century, for the competition wallah often brought his wife and family with him, and a new, more sober, masculinity sprang up in India. The ideal Anglo-Indian male's claim to gentlemanly status no longer rested merely on birth or martial virtues but on reputation and status within the community, much as it had always been to some degree. Socially, however, there were profound differences in pre- and post-Mutiny India. In Calcutta, such eccentricities like torchbearers shouting one's title gave way to

new rounds of social activity as a mixed bourgeois-bureaucratic society now rose to preeminence, as evidenced by the new etiquette of the visiting card and the increased hierarchical nature of society in Calcutta.[66] The pleasures of the nautch (dance) were replaced with amateur theatricals, and idleness and luxury were replaced with work and a Spartan regimen. Even though the competition wallahs still replicated aristocratic pursuits such as hunting and the personal exercise of authority, the perceived venality, avarice, and easy virtues of the aristocracy had to be replaced with newer and sterner morals. If some of the glamour disappeared, Indians and Britons could be thankful for the more sober government now installed, and if there was less camaraderie between the races and more social distance, this was the price that had to be paid for law and order. At the very least, however, the fusing of imperial, aristocratic, and bourgeois values in India produced a more honorable rule for the subcontinent. Thus, by emphasizing what they perceived to be their talents, the competition wallahs hoped to claim their preeminence over India, as well as their preeminence over the Anglo-Indians who had ruled it before, once they took the reins of government from the ostensibly withered and decrepit hand of the Company. Imperial excitement now lay in the frontiers, and Anglo-Indian fiction, especially romantic tales of derring-do and bravery, obligingly relocated to the Northwest frontier, where bravery regularly triumphed. But ruling India now took more than sheer bravado and martial spirit, for India now required an iron code of conformity and social acceptance that could be found in these new and "honorable" rulers of India. Consequently, this expansion of honor in India echoed the expansion of the empire in the 1800s: as imperial rule expanded, so did honor and who could claim it.[67]

The sense of honor that eventually developed in the Raj prized conformity over the relentless quest of individual honor at the expense of the institutions of government and just rule. India would now be governed more efficiently, with regular steam service and regular telegraphic communications from home. If the men chosen by exam did not evince the same level of genius as before, there were now fewer bad eggs in the imperial omelet. The period in India after the Mutiny was, moreover, not one of glorious conquest, but rather rested on the steady advancement of more "professional" and "scientific" forms of government for India. The glorious days of freebooters and conquests—the age of Clive—had given way to the age of the ICS and to the era of the patient and steady administrator advancing his corner of India at a slow but steady pace into the modern world.

In Calcutta during the eighteenth century, for example, duels had been a regular occurrence (Hastings fought one), and "affairs of honor" took place behind the "trees of destiny."[68] As bourgeois "progress" took hold in the subcontinent, dueling died out, and if Oakfield's (of W. D. Arnold's novel) hesitance in dueling marked him as a coward, the new shame in British India lay in not fitting in comfortably with the imperial social formation.[69] Still, middle-class men of the early decades of 1800s could claim a higher status for themselves by dueling, and the image of the middle classes prohibiting dueling for moral reasons is not complete, for much of the resentment of dueling in England and in India was concerned with limiting dueling and not abolishing it outright, for otherwise "the reckless, the satirical, the sarcastic . . . would be the tyrants of social life, if the fear of the [duel] did not keep them in order."[70] A gentleman had to have a method outside the courts of defending his reputation, though the *British Code of the Duel* of 1824 recommended that a gentleman assess the social qualifications of a potential opponent, and a common complaint heard was that "linen drapers" and other shopkeepers were using the duel to achieve equality with the genteel.[71] Within the genteel, the duel insured equality, and the late revival of dueling in England in the seventeenth century represented a successful attempt by the lesser gentry to put themselves on an equal footing with wealthy aristocrats. After the duel had become formalized, a poor gentleman "who offended a rich one was no longer likely to be victimized by assault at the hands of the hired thugs of his enemy."[72] The duel in part democratized the aristocracy, but the death of the duel occurred in the 1800s when the upper class determined that the duel (along with democracy) had gone quite too far.

There was typically a class element to duels, and if the middle class did not know how to respond in an appropriate manner to an insult, the lower classes typically responded too quickly. One important aspect of the duel was therefore its stately and measured nature, in which tempers had cooled but the aristocrat still fought. The form of the duel determined how society judged the combatants, and duelists could be mocked if they showed improper form. One case in 1806 involved a poet and a critic who dueled, though they merely loaded their pistols with powder and added no shot to the powder. These kinds of farcical episodes, in addition to governmental regulations, helped bring about the decline of dueling. In the Raj, when taken too far, the duel could also upset military discipline, and though it was common there for the loser of duel to have his death ascribed to cholera, thereby avoiding any legal penalties for the winner, the duel had

largely disappeared by the 1840s.[73] The Indian Army was concerned that soldiers would imitate their officers, and the diffusion of dueling among the ranks had to be thwarted.

There were other moral reasons to avoid dueling in the Indian Army, and the anonymous officer who wrote "Duelling in Our Indian Army" decried the lack of suitable society for officers there, who turned to gambling out of boredom, leading to many duels being fought over gambling debts. The men would bet, for example, on "frivolous matters" like the number of Indians who might pass by a window in a given time. Of course, drinking accompanied this behavior, in order to create excitement for a time, and thus brought many a "brave fellow, who in more active service would have been an honor to his country and friends, to an untimely grave, perhaps by the hand of the duelist."[74] William Hickey, voyaging out to India in the late 1700s to join the East India Company, mentioned that two other cadets on board "differed materially" regarding a gambling debt, which produced a violent quarrel. After abusing each other "in the most scurrilous and blackguard language, they boxed," but the officers on board quickly interfered, observing that such ungentlemanly conduct would lead to cadets' dismissal from the Company.[75] The officers then forced the two to resolve their differences the way gentlemen should, in a duel, though the seconds secretly removed the ball from the duelists' pistols, ensuring that both were unharmed. Upon arrival in India, Hickey witnessed another duel that was caused by the "barbarous" customs of "pelleting," in which dinner guests took pieces of bread and made them into little balls that were then flung across the table. Even women participated in pelleting, and Hickey sneered that this custom was "fitter for savages than polished society" and produced many quarrels, until a Captain Morrison was struck in the face. Morrison had "expressed his abhorrence" for pelleting and decreed that anyone hitting him would be called out. In the duel, Morrison shot the offender through the body, who lay upon his bed for many months and never fully recovered, which "put a complete stop to the absurd practice" of pelleting.[76] Slower to die out was the duel, which was not repudiated until the 1840s, both in England and in India. In 1843 a duel outside of London between Major Fawcett and Lieutenant Munro (who happened to be brothers-in-law) led to the death of Fawcett. The army then refused a pension to Mrs. Fawcett, for her husband had violated regulations against dueling. The effect of this was immediate, for after 1843, when someone was "called out," he could claim that he was protecting his family from

destitution should he lose the duel, meaning that "potential duelists were given the chance of peace with honor."[77]

In the Raj, "peace with honor" is perhaps a useful description of an entire mindset after the 1850s. In India, individual status by this time no longer measured merely in terms of dueling or martial valor, but was marked more by the obsession with status and prestige, and it is all but impossible to imagine late Victorian imperialists "pelleting" each other at the dinner table. Notions of honor mirrored this change as well, and one's reputation no longer depended on one's willingness to duel on the slightest pretext. Honor instead found expression in men who assiduously followed bourgeois codes of conduct and sought to rule India fairly, which mirrored the attitude toward dueling that occurred in England. Aristocratic reputation in England historically depended on an instant response to an insult (as did the status of the lower-class laborer, though again, the aristocrat could afford to fight at a later time, on the "field of honor" denied to working-class men). Middle-class values, however, focused on "reliability, competence, restraint, and deferred gratification, all of which are demonstrated gradually and cumulatively."[78] As usual, Kipling is perhaps the best guide to this mentality as reflected in *The Jungle Book* and *Kim,* in which one should "obey the law, do your duty, play the game, be a man, and do the day's work."[79] This was the guiding ethos of the new Raj, and of course "playing the game" was part of the code that replaced the duel, for by the late Victorian era, the influence of cricket and football encouraged students to see themselves as part of a larger group, whose cohesive nature required that he subordinate his own individual interests to those of the collective.[80] The Raj, after its conquest, required the greatest team effort of all to hold it together, with men required to "play the game," and the competition wallahs could claim that their measured and competent rule was the best hope for redeeming India, as well as British rule there.

The Raj therefore replaced the supposedly inferior customs of the Company with a rigid hierarchy codified by the Warrant of Precedence that allowed for little dissent by its members. The code of the warrior who was prickly about his individual sense of honor now matured into a system in which the needs of the group became paramount. Within a few years in India, the code of Solon had replaced that of Achilles, as the warrior reluctantly gave way to the lawgiver bent on ruling others fairly for little reward except perhaps for the honor that came with the moral exercise of power. In the ancient world, as in pre-1857 India, honor was found in warlike communities of men bent on distinguishing themselves from others through

heroic acts. For Anglo-Indians, honor was now derived from a much stricter code of behavior that could at times limit one's actions. If honor was built in part on reputation, the community had to bestow it, but in the Raj there could be little patience for an Achilles sulking in his tent in a time of crisis. Conforming to a code and knowing the limits of acceptable and unacceptable behavior were the new ideals, and belonging to the tribe always remained paramount in the Raj, especially since Anglo-Indians' native distrust of outsiders was legendary. In this regard, Lycurgus rather than Solon might be a better metaphor for what Anglo-Indians hoped to achieve, for freethinking could rarely be a virtue for a people surrounded by millions of Indians thought to be constantly probing for weakness. Like Spartans with their helots, Anglo-Indians typically sought to remain a race apart from those that they ruled, and competition wallahs were therefore likely to claim an essential difference between themselves and most Indians. Older hands believed this sense of distance/difference was but another manifestation of the deficiency of their character, since the newer men were uncomfortable with alien customs and needed instead to cling as tightly as possible to the customs they already knew and respected. Most change in the Raj was thought to be bad, especially if it encouraged differences of opinion. Unity through a clearly recognized but entirely rational hierarchy was the new ideal, and it was embodied in the middle-class willingness to become part of this hierarchy since they themselves were elevated in the process. If the middle classes were somehow ennobled in this process, so much the better, for imperial society always needed its gentleman to protect it.

The Land of Snobs

Yet, what should always be remembered about the bourgeois is that for all the rhetoric praising them, they were mocked as well. Viewed from above and below, the middle class looked very different, and respectability and integrity more closely resembled "snobbery and pretension to superiority" when viewed from below, and risible mimicry when seen from above.[81] In the nineteenth century, British India acquired the reputation of being a land of snobs, although this pretentiousness served a social purpose in a society based on perceived merit and belonging. "One's occupation, not one's birth, breeding, education, or even financial standing determined one's place in the Indian scheme of things," wrote A. Claude Brown, an editor of a Calcutta newspaper.[82] In such a closed society, social rank depended almost entirely upon official position, and neither wealth, nor family,

nor standing, nor artistic or literary ability determined one's status. Anglo-Indians lived in a world largely without philosophers or intellectuals, since few alternative routes to eminence existed outside of "official" society, and few slipped through the hierarchies imposed by Anglo-Indian society. Anglo-Indians established a ruthless system that distrusted outsiders and set loyalty to the group as one of the highest of imperial virtues, but they almost always felt a sacred kinship to other Britons. Therefore, even though hierarchies in British India were rigidly maintained, any male with a white skin (with the possible exception of the British Tommy) could declare himself honorable and be accepted into elite society by virtue of his rule over a numerically superior people. Moreover, an Anglo-Indian could be considered elite partly because he was much more likely to meet a viceroy than someone of equal rank back home would be to meet the prime minister. Social circles were very small in India, and even though differences of class were readily apparent in Anglo-Indian society, the capacity to claim distinction by virtue of one's race and British background united Anglo-Indian society and promoted a narrow ideology that was believed to keep Anglo-Indians in power. Adherence to such codes helped solidify Anglo-Indian rule and cemented bonds among the ruling society, and the imperial community constantly "found reasons to trust one another and to punish the untrustworthy."[83] Most of the unofficial institutions of empire therefore sought to cement such social relations and draw Anglo-Indians into one simplified and coherent ideology of rule.

As previously noted, Anglo-Indians were helped in this conformity by what Anglo-Indian society lacked, since writers of the first caliber were noticeably absent (Kipling left at twenty-four and never returned to live in India). It was, moreover, a society largely without students, old people, painters, actors, and musicians, and while it exalted duty and self-sacrifice, it undervalued bankers and industrialists. Such a society could see itself only in purely official terms, classifying its members "by the position they achieved and the honors they were awarded."[84] Yvonne Fitzroy, in "Courts and Camps in India," wrote that the chief goal of Anglo-Indians was to "seek Precedence and ensure it."[85] Edward Wakefield, describing such pettiness in his memoir, wrote that one Anglo-Indian "arranged for his washerwoman to have a stone above rather than below that used by the [ICS] commissioner's *dhobi* at the ghat (stairs leading to a river, typically where washing was done)."[86] An Indian critic, describing such strange customs, wrote that Anglo-Indians "worshipped ceremony as a god, treated extremes of fashion as immoral, and freedom of speech

as a shocking breach of decorum amounting to impropriety, and condemned to perdition all who refused to be hidebound by custom."[87] This writer also mocked Anglo-Indians for believing that changes in speech and dress might adversely "affect their prestige."[88] If the country of India was described as inherently conservative and feudal, Anglo-Indian society was almost as rigidly maintained and ridiculous to its critics. Their customs could only be truly understood by those who understood the imperial mission and the hallowed process by which Europeans asserted their authority in India. If places were not assigned for a dinner party, due deference might have been upset and the carefully calibrated system of honors and deference thrown into disorder. The protocols were rigid, monotonous, and homogenized to a degree not found anywhere else in the empire. "'Do you know Mrs. Herbert of Public Works?' the Anglo-Indian hostess might ask. 'May I introduce Miss Entwhistle of Irrigation?'"[89] Place and status having been ascertained for the evening, Anglo-Indians could comfortably and reliably navigate the well-marked channels of imperial society.

Determining who belonged or was admitted into this elite society consequently preoccupied almost all levels of the Anglo-Indian hierarchy, since proper behavior was the mark of a sahib or memsahib, and acceptance and belonging in a cultural, political, and racial elite was a key theme of imperialism. Correct behavior and actions marked one's acceptance and intensified feelings of group solidarity. The answer to challenges made to the Raj lay in shared social values for the group and the requisite moral character of the individual, and "right lines of action and commitment to empire overrode nearly all other concerns of the day."[90] Anglo-Indians thus preferred to keep company, whenever possible, with people who looked and acted like proper imperialists, and who possessed similar political tempers. One Anglo-Indian likened her world to an Atlantic liner floating on the Indian world, in which "water tight compartments" separated Anglo-Indians from "richer minds than his own . . . hence he lacks the very breadth of mind upon the possession of which he congratulates himself."[91] Still, this critic noted that though Anglo-Indians were "dull and snobbish and not obviously clever" and did not understand any race other than their own, "one can detect under the surface of muteness and officialdom the sturdy self-control, [and] the patient and persistent driving force that have made the country what it is today."[92]

After 1858, however, too much innovation was thought to be unhealthy in India, and the rate of change—of almost any sort—was

slowed to an almost glacial rate. What had been deficiencies in the middle-class mentality, at least in India, were now transformed into virtues. Many of the liberal tendencies of British rule in India were accordingly checked by a class of men ostensibly not confident enough to allow change or comfortable enough to establish easy relations with Indians. These new customs were also linked to a more rigid conception of race then emerging in British India, making race a more central component of imperial ideology. The Indian "rejection" of benevolence as demonstrated by the Mutiny allowed a more autocratic (verging on despotic) form of government to be imposed, based on such racial formulations. "Indians," as Thomas Metcalf has described this change, "were not like Englishmen, and it was fatal to treat them as though they were."[93] Thus the (perceived) easier sociability between the races of the previous age gave way to the distance and aloofness that characterized a class of men unsure of their own status and anxious to prove themselves able, if not always friendly, administrators. The nabobs were considered experts at treachery and double-dealing, yet even though "they conquered India, they did not despise it."[94] After 1858, the British who lived in the subcontinent were not conquerors, but many despised it, for when Indians had supposedly turned their back on progress, a heightened race consciousness emerged and feelings of solidarity were strengthened to counter this continual threat of revolt. Like a true aristocracy, they were unconcerned with being liked, instead demanding that they be obeyed and respected, and they "were only further convinced of this by how little they enjoyed doing it and how little they were appreciated for doing it."[95]

If Anglo-Indians were bringing happiness and contentment to India, if not democracy, their own happiness seemed to have been misplaced on the voyage out to India, having been sacrificed to the cult of etiquette. The overly rigid protocols of Victorian imperial society enacted in India would last long past their pinnacle in England. Inherently conservative, the etiquette and domestic manuals produced by Anglo-Indians were intended to maintain the status quo for as long as possible, at which they evidently succeeded, since imperial society—even in matters of fashion—always seemed at lest thirty years behind England. The most infamous example of this ritualized hierarchy was the Warrant of Precedence, in which a civilian of "eighteen years' standing had equal status with a Lieutenant-Colonel but was eighteen places above a Major or a Civilian who had been in the country for only twelve years."[96] At the top of the hierarchy was the viceroy of India, followed by the governors of

Madras and Bombay. In the First Class were ICS members of thirty years' service, the archdeacons of Calcutta and brigadier generals. The Second Class was for ICS members of twenty-three years. Also included in this were the tables of salute: the Queen-Empress (ever since 1877) received a 101-gun salute, while the viceroy got 31 guns. In the Third Class were occupations such as agricultural chemists, the superintendent of the Indian Museum and the superintendent of Stamps and Stationery. Other levels sandwiched into the hierarchy were "Sanitary Commissioners and Conservators of Forest, Senior Chaplains, Managers of State Railways and Superintending Engineers of the Public Works Department."[97] The warrant also gave "essential advice as to whether the superintendent of the opium factory at Ghazipur was to be seated ahead of the general manager of the Rajputana Salt Resources at dinner."[98] The warrant was published each year in *Thacker's Directory,* which also published detailed information on Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, including postal and telegraph rates, customs and stamp duties, and a list of the trades and professions of India. For those stationed in smaller stations, this meant that one dined and sat next to the same people at station at every formal event, adding considerably to the tedium, unless the station decided not to follow precedence, which seems to have happened infrequently.

Most Anglo-Indians therefore saw any diminution of their individual power as a threat to the sovereignty of the Raj. They linked their imperial status to stability, and the Viceroy Lord Ripon, most infamously, learned the dangers of trying to lessen Anglo-Indian prestige. Ripon was a Gladstonian Liberal sympathetic to the claims of Indians for self-rule and sought to make "educated natives the friend, instead of the enemies of our rule."[99] Ripon was responsible for the Ilbert Bill in 1883 and was never forgiven in Anglo-Indian society for this attempt to allow Indian judges to try Europeans, and in a final indignity, his statue in Calcutta was financed solely by Indians, since no Anglo-Indians would contribute.[100] Ilbert was the law member of the Government of India, but as viceroy, Ripon was the more obvious target for the venom of Anglo-Indians, and he was even booed by nonofficial Anglo-Indians and called the "greatest fool in Asia."[101] The bill was seen as a challenge to the control that European capitalists exercised over raw materials and labor in the interior of India. The "white mutiny" that arose as a response to the Ilbert "crisis" resorted to the usual arguments in favor of the Raj—Indian judges could not be trusted with power and Indians would use the loss of white prestige to "fill their harems with

white women."[102] Threats to the honor of Anglo-Indian society, especially when directed at those most insecure about their status in imperial society like the nonofficial community most threatened by the Ilbert Bill, were long remembered and rarely forgiven. Those who had most recently acquired "honor" were the least likely to give it up and were also the most likely to shout the loudest when they felt their honor threatened, since they could only see the bill as an insult. A compromise was eventually reached in which British subjects won the right to trial by a jury composed of at least half Europeans British subjects or Americans, ensuring that they could manipulate the judicial process. The Ilbert affair revealed the fractures in imperial society, since viceroys like Ripon could be assured that they still belonged to the prestigious and honored elite when they sailed for home. Many Anglo-Indians, on the other hand, were well aware that their status could only be maintained in India, making them more likely to desperately cling to the prestige bestowed by a white skin in India. Anglo-Indians were all too aware that they would not be recognized as aristocrats at home, and their forlornness was commented upon by Fitzjames Stephen, who found them "very sensitive" about feeling "undervalued and snubbed in English society."[103] In a short story by O. Douglas, "Olivia in India" (1913), the author claimed that "everybody in India is, more or less, somebody. It must be a very sad change to go home to England and be poor and shabby, and certainly obscure."[104]

In the liberal view from England, it was clear that Anglo-Indians had absorbed most of the perceived faults of conservatives back home. The dispassionate professionals who represented the best hope for a just government in India, according to J. S. Mill, would not prove to be the bulwark against exploitation that he thought they would be. They also proved not to be as pacific as Mill had hoped, for as John Kaye later observed, "in India every war is more or less popular. The constitution of Anglo-Indian society renders it almost impossible that it should be otherwise."[105] A society built on dominance and oppression could never bear to see itself shamed in any way, and thus the Anglo-Indian community usually considered their prestige and honor foremost whenever presented with a crisis, with predictable results.

Because their status could only be maintained while in India, the competition wallahs, unlike the freebooters of an earlier era, saw India as an end unto itself, since they had a steadier but usually smaller income. In their view, however, the more rigid social prescriptions of the competition wallahs demonstrated the endurance needed to prevail there. Now that entire careers would be spent in India and

the subjugation of the land was all but complete, the "birds of passage" settled down to make lives there filled with as many reminders of home as possible, which tended to put more distance between themselves and Indians (with the exception of servants, the keeping of whom elevated almost Anglo-Indians into the ranks of power unknown to them in England). If Anglo-Indians remained in India for twenty years or more, they would be rewarded for their efforts, but most gave up going to India to establish fortunes. Rapid advancement in the imperial bureaucracy was still possible, but the advances now took place almost exclusively on Indian soil.[106]

Consequently, the status and power that the Anglo-Indian experienced in the subcontinent all but disappeared for the Anglo-Indians upon returning home. If the nabobs were caricatured for their obscene wealth and nouveau riche manners, Anglo-Indians had to adjust to diminished lives in England. In the nostalgic collection of oral histories *Plain Tales from the Raj,* a mother described an epiphany by her five-year-old child when confronted by the difference between England and India for the Anglo-Indian. The Anglo-Indian family boarded a train in England and as it started, the child asked why a guard had not come up to ask permission for the train to leave the station. The mother had to explain that they were "no longer in daddy's district," and no one in England would come to ask their permission to start the train.[107] When in England, all Anglo-Indians felt this shock of being without the power that marked their imperial lives, since the hierarchies of honor that existed in India could only be maintained while there. The aristocracy could never accept them as equals, and the lament of the returned Anglo-Indians was a melancholy coda to their imperial service: covenanted civilians were excluded from Victoria's Jubilee, or ladies in England "forgot" dances with gentleman discovered to be Indians officials on furlough.[108] Whatever power the Anglo-Indian did possess was not expressible in the personal and feudal terms that marked their relationship with most Indians in the subcontinent. Lord Dalhousie had once observed that a member of the "Civil Service in England is a clerk, a member of the Civil Service in India may be a proconsul."[109] One very wealthy man from England, dining in India, remarked: "I cannot help thinking that these [ICS] people who go into dinner ahead of me are the wretched people who put up little bungalows round me place in Hampshire."[110] Ultimately, the code of honor was not transferable to England, which made Anglo-Indians cling to it all the more vigorously when in India.

Servants of the Raj

The differing conceptions of their roles in England and India also point to oversimplifying notions of class, especially in an imperial context. Though the middle classes were considered to be dominant in India and the term is useful in describing the virtues of the imperial social formation, it has its limitations in understanding how Anglo-Indians thought of themselves. The term "Service" class is perhaps more useful, this class being composed of administrators, managers, and professional employees in both the public and private sectors. Anglo-Indians in the army of civil services were not part of the capitalist class or the landed class, since in India they owned little or no land, and the salaries for these men were derived from taxes on salt, the peasantry, or directly on land. Even the background of the ICS in the late 1800s reveals the ties of the successful candidate either to the land or to a father who came from this service class. Of the 333 successful candidates between 1874 and 1884, "227 were the sons of landowners, army and navy officers, home and Indian civil servants, clergymen, lawyers and doctors, and 84 came from commercial and farming backgrounds."[111] Most officers of the ICS identified themselves as "upper-middle class," but the relative paucity of candidates from a commercial or industrial background is telling.

These men were somehow different from the typical bourgeois, and as such, the officers represented a more dominant power than themselves, making them servants of the Raj.[112] This system of rule was predicated on the Raj explicitly trusting their servants to safeguard the interests of the imperial government as well as the masses of Indians they ruled, provided they remained loyal. This medieval metaphor has already been explored, but it should be remembered that for the young, ambitious Englishman, India represented a personal fief to which he had hereditary rights. The Anglo-Indian, especially in the ICS or the officer corps of the Indian Army, tended to think of the subcontinent as his birthright and the people there as his charges who needed constant attention. Even in the 1920s and 1930s, the men of this generation still believed in the mission of empire and, perhaps, most importantly, thought it "was the right thing for a young Englishman to do, to go out and rule over a lot of people."[113] The ICS officer therefore tended to see himself as a feudal, but largely benevolent, overlord. Before his appointment to office in India, the ICS officer even made a declaration, much like a medieval oath of fealty, that he would obey the viceroy, behave decently, and agree to the rules as laid down by the Raj.[114] This sense

of trust was an integral part of the identity of the officer. In India, with broadly diffused power, the representatives of the Raj typically possessed relative autonomy within the organization. Because of this bond of trust, officers were free to act as they thought best, and this right was conferred upon them as a perquisite of the job.

As part of this service class, the demeanor of the ICS officer (or, more broadly, the gentleman) was not, however, to be ostentatious, but dignified and somewhat aloof, especially in the ICS. Although the ICS officer ruled over others, he served, allowing him to claim the moral high ground. For the Anglo-Indian to think of himself as a servant, humbly performing his imperial tasks for little remuneration and even less gratitude from those who benefited from his rule, all but required that he embrace honor as foundational to his identity. Even as a humble "servant," he managed to keep his personal sense of integrity and prestige intact, since he served India because "honor bade him do so, not because any absolute authority compelled him."[115] He followed a higher code, one that was internalized and undiminished by being part of a hierarchy, since honor required that his own personal sense of power not be overly restricted.

The elite ICS were given wide latitude in their actions, and a widely related story, surely apocryphal, told of an officer who was given a distasteful order from above. He replied with: "Your letter of the . . . instant, which is before me, will shortly be behind me in another capacity. I am, Sir, your most obedient servant."[116] The ICS officer stood atop the imperial hierarchy, and could therefore rule as he saw fit. Especially if they were secluded in the *moffusil* (the backcountry, or remote station, in India), they could largely do as they pleased, for they seldom received commands from above, at least commands that had to be obeyed, and honor could be maintained more easily there, since commands received from above tended to restrict honor. In addition to outright refusal, another method could be employed to dodge orders from above. The author Philip Mason, a member of the ICS during the 1920s and 1930s, related that district officers circumvented orders by following the "Gambit of the Second Reminder," which relied on "lost" paperwork and was an "infallible recipe for disobeying the order of higher authority," since in Mason's view, the Second Reminder meant "at least a two year lag in any action having to be taken."[117]

The nature of the specific skills taught to the potential officer also reflected the charismatic and personal nature of his rule. The recruit, having passed the civil service examination at or near the top of all recruits, underwent extra training, learning to ride a horse if he did

not already know how, and he also studied a native language, usually Hindustani (Urdu). These were two absolutely necessary skills for someone posted to a remote station in India. Given the vastness and geographical complexity of India, the first-year man could be stationed in a desert plain, in the hills of the Northwest frontier, or in a dense, jungle area—and he almost always went alone. Traditionally, the men of the ICS did not marry during their first few years in India, but rather were expected to devote their energies to the service of India. If they wanted to have a successful career in India, most recruits spent their early years of service in a district away from the large cities of Bombay or Calcutta, since a lack of field service would eventually hamper a career in the ICS or in the army.[118] Since the men of the ICS exercised personal rule over thousands, if not millions, of Indians, friction between Calcutta and those in the *moffusil* was a constant theme in imperial politics, much like the tension between London and Calcutta. Anglo-Indians conceived of themselves as ruling honorably, but the "most" honor accrued to those in the "real" India of heat and dust, in small villages where the cult of feudal power reigned strongest. Those like viceroys or those who knew only the great cities never knew the real India, insulated as they were with tennis and dances. Predictably, those most likely to be in the *moffusil* were army officers and ICS officers, who considered themselves to be the elites of Anglo-Indian society. The ICS and army officers of the *moffusil* saw themselves as "ma-bap" (mother and father) to Indians, reflecting the ideal imperial relationship between ruler and ruled. Thus, the smaller the number of Anglo-Indians in a given area—especially if they were not involved in any kind of extractive industry or agriculture—the greater the honor that accrued to the imperialist.

If the ICS officer did not have the necessary qualities for enforcing obedience and authority when he left Britain, he soon developed them in his district or he quit. Those who stayed usually proved themselves capable; thus, the ICS often gave little guidance to these men, assuming their superior character and sense of honor would lead them to the correct conclusion in dealing with the myriad problems he faced in a district. One first-year man was told to "go out, settle the district, and see that there are no rows."[119] From land disputes all the way to the imposition of death sentences, the men of the ICS sincerely believed that there was nothing they could not do.[120] Honor guided them when the law did not, yet, ICS officials typically saw themselves foremost as protectors of the poor. They conceived of themselves as dispassionate rulers who were above the usual undercurrent of graft and bribery in India, though most did have a reputation with the

Indians for honesty and integrity. They were also forbidden from taking gifts from Indians, and to discourage any other form of graft, ICS salaries were made public among the British, further reinforcing the fact that everyone knew their exact position in society and their hierarchical position within the administration of the Raj. Still, it was not necessarily the institutions of the Raj, but the men who ran it, that made India the proudest achievement of the empire.

Clothing and Protocols

If the middle classes were perceived as self-satisfied and smug, they could always point to their achievements, especially imperial ones, as signs of their moral worthiness to rule the world. Bourgeois rituals also drew strength from the success and solidity of its customs, which so many attempted to emulate, and as the moral temper of the nineteenth century changed for Anglo-Indians, so did the clothes. The glamorous costumes of Calcutta disappeared, replaced by "equally uncomfortable but less glamorous clothes, black morning coats, top hats, even on the hottest of days, and no gentleman or lady ever called on friends without the gloves prescribed by etiquette, even though the temperature might be over a hundred degrees in the shade."[121] Respectability required certain sacrifices, and the maintenance of a new bureaucratic order had to produce outward symbols of its triumph. The illogic of "dressing for dinner in the jungle" was never illogical to an Anglo-Indian male, but was simply an expression of who he was and why he deserved his place in Anglo-Indian society, as well as his right to rule over India. His morality could be seen in his customs, his dress, and in his actions, which were all rigidly proscribed by a society bent on social conformity and outward appearances. Clothes did not necessarily make the man, but the Anglo-Indian male realized that a premium was placed on decorum and proper behavior, and even appearance. To live outside these codes estranged one from the society that produced them and came dangerously close to questioning the moral authority of the Raj.

Imperial manuals explained at great length the protocols of the Raj and the need to conform to them, even if they made little sense to outsiders. Just as the Anglo-Indian regime had to maintain power over India, the internal hierarchy of Anglo-Indian society required specific attributes of obedience, and by making the lines of authority visible, Anglo-Indian society hoped to reduce ambiguity. For example, the chronicler of the ICS, Philip Mason, recounted a story of one Indian scholar, a lawyer nearly seventy years old, forced to get

off his pony and pushed off a road by British subalterns because "no Indian was to ride a horse in the presence of his white masters."[122] Additionally, in the bungalow and in some courtrooms, Indians were not allowed to wear shoes or socks, since "it was an insult for them ever to put on shoes in our presence."[123] Status in the Raj came with a variety of such privileges, and Anglo-Indian society was never as united as when these privileges came under attack (for instance during the Ilbert Bill affair). Such resolute behavior toward Indians was not always possible, but there were other ways not involving such intemperate behavior for Anglo-Indians to mark their customs as superior, for clothes and customs conferred prestige and signified the worthiness of Anglo-Indians to rule over India as well as their ability to transcend it. This logic of separation developed with the century, and, as E. M. Collingwood has pointed out, during the nineteenth century, Anglo-Indians began to wrap themselves in a solid carapace of clothes that insulated them from India and Indians. The wearing of clothes unsuited to the tropics only confirmed the superiority of the Anglo-Indian, whose clothes represented civilization and typically delineated Britons from Indians.

Another change lay in the use of hookahs, since they were associated with indolence. The smoking of hookahs, while fairly common among Anglo-Indian men, carried Oriental temptations for the unwary, and one phrasebook warned:

> It has ever appeared to me a degrading habit for a gentleman to become a slave to his hookah; and it is beyond endurance, to see a great lusty-hookah-burdar, insinuate the pipe of his long *snake* into the delicate hand of a European lady, after dinner, who plies the machine with as much glee as the sable and subordinate nymph of the country does her *naryiyal* (coconut). For the honor and delicacy of the sex, this practice is by no means common; and the wonder is, that it should ever have existed. The habit of smoking . . . is no doubt attributable to that listlessness and want of mental energy, so predominant in the character, both of sojourners and permanent inhabitants of sultry latitudes. The indolent in mind and body are in general its greatest votaries.[124]

Hookah-smoking constituted a double threat to Anglo-Indian masculinity. It encouraged vice and Oriental repose for the "indolent in mind and body" who refused the hookah with difficulty due to their lack of character. Hookah-burdars (those who prepared the hookah for the Anglo-Indian) also broke the social distance between Indian men and Anglo-Indian women, and the obvious sexual imagery imagined by this writer threatened the moral sanctity of Anglo-Indian womanhood with

the debauched state of the hookah-burdar, so "gleefully" enjoying his moment. Honor again demanded that Anglo-Indian women be above reproach; any actions that lessened prestige could rot the moral foundation of the Raj. Such warnings against Oriental luxury that abounded in manuals and guides reaffirmed the need to "remain British" in thought and action, and such judgments about the "masculine power" of Anglo-Indians lay at the very core of imperial society.

Since reputation was central to the Anglo-Indian identity and was confirmed by the group, individuals needed clear symbols that marked them as proper Anglo-Indians, in addition to their white skin. Clothes and customs sanctioned the Anglo-Indian way of living in the tropics, and wearing the proper outfit meant one was acceptable in imperial society. Only in the notorious hill stations was it deemed safe to relax the strict protocols of the Raj. Most importantly for the health of Anglo-Indians was the solar topi, a sort of fetish that demonstrated British ability to overcome debilitating heat.[125] The topi, once considered inappropriate for town wear, became increasingly respectable during the latter 1860s, and in interviews conducted by Professor Frank de Caro in the 1970s, Reverend Leslie Newbigin reflected that "you were a cad if you didn't wear a topi. It wasn't just that you were silly, you had gone native. It was the white tribe's fetish. If you didn't wear a topi, you were not part of the tribe."[126] Being part of the tribe meant dressing the part, and in a society so dependent on image in maintaining rule, clothes were but one more characteristic of the ruling race and its ability to rise above India (and Indians). The official chronicler of the ICS, Philip Mason, reflected that Anglo-Indians were "really fussy about being punctual" and about "wearing the right clothes for specific occasions." This was done in order to "keep up a front and maintain your standards and dress for dinner in the jungle," which aided in "keeping aloof."[127] Imperial life was lived under the withering gaze of opinion, and all the signs of a proper upbringing "told" in the Raj, including proper accent, grammar, posture, bearing, and more. In a *Passage to India*, Dr. Aziz fails to correctly attach a button connecting his collar to his shirt, and Forster's Anglo-Indians needed little else to condemn him. Two Anglo-Indians never needed to look too closely at each other (or at Indians) to see these marks of fitness; all they needed was a glance.

Clothes marked the superiority of imperial society and allowed Anglo-Indians to conquer the subcontinent and its inhabitants by adhering religiously to their customs and distrusting those with heretical notions about India. By giving the British a civic ritual and

sense of place in India, the cult of orderliness allowed the ICS and the Raj to bring order out of the perceived chaos and enormity of India, even while Indians were frozen in medieval customs that they were not allowed to transcend. Such customs represented another way that the British maintained their aloofness from India and showed their ability to conquer the climate while maintaining their prestige and dignity. Personal authority flowed from such attitudes and marked one as *burra* ("great" or "important," as in a *burra sahib*) and not to be trifled with, much like the empire itself. Whether demanding that Indians dismount from a horse or take off shoes in the presence of Anglo-Indians, such customs could not be allowed to wither and die, for they were the methods of imperial administration writ small. Such façades were sometimes described as a "game," and it is probably no accident that amateur theatricals became popular in Anglo-India. To quote Orwell, the imperialist "wears a mask, and his face grows to fit it." Those who could not wear the mask comfortably and enforce their will, especially over "weak" Indians, were no imperialists at all. Orwell lasted five years in Burma, though his experiences with an authoritarian regime would define much of his later work. Those who wanted to last longer would face enormous pressure to conform to a type of group-think that sustained the imperial mission.

Another marker of British superiority lay in her technological prowess, and technology fundamentally changed India's relationship to England, since India could now be more closely tethered to London. Like an overly protective parent, the metropole would seek to monitor events in India more closely, to ensure that the Revolt would never be repeated.[128] In this more rigid relationship, steam-powered ships and the construction of the Suez Canal brought increasing numbers of Britons to India, largely in its most important governmental component, the Indian Civil Service—dubbed the "steel frame" of the Raj. Almost everywhere one looked, a general hardening seemed to be taking place—both in attitudes to Indians and in the methods used to rule them.

The "steel" aspect in this description of the ICS was therefore a fundamental metaphor for this rigid framework of the Raj, marking all the superior elements of British society. The character of the "typical" Anglo-Indian likewise stiffened, as the ramrod-straight backbone of the Anglo-Indian of the Raj replaced the supposed voluptuary thought to be characteristic of pre-1858 India, a time when men had nonetheless been more at ease with native customs. The "indolent" nabobs pictured reclining while smoking hookahs died out, to be replaced by upright Englishmen bent on moral and physical

improvement. These "new men" thus established new protocols and methods of government in India, modifying imperial ideology to match their perceived talents. This "steel frame" was built and maintained by men determined to establish themselves as the fittest group ever to rule India, and they were determined not to sink into "Oriental decadence," the perceived affliction that eventually ground down all of India's previous conquerors from the Aryans to the Muslims (and almost claiming the British as well during the Mutiny). As much as possible, the "new men" in India walled themselves off from Indian society, to protect both themselves and India, justifying this distance because of the degeneration that India seemed to instill in all her conquerors. These sorts of beliefs would eventually harden into caricature in the twentieth century, but like all ideologies, they had coherence and meaning at the time, especially when such beliefs actively helped a tiny minority keep 300 million Indians under the rule of the Raj (a fact that Anglo-Indians rarely tired of proclaiming). Yet, echoing Victoria's grand vision of the "contentment" of Indians, this rule was rarely described as exploitation, and one American admiral believed that the Pax Britannica established after the Mutiny was not maintained by force of arms, but rather "arises from pure contentment. Nowhere in the world is there exhibited such contentment by people under a foreign yoke . . . for every 400 of the natives there is but one English soldier."[129] Actually, the ratio was much vaster, and the ratio of the native population to the European soldier in 1900 was about 5,000 to 1.[130] And in these numbers lay an essential Anglo-Indian truth: the absence of another large-scale Indian revolt was taken as a sign of "contentment" with the Raj, although Anglo-Indians at times complained that Indians did not show enough gratitude for their just rule. Anglo-Indians therefore preferred not to believe that their rule rested on military might alone. Instead, the "foreign yoke" of the civil service was thought to be somewhat unoppressive, especially since the Raj was intent on the physical betterment of India. The metaphor of the "steel frame" reflected the code that made Anglo-Indian society function, for it both structured Anglo-Indian society, making sure that most imperialists measured up, and also providing a bulwark against Indians if necessary, who surely recognized the futility of trying to overthrow a society that provided order and decent government, but one that sat safe and secure behind the protective embrace of its superior customs and was all but impossible for Indians to scale or breech.

Maintaining its distinctiveness (both racial and social), for Anglo-Indian society rested on such easy assumptions about proper and

improper methods of rule. Anglo-Indian society was severely compressed and highly artificial, and so tightly knit that it exerted a constant pressure on all its members to conform. It likewise fostered dissatisfaction with the imperfect replica: all Anglo-Indians were encouraged to demonstrate the virtues of the superior race, and the smallness of the Anglo-Indian community helped in making these distinctions.

Imperial Bodies

Yet this manhood at times had to be bolstered and the temptations of empire overcome. Diseases too, which too often came from temptation, also had to be conquered, especially for the young. One guide to India suggested that the secret to avoiding disease lay in keeping fit, since "microbes, germs, bacilli," preferred a man "a bit below par [rather] than one in perfect health."[131] The man who "goes in for women, smokes more than is good for him, dips his finger too deep or gets a sluggish liver from want of exercise . . . makes the most desirable residence" for these microbes.[132] Keeping fit benefited both the individual and the empire, assuring them both a long and healthy life, and imperial duties demanded a fit and worthy race or the basis of a "natural" superiority quickly vanished. In Europe, an emerging movement decreed that exercise not only developed robust bodies but stimulated the central nervous system and the "brain and spinal marrow," which in turn brought the body under the control of the will.[133] These active and developed minds and bodies could then serve useful imperial needs. Moreover, a vigorous appearance usually signified a moral and healthy mind, not degraded by excessive vice. Those with any important physical weakness were rejected for the ICS, and a guide written to help those applying for the ICS noted the connection between health and intellectual fitness. The author wrote: "It has been forced upon me, by the duties thus performed, that superior physical health and strength are generally essential to success in those competitive exams."[134]

Part of imperial superiority thus lay in the superior physical strength of the Anglo-Indian male, and this strength was declared to have a moral as well as physical foundation. Physical activity now produced a "moral" mind and a person whose body was as fully developed as his brain, if not more so. As two historians have written of this era, "manliness was increasingly divorced from piety and came to be anchored in the cult of games."[135] Such games were schoolboy rehearsal for the reality of empire, and to "step onto the pitch" of

empire required the same virtues—tenacity, diligence, discipline, and teamwork—that kept the empire intact and enlarged it when possible. These sporting abilities translated directly into imperial experience and prepared young imperialists for the challenges of empire, and games likewise allowed the young man to learn to triumph over his own body. Increasing codification of morals and manners marked the end of the nineteenth century, and rules now regulated sports. Along with the emphasis on proper forms of athleticism came a bourgeois emphasis on self-mastery, control, and restraint of the body, but an ideal like fair play could never be equated with weakness, however, and by following such codes the English nation could continually draw upon imperial manhood without worry. Men had to possess, or develop, the same tenacity and courage as the British bulldog, which did not yield, and the author of *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects,* a primer for boys in Indian schools, wrote that the courage that inspired soldiers in battle and sportsmen in the jungle could allow men to face great peril, "not only without fear, but with a kind of stern joy and pride; this fearlessness which brave men share with brave beasts is generally, but not always, accompanied by bodily vigor . . . it is a much higher quality in men than in brutes."[136] Anglo-Indians believed their success in India depended on control of their bodies, and just as the Raj triumphed over nature with public works, the Anglo-Indian ostensibly developed a similar mastery over his own desires and his own body. Even the liberal viceroy Lord Lytton, when meeting a corps of "warlike" Sikh and Pathan cavalrymen, later wrote that he "felt that the Englishman was the finest man of the three, fitted in all respects to command these stalwart hill-men, not only *par droite de conquete,* but also *par droit* de naissance [not only by right of conquest, but also by right of birth]."[137]

As noted, the main flaw of the middle-class imperial type lay in his unimaginative nature, but this was rarely seen as a weakness, since the empire demanded hard work and vigilance rather than speculative minds. The men needed there did not need to overburden themselves with too much theory, and instead, they needed to learn how to make themselves obeyed. Solid as granite, such men never folded in a pinch and continued to "play the game" no matter the odds, at least theoretically. As Eric Hoffer described them in *The True Believer,* the British rulers of India were of a type altogether lacking in the aptitude for getting along with intellectuals in any land, and least of all in India. They were instead men of action imbued "with a faith in the innate superiority of the British."[138] Moreover, Indians (especially babus) were scorned for being "men of words" rather than

men of action, but as much as possible, the British "tried to preserve the realm of action for themselves." Thus, they did not encourage Indians to become engineers, agronomists or mechanics, but instead chose to produce "impractical" men of words, and it is an irony of fate that this system, instead of safeguarding British rule, hastened its end."[139]

Colonial fiction and other works of empire revealed that these codes were based not on academic prowess but on the strength and virility of the somewhat primitive virtues of Anglo-Indians. Energy overcame sloth, degradation, and effeminacy, and energy likewise held the empire together, since notions of Anglo-Saxon supremacy centered on a life of action over one of passive reflection. The will to labor energetically and perseveringly meant that energy "may be defined to be the very central power of character in a man—in a word, it is the Man himself."[140] In the Raj, possession of such "energy" was always more important than genius.

Being resolute men of action, Anglo-Indians were supposedly immune to the Indian tendency to react hysterically in minor situations, and in one Edmund Candler story, the principal of a school, Mr. Skene, is described as having a "thick, sun-burnt neck, broad shoulders and bulging calves, which seemed to stretch out of his wide trousers and made him appear as the impersonation of strength."[141] Like an anchor in a treacherous sea, his physical presence generated a stoic, calm, imperturbable demeanor, which made him a natural leader. In this story, Mr. Skene gives a speech in which he defends the lack of free press and free speech in India: "Things are different here [in India], rumours of cow-killing will stir blood to a white heat, the story of a defiled mosque will raise a Jihad. There is all the difference between holding a lighted match to an iron safe and to a hay-stack."[142]

Principals like Mr. Skene were typically not imperial heroes, but it is obvious why Candler chose to exalt him. If conforming to the group norms forestalled further violence by Indians, then this was the more honorable behavior for middle-class Anglo-Indians to follow. Sameness kept one in the group, and though the ICS rode atop the imperial hierarchy, most levels of the imperial society found solace in their own honor and honorable acts that maintained the dignity of the Raj. If the age of heroes was past, the age of the bourgeois would be marked by an ability to patiently lay down the grid of civilization where little to none had existed—much like the methodical work of a schoolteacher or principal. Moreover, the cult of frenetic activity in British India—the excessive record-keeping, the census reports, and

the cult of work that underlay imperial rule—all these acts became new creeds that were worshipped and exalted by men who were sure their intentions for India were noble and honorable. The cult of progress represented the path to honor, and adhering to these customs and participating in the imperial discourse in prescribed ways brought *dignitas* and gravitas to the imperial task. Much like Candler's models of imperial manhood, Kipling's heroes were those who followed the codes of the group. Those who did not, like "The Man Who Would Be King," were posers, "fallen" whites outside the accepted hierarchy of Anglo-Indians. Their attempt at kingship could only take place beyond the rim of mountains in the wilds of Kafiristan, where British law had not yet triumphed. The ideal man was therefore one who followed duty and not his own potentially flawed heroic ideals. Without honor to guide it, empire was merely another form of exploitation with which Asia had long experience.

All over the empire, the stability and tranquility of the Pax Britannica was thought to depend on such men of character who closely followed these requisite virtues. G. W. Steevens wrote that the "Englishman stays at his post, and shoots, and rides, and gives orders."[143] These were the simple virtues, closely adhered to, that kept the empire great, and these were somewhat different characteristics than those that had won the empire. The fact that Steevens's imperial specimen obeyed the hierarchy gave him more power and justified his rule over Asians (or most nonwhites), whose inability to follow such ideals kept them in a subservient state. As described by Steevens, such men, and not the institutions to which they belonged, were arguably the bedrock of British imperialism. They lived by an unofficial code sanctioned by other men with whom they socialized, but the intense scrutiny of Anglo-Indian society deemed whether they were of imperial caliber or not. If all the men there were not necessarily considered to be "first rate," the lesser ones were expected to know their job and perform it. Such distinctions, based on specific ideas of honor, character, and masculinity, were the guiding ethos of the British in the late nineteenth century. Because of their theoretically more virtuous lives, the rulers of India were able to direct India in a direction suitable and appropriate for a people still learning that liberal democracy required patience, fortitude, and manly virtues that were presently absent from most of Indian society. India, since it apparently lacked significant numbers of such honored gentlemen, had little hope of self-rule, and instead, would be better off following their mandarin leaders, whose ideals alone represented the salvation of India.

The middle-class deficiencies of intellect were more than compensated for by the achievements of the race in India, though this emphasis on appearances and shared values drove Anglo-Indian society to gradually retreat to the clubs and gymkhanas, to the hill stations, and to their bungalows—all areas where the immediate environment could be controlled, and where one could be physically apart from the chaos, dirt, and noise of India. Indian bazaars, moreover, represented the "filth and beauty" and in general the temptations of the east. Thus, bazaars were definitely off limits to European women, and men did not like to go there even as escorts since most "loathed them with a truly masculine hatred."[144] By focusing on areas which could be controlled and by emphasizing the imperial traits needed for Anglo-Indians, the Raj produced the appropriate symbols for the maintenance of British imperial supremacy, and for a society that "did not always agree that what it was doing was right, imperial causes sought to either silence or co-opt the voices of doubt and opposition."[145] The pleasures of the nautch and the graceful hedonism of the nabobs had given way to club life, billiards, the "pleasures" of the amateur theatrical, and after-dinner parlor games. Alcohol never completely fell from favor, however, perhaps because of these newer pursuits, which evidently required near-heroic levels of drink. Yet such protocols ensured the longevity of the empire, which could only be sustained by men and women who knew how to maintain prestige, and as commonly recounted, the club windows were always shuttered during rehearsal for amateur performances, lest some Indian see a memsahib in an undignified or less than stately condition. For Anglo-Indians, an emphasis on such shared customs and rituals reinforced the cultural, political, and racial ties that forced the alien rulers into an ideologically compressed society, which found ennoblement in the civilizing work of empire even as they downplayed the very tangible material and economic benefits their country received from India.

No Country for Old Men

India, unfortunately, demanded much of its conquerors, whose health was often ruined while there, and the cemeteries filled with the Anglo-Indian young (both children and young adults) served as mute testimonies of imperial sacrifice. Anglo-Indians therefore had to construct belief systems that counteracted the perceived degeneration of the Anglo-Indian body in a subtropical climate, and the goal for the ICS, as with almost all Anglo-Indians, lay in radiating a youthful vigor since the elderly lessened prestige, and many authors commented

on the absence of the British elderly in India. India seemed to be stocked by young men, and Santayana famously remarked on the Englishman as the "sweet, just, boyish master of the world"[146] Most Anglo-Indians retired to England, and when they left, their place was ideally taken by someone fresh out from England who would have "all the strength and vigor of their race," and who brought with them "the latest knowledge from the colleges and schools and workshops of their country."[147] After a twenty-year career, the typical ICS officer retired with his pension to England. Army troops were likewise rotated home on leave in an effort to keep them from "going native" or being "browned off" by the fierce climate and temptations that India offered. In India, youthful vigor was thought to triumph over imperial problems with some regularity, and consequently, the British regenerated India by remaining fresh and vibrant. This contrast was all the more compelling since many Anglo-Indians described Indian civilization as ancient and decadent, so that Anglo-Indian autonomy also rested on their members being in the prime of life, which contrasted with the perceived infirmity of most Indians. A middle class in the middle of their life brought the age of equipoise to India. Not too brash and youthful, but not yet senile and feeble, Anglo-Indians were the workhorses of imperial administration, as described by Fitzjames Stephen. Upon arriving in India in 1869, he described the immense amount of work done by Anglo-Indians: "The people work like horses, year in and year out, without rest or intermission, and they get hardened and toughened into a sort of defiant, eager temper." He was also impressed by the masculine power of this middle-aged society.[148]

Though they did little to no manual labor, Anglo-Indians described their lives of unceasing work, occasionally punctuated by the excitement that only India could provide for those of more limited means. The tedium of providing a regular system of administration did have its downside, and as an antidote to doubt and boredom, work and sport held an exalted place in India. Boredom had to be borne as another burden of empire and taken as part of a sense of responsibility: "He is bored, but boredom is a duty, and there is nothing else to do," wrote one Anglo-Indian.[149] Often exasperated by their depictions in England of lives spent in Oriental leisure, Anglo-Indian society responded by yoking their lives, their work, and even their boredom to the imperial mission, and one Anglo-Indian wrote of "the nobility of their task [that] seemed to throw a sort of moral grandeur over their lives that might otherwise have been commonplace and even ignoble in their dullness."[150] By elevating their own contributions to

the Raj, they were able to take part in something larger than themselves and to live by a code that required patience and perseverance, which were the perceived traits that sustained the empire.

Although an emphasis on work therefore remained paramount in empire, the real mission lay in governing other men, thus the work typically performed by Anglo-Indians was of a very specific nature—as overseers. Though the middle classes in Britain were closely associated with technological progress, the men who ruled India after 1857 found many ways to disassociate themselves from being linked too closely to such technology. There were always large numbers of Indian minions to receive orders and carry out degrading or offensive work and keep Anglo-Indian hands clean, and work that involved heavy labor or the sullying of one's hands was rarely performed by Englishmen. Even though the Anglo-Indian was still expected to follow most Anglo-Indian conventions, the cult of the individual in India reigned supreme, especially when it came to naked displays of power. Servants existed for a purpose, and the gentrification of Anglo-Indian society rested on the labor of others in a quasi-feudal political and social arrangement—or as one guide to gardening in India noted: "When I speak of doing a thing in the garden myself it merely means I sit, or stand, and see it done. In this land no one does any gardening personally."[151] If they did not perform the work themselves, they *organized* the work. Anglo-Indians, moreover, rarely received orders from others—at least directly—and they neither punched clocks nor dealt with overbearing bosses. Their adherence to an unofficial code was largely voluntary and in the best interests of the empire, which in turn buttressed the imperial ideal of noble service for a just cause.[152] The "instant aristocrats" quickly aped the traditional role of the aristocracy in England, and they framed their arguments over the justness of their rule in much the same way, as a natural aristocracy who deserved to rule others. This medieval vision of deference and respect was especially appealing because it downplayed the importance of wealth or intellect.

Honor Found and Honor Lost

Since the Raj relied so heavily on symbolism and the appearance of control, Anglo-Indian society reserved its harshest criticisms for those who questioned Britain's imperial motives in India, as this most directly threatened the sanctity of the Raj and the honor of its administrators. As noted, India's contributions to England's imperial economy tended to be downplayed, which helped distinguish the Raj

from the rule of the East India Company and the earlier conquerors of India interested mostly in conquest and profit. Questioning the motives of Anglo-Indians undercut the imperial mission, and such criticism from Indians on this charge was naturally expected. When it came from England, Anglo-Indian society produced fierce rebuttals and protestations that those in England did not understand exactly how English global preeminence was maintained. Anglo-Indian society resented its portrayal in the English press, and this created friction between the two societies about the realities and perceptions of Anglo-India. Always image-conscious, Anglo-Indian texts constantly stressed the work of empire, yet the staged version of empire, packaged for a public back in Britain eager for good news of empire, rarely sat well in India. The stay-at-home imperialists never knew the real India experienced by Anglo-Indians—the sweat, the labor, and unremitting toil without reward or recognition. Jingoism was therefore typically frowned upon by Anglo-Indians, since chest-thumping and excessive braggadocio too closely resembled the misperceptions held by many of the English who had never been to India, meaning that one had to live in India to understand it.

Anglo-Indians rarely thought of their own imperial texts as being bombastic, like those produced in England; rather, they tended to emphasize the "real" India and its administration. Cheap, cardboard versions of imperialists sullied the reputation of those who actually performed the work of empire with very little fanfare and belittled the sacrifices made by those cut off from English civilization. Those who ruled other men need not boast nor beat the imperial drum too loudly, as one author of the time suggested, writing of the "ignorant mind and undisciplined mind that talks cant about the glory of an Empire for which it is unwilling to make the slightest sacrifice."[153] Instead, proper decorum and bourgeois morals emphasized the restraint shown by men of character while serving in India. As always, there were exceptions to this rule, but Anglo-Indians constantly harped on the misperceptions and ignorance of the English about their own empire. In a satirical account of the British abandonment of India at a future date, the anonymous Anglo-Indian author of *India in 1983* described the viceroy's departure from India, as "distinctly not a dignified exhibition," with people looking on "with apathy."[154] After arriving at the Bombay harbor in a buggy, the viceroy boarded a mail steamer bound for England. Yet, in the satire, when the London papers describe the departure, the author reveals his disdain for the London media's penchant for creating melodrama where none existed. The London version of events thus alludes to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise,

reporting that the departure of the viceroy was witnessed by the vast population of Bombay (some two million in all). Moreover, according to the London press, the viceroy was drawn in a raised car drawn by four white elephants, and all the castes of India were represented in the procession.[155] Such fundamental misunderstandings of the real work in India caused Anglo-Indian society to distrust those outsiders. They bore this burden so that the empire could remain powerful, and their melancholy spirit of self-sacrifice and their resentment of jingoism only reinforced the sense of following a code self-restraint and sober ideals. In essence, imperial society was somehow "different" from Britons back home, and this separation was embodied in the sense of honor that Anglo-Indians felt.

For Anglo-Indians, to have their honor threatened by other Englishmen was especially galling, and imperialists could never stomach their depictions by critics like Kipling's "Padgett M.P." or the critics who came to India during the cold weather and never saw the "real" India. Knowing that his intentions for India were honorable, the Anglo-Indian considered himself to be above reproach, and others could not evaluate his motives for being there. This is why Anglo-Indian society showed such distrust for the "instant expert" sent out from England for the grand tour of India. Especially loathed and scorned were such MPs like Padgett or other "Traveling Gents" (TG) associated with liberal causes, since these critics tended to question the noble ideals of service of those residing in the subcontinent. Nothing raised the ire of Anglo-Indian society more than being judged by outsiders with little experience in India. Like all closed and embedded societies, they had somehow convinced themselves that India could not live without them. Kipling, in "The Enlightenment of Padgett, M.P.," sought to discredit the "sneers of the traveled idiots who duly misgovern the land."[156] Outsiders, especially those from the home island, were often the very people to question of honorable intentions of the Raj, at least in a way that might resonate adversely with the public back home.. Those who questioned the imperial ideal, such as the instant expert sent out from England and radical MPs, were usually the object of scorn in Anglo-Indian society.[157] The distrust of the instant expert represented an ideological blindness on the part of the Anglo-Indian community, as well as an unwillingness to face up to the consequences of imperial exploitation. The appeal to honorable intentions, in fact, may have helped assuage guilt over the treatment of Indians, since ultimately the tonic of just governance would theoretically bring more benefits to the subcontinent, although the medicine may not have been pleasant for Indians. Overlords needed

legitimacy, and meddling politicians like Kipling's Padgett both threatened and questioned this legitimacy. The distrust of outsiders reminds us that Anglo-Indians often thought of themselves as a breed apart who were devoted as much to India as to Britain, and they could be quite prickly when such outsiders questioned their honor. Yet even outsiders and critics of empire often cast their criticism in the language of honor and shame. In his infamous review of Kipling, "The Voice of the Hooligan," Robert Buchanan blamed Kipling and the jingo press for damaging England's international reputation. In addition to blaming the media for "keeping the public intelligence on a low level" with "hasty news and gossip, and with bogus views of affairs concocted in the interests of the wealthy classes," Buchanan wrote that he loved his country and would "gladly see it honored and respected wherever the English tongue is spoken."[158] Kipling, giving free reign to his own inner hooligan, had done incalculable damage to the English reputation, and Buchanan hoped that this "wild orgy of savagery" that Kipling represented would fade away, though until then, the English would pay for these attitudes in "blood, tears and shame." Buchanan still believed the empire to be a force for good.

Dangerous signs of anarchy and degeneration had appeared in the late nineteenth century though, and the growth of the French and German economies was eyed with some nervousness by Britain. As these European rivals for empire began to encroach on the British world system, England responded with an increasing militarization of public life. A world system that contained wars and guaranteed profits could not be yielded to colonial or European pretenders, and a national and individual emphasis on work was intended to counter any degeneration and helped keep chaos and nemesis from overtaking the empire. India was a place of work for imperial society, of hard work followed by even more strenuous leisure, and thus did not seem congenial to a life of idle speculation. India was the land of doers, of joiners who could get things done. Indians, on the other hand, gave in to the climate, and "the love of repose reigns in India. . . . It is more happy to be seated than to walk; it is more happy to sleep than to be awake; but the happiest of all is death."[159]

Imperial manuals often spelled out how domination could be achieved over such people, and the revival of climactic theories of Indian degeneration coincided with the waning of reform movements in India in the mid-nineteenth century. Such manuals also revealed the fear of individual degeneration among Anglo-Indian society. In the imperial mind, India was a calling that required a missionary spirit and a life of dedicated service within a rigid hierarchy that demanded

loyalty, conformity, and a sacred conception of duty to empire. Valentin Chirol, in *Indian Unrest* (a book written in 1911 to counter surging Indian nationalism and to warn of imperial hubris among the Anglo-Indian community), decried the lack of administrative "spleen" shown by the most recent batch of colonial administrators, especially those of the uncovenanted lesser civil services. (All members of the ICS entered into a "covenant" with the secretary of state for India that directed the officer not to engage in trade or accept gifts from Indians. Such a covenant sought to pay the officer a more-than-decent wage to keep him from resorting to bribes, which were the perceived flaws of the officers of the East India Company. This system also connoted the sense of internal hierarchy of the Raj.) The author complained of men being sent to India as lawyers, doctors, or educators, but who did not possess the necessary temper to rule Indians. These men were nonetheless allowed to work in India with no knowledge of the language or customs of the people. Such people, whose attitudes were the result of "carelessness or ignorance at home," only came to India for jobs, but the author reminded his reader "there is no room in India for jobs."[160]

All jobs were in a sense imperial jobs, for in the subcontinent, the downward trajectory of Indian decline was usually compared with the arc of England's progress. Treacherous India, however, was often described as having seductive powers for the uninitiated or ill prepared. Those who succumbed to its temptations damaged the prestige of the ruling race and manuals repeatedly focused on the dangers of the Indian climate and especially of its women. The subtropical climate could cause a degeneration of mind and body that was especially dangerous for otherwise vigorous Europeans. The Indian body, having adjusted to the tropical climate, had theoretically already responded by becoming languid and lethargic. For the British though, their medical knowledge blunted the impact of Indian disease.[161] The fear of degeneration surrounded the British in India, and they had only to look around them to see examples of degradation and the dangers of "going native." The Portuguese, once rulers of India themselves, had traveled the path of miscegenation that led them inevitably downward into imperial and moral collapse.

For Anglo-Indians to take pride in their work required that as many of them as possible, if not agreeing on the methods used, should at least "put up a good show" in their work. Anglo-Indians were expected to follow the conventional rules laid down by their society, and ignoring such protocols was likely to cause trouble. Upon arrival in India, many youngsters were placed with "old India hands"

to ensure that their behavior would prove acceptable, or to change it if it fell short of the ideal. As noted previously, the indoctrination of the griffins was commonly carried out by having these newcomers live with their superior officers, to determine if they were fit enough for imperial rule and to instruct them in the social conventions of Anglo-India.[162] Anglo-India was both remarkably open and remarkably closed, for hospitality was expected throughout the land from those who were already members of the dominant order, so that any Anglo-Indian could travel with the full expectation that he or she would be cared for by a countryman. In a novel, Maud Diver called this attitude the "land of the Open Door, "where the wandering bachelor—sure of his welcome—drops into any meal of the four. . . . India is the land of dinners, as England is the land of five o'clock teas."[163] This openness had its darker side however, serving both as mutual surveillance and as a way to enforce a rigid and "correct" attitude to India and Indians. Such protocols ostensibly kept degeneration at bay, through constant vigilance and the policing of norms.

"How the Raj chose to see itself" was of course very different from the perceptions of the European population actually living there, giving rise to the "illusion of an essentially elite European community."[164] More than half the Europeans living in late nineteenth-century India were "poor whites"; however, these people were all but invisible to the "official" community in India, since the "poor whites" possessed the least honor, and also had enormous potential to degrade the racial prestige of the ruling elite. Their very existence was a rebuke to dominant stereotypes about the ruling class, and their lack of honor disqualified them from acceptance into the official Anglo-Indian community. Fundamental to honor was its opposite—shame. "Fallen" whites represented one of the great fears of Anglo-Indian society, the loss of dignity, respect, and shame brought upon by dubious moral act. Thus, a constant sorting took place among the Anglo-Indian community in India, as those deemed worthy of the inner circle of power were vetted for imperial rule, while those cast outside this circle quickly fell from imperial grace. The "loafers" and "poor whites" who had fallen away from the norms of the group were dangerous in a world where race discipline kept Indians in check.

A number of legal and moral regulations attempted to regulate and explain those who "did not measure up" to their imperial tasks, and these outcastes demarcated the boundaries between acceptable and nonacceptable behavior. Their nonstatus was much commented upon by Anglo-Indians, and their irrational behavior was typically attributed to drink, drugs, or the dangers of "going Oriental." Degeneration

led to dishonor and debarment from the ruling caste, such distinctions providing boundaries and reaffirmation for those who remained in power of their sense of mastery over themselves and India. Especially despised were those Europeans deemed "vagrants," which meant any person of European extraction (other than Eurasians) found asking for alms or "wandering about without any employment or visible means of subsistence." Any such persons could be sent to a government workhouse, or the Raj would find employment for them, though their failings were typically blamed on alcohol or drugs, and not described as a failing of blood or race. If the vagrant failed to obtain employment within fifteen days of his arrival, he would be forwarded to a workhouse. Moreover, if he could find no "suitable" employment, the local government could "cause him to be removed from British India (at the expense of the Raj). A "persistent vagrant," one who had been convicted under the act on vagrants, was also "deprived of his privileges as a European British subject."[165] Begging could never be reconciled with imperialism, and the hierarchy had to be policed through such laws. Even private soldiers of the British Army could threaten honor, due to their drunkenness or claims to be sahibs. The historian Dilke, in *Greater Britain,* wrote that "it was impossible to over-estimate the harm done to the English name in India by the conduct of drunken soldiers."[166] Those lower down in the hierarchy, such as soldiers and vagrants, needed near-constant surveillance to ensure that their actions did not harm imperial prestige, or at least the claim of moral superiority for Anglo-India.

Such "loafers" knew the bazaars intimately, and were often men who had deserted from the army or navy, as immortalized by Kipling in "The Man Who Would Be King."[167] Such behavior in England could be more easily ignored, but the sense of unity demanded in British India bound everyone together for their own safety. Vast social chasms that existed in Britain shrank in India and were bridged by a society bent on maintaining dominance, so that ideas of honor bridged the gap and helped bury the differences that had existed back home. Imperial hierarchy was undoubtedly reflexively hierarchical, but the needs of empire and this desire for unity forced Anglo-Indians into a hierarchy in which prestige had to be preserved at all levels, and those who failed to cultivate this prestige could not be allowed to remain in the honor group.

The imperial hierarchy of India thus fulfilled its purpose in offsetting anxiety about the right to rule there. These anxieties were expressed in various forms, but many centered on the cult of the body and the demarcation of appropriate and inappropriate imperial

behavior. By following these customs, empire could be maintained, yet failure to live up to these codes imperiled Anglo-Indian society and the Raj. Willing themselves to believe that they were part of an honor group, Anglo-Indians took solace in the view that most of their actions could be linked to sacred conceptions of duty and honor, two touchstones to which they continually returned. Since the Raj relied so heavily on symbolism and the appearance of control, Anglo-Indian society reserved its harshest criticism for those who questioned Britain's motives in India, since such critiques threatened not only the sanctity of the Raj but also the good intentions of its administrators, and not least of all, their honor.

Conclusions

Ultimately, such claims about honor and shame rested less on rigorous logic than on appearance and reputation, which carried an internal logic of their own that was understood by every Anglo-Indian. The appearance of rationality, of clothes, of the solar topi and British medicines, and of rigid discipline all mattered in a society dependent on the judgments of the group in determining one's acceptance and "place" in the hierarchy, and demonstrating these typically Western and British virtues was always a preoccupation of Anglo-Indian society. Anglo-Indians sought to control degeneracy through a set of rigorous but ennobling rituals. Appearance mattered to a degree that outsiders found bordering on the ludicrous, but the structures of imperial India were expressed in such various locations as government buildings, government works, the bungalow, and upon (and within) the body of the Anglo-Indian male and female. All these microsites of empire implied a hierarchy that could be seen and felt. Without a visible hierarchy empire crumbled away, since any movement that threatened social distinction could also level imperial government. The genius of the middle-class method lay in justifying this hierarchy by linking it to notions of honorable rule. Adhering to the rigid hierarchy made Anglo-Indians and the empire great, and this way of seeing the world was taken as natural. If India was like most societies throughout history in preferring rule by honor, Anglo-Indians would become a nonaristocratic aristocracy based on ideas of blood, duty, and the perceived nobility of their task. As Lucy Smalley in Paul Scott's *Staying On* expressed it, "a hierarchy was a hierarchy, and a society without a clear stratification of duties and responsibilities was no society at all, which the Indians knew as well as anyone, let alone the British."[168]

Chapter 3

Queen of the Earth: An Empire of Honor

In every quarter of the world Rome is still looked up to as the mistress and queen of the earth, and the name of the Roman people is respected and venerated.

Marcellinus of Antioch

We are here as representatives of Christ and Caesar to maintain this land against Shiva and Khalife. In that task we shall not falter. . . . If you agitate, you will be punished; if you preach sedition, you will be imprisoned, if you assassinate, you will be hanged, if you rise, you will be shot down.

Al Carthill, The Lost Dominion[1]

As the British Empire reached its final stages of expansion during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it increasingly looked to the example of Rome as a guide for its own imperial destiny. As a former colony of Rome, England had often consciously emulated the Roman imperial example, and the English invoked Rome to conjure up images of themselves as the modern paragons of the virtues that seemed inevitably to lead to world domination. The apogee of British rule consequently spawned a number of works that explicitly compared the two powers, and this latter stage of empire marked both the pinnacle of British power and its closest association with Rome, since the British now imagined themselves as the repository and embodiment of the Roman past. The British could draw on a treasury of Roman virtues with interest, and the dividends would

be the honorable rule of a civilizing power ruling over backward people—to the benefit of both. Now more than ever, the British were the heirs of Rome.

Yet the British simultaneously had to distance themselves from that other great theme of Roman history—decline and fall. Roman history revealed the dangers of Eastern luxury and vice to once hardscrabble cultivators who had acquired their dominion through patience, fortitude, and a devotion to ancient ideals. The East seemed to produce men (and virtues) of a different stamp, for it had been conquered and ruled by men who slowly turned themselves into gods. Its history was marked by flamboyant, if ephemeral, conquest before sinking into typical Oriental "decadence." If Eastern dominions, moreover, were obliterated and buried beneath the sands of history with no legacy other than that of cruelty, Romans conquered and held territory through the steady and methodical administration of far-flung lands, and this legacy inspired the British to make constant comparisons between themselves and the Romans. Even the threats to both empires were thus very similar, in that both empires always had to fight the barbarians at the gate while they simultaneously sought to produce imperial men who were capable of defending the homeland. Thus, whether interpreted as exemplary or as cautionary tales, the Roman comparison provided many writers with a fruitful, though potentially vexing, comparison. Kipling, as usual, posed the issue most poignantly, for in comparing the two he asked, "But when the situations are so ludicrously, or terribly, parallel, what can one do?"[2]

In between encomium and cautionary tale lay many more examples, for comparisons with Rome ranged over a broad swath of ideological territory. In his recent *Decline and Fall of the British Empire,* Piers Brendan describes some of the myriad ways Roman history seemed applicable to imperial Britons, who mined different eras of Roman history like archeologists sifting through the rubble, all the while looking for signs of former greatness that could be applied to their own era. Republican Rome was "pure, virtuous, heroic, the matrix of Macaulay's Horatius and Kipling's Regulus."[3] Stoic Rome was exemplified by the noble Brutus and Marcus Aurelius, or even Horace at the bridge, bent on defending his homeland with no thought of his own safety. The Pax Romana and the golden age of the Antonines represented the summa of a well-organized civilization (and empire) that took care of its subjects and bestowed good government. In architecture, "there was monumental Rome, imitated wherever British imperialists wished to enshrine power in stone."[4]

The earlier empire of England, however, sought to distance itself from Rome because of its perceived decadence, choosing to emphasize instead the goals of free trade and the spread of freedom. Rome thus served as an example of imperial overreach. In the eighteenth century, proponents of the "empire of the deep" still had suspicions of territorial empire, and the English at the time preferred to imagine themselves as a free people resisting the imperial aspirations of France and Spain, both of which were associated with the "popery" and "despotism" that ultimately flowed from Catholic Rome. Even in the early nineteenth century, imperialism was "associated pejoratively with the Napoleons in the continent,"[5] and the example of Rome was shunned by British political thinkers—the conventional wisdom being "that over-expansion had ultimately destroyed Rome" since "the empire had become too unwieldy. Its people had lost their taste for freedom, and they [the Romans] had been corrupted, above all, by the wealth and luxury of the East."[6] Romantic writers would even sympathize with the Orient more than with Rome, thus downplaying the importance of the classical era, since (according to Madame de Stael), Greeks and Romans lacked character, because "action was all in antiquity and character played not the same role as in modern times."[7] Rome was also associated with decadence, cruelty, and a lack of virtue, as evidenced by Bulwer-Lytton's *Last Days of Pompeii*.[8]

By the end of the 1800s, however, the reputation of Rome would be rehabilitated as British soldiers and administrators ostensibly became more moral, more popular, and more Christian, thereby marching into late nineteenth-century prominence and reflecting the newfound admiration for a well-run empire governed by an efficient bureaucracy.[9] By this time, even the word "imperialism" acquired a more positive connotation than it had earlier, reflecting the mood of a nation that had become more consciously imperial. In India, especially after the Revolt of 1857, Britons could take more pride in this realm of empire, since the subcontinent was no longer to be exploited for commercial gain; rather, it now fulfilled a higher purpose.[10] The liberal forces of reform (and self-rule for Indians) were also checked, and Rome was more willingly embraced as an example of an authoritarian society that brought benefits to backward and unenlightened subjects. The cult of Rome also helped to spawn a new form of masculinity that was more sober and serious, and marked by a stoic code that the Roman typified. In India stoic restraint was exalted, especially in regard to previous conquerors of India who lacked such a code, leading inevitably to their downfall. As noted in Chapter 2, the Anglo-Indian, especially of the ICS, exemplified

this ideal type, and more broadly the Anglo-Indian was thought to be the only person to be trusted with wide-ranging, imperial power, since it rested uncomfortably on shoulders not accustomed to such authority. Honor stayed the authoritarian whip hand of empire, or so it was thought, and Anglo-Indians generally conceived of their mission in highly moral terms—consciously echoing Virgil, who had described the duty of the Romans "to humble the arrogant and be sparing to their subjects."[11] Thus, even though historians since Gibbon have often gleefully focused on the decline and fall of Rome, the example of a world power spreading civilization to the far corners of the known world remained an important ideal, and historically, "the *idea* of Rome as a great, unifying world entity has probably been more significant."[12] In an age which saw Queen Victoria become an empress and the British officers metaphorically transformed into Roman centurions, the men who governed and protected the empire increasingly emphasized their paternalism, duty, and self-sacrifice, conceiving of their mission to rule over others in lofty language that expressed these moral beliefs.

To understand what Rome meant to the British (and Anglo-Indians) and why this was important, this chapter focuses on British descriptions of Rome and how such histories were deployed to help the British understand their imperial mission. I will also examine British descriptions of both their own history and that of India, especially since history was employed to justify the continuing British presence in India, and an almost continual need existed to contrast British history—properly understood—with Indian history. The focus is therefore somewhat broader in this chapter than in others. If nationalism is in part an invented tradition, the imagined relationship that Britons maintained—through an almost constant dialogue both with their own past and with that of Rome—opens up methods through which Britons could think of themselves as an imperial race who were ruling India in the name of progress and enlightenment. Conversely, how Rome dealt (or did not deal) with their problems was thought to be illuminating and useful, especially for a Western power seeking dominion in the East, a place that traditionally tended to absorb her conquerors and make them fall away from the virtues that led to their original dominance.

In India, most Anglo-Indians (especially those in positions of power) were thoroughly familiar with the classical world, and this knowledge would be put to use by the rulers of India in the competitive exams to get into the ICS. Histories of India sought to justify the imperial mission, using India's past to buttress claims of the British

right of conquest there. India could not claim nationhood if it had never been a nation in the first place, and history was found to be useful in forestalling claims of Indian independence (or that the subcontinent was capable of unifying on its own).

National Honor

Phiroze Vasunia has skillfully described the effect that Rome had on the Victorians, a list that includes "Benjamin Disraeli, William Gladstone, Rudyard Kipling, Lord Curzon, Arthur Balfour, and Robert Baden-Powell."[13] There were many other, lesser examples, but the British continually turned to Rome for instruction and enlightenment on running their empire, especially since Rome had been eminently successful in articulating similar honorable ideals of ruling others justly and fairly, and it provided the basic model for a technologically advanced civilization spreading its benefits to backwards provinces and peoples. In order to spread this message of cultural and technological superiority, a number of works published in this era all made similar points about the similar gifts of Rome and England in the manly art of imperial government. For example, Evelyn Baring (Lord Cromer), who taught himself Greek and Latin and was later president of the Classical Association, published *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* in 1910. Cromer described both empires to be "alien benefactors" in the East, although he noted that the problems of the Romans were "easy" compared with the problems faced by the British, due to the hunger of other European nations for colonies, which led to the scramble for Africa, as well as increasing tensions among the European powers prior to the outbreak of World War I. James Bryce, who won a first in classical moderation at Oxford in 1859 as well as the Chancellor's Latin essay prize in 1862, would put his knowledge to imperial use in *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India* (1913). Not surprisingly, Bryce believed that if the British Empire could be compared to any other empire, only Rome was suitable for a historical analogy. Moreover, according to Bryce, both peoples conquered because of "their strenuous and indomitable will, buoyed up by the pride and self-confidence from a long succession of victories in the past. . . . The triumphs were a triumph of character . . . often over feebler folk." This domination, according to Bryce, "seems to have about it an element of the supernatural . . . and the British Raj fills them [Indians] with a sense of awe and mystery."[14] Arthur Jose's *The Growth of the Empire: A Handbook to the History of Greater Britain* (1910) was meant to

make its reader feel that they were "both a product and a part of the English historical narrative" and that Britons "are of the race of empire builders, and it is our business to understand their building in order rightly to maintain it."[15] C. P. Lucas, like De Stael a century earlier, emphasized the importance of the elusive trait "character" in *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (1912), though Romans now seemed to possess character in abundance. Lucas studied at Oxford and, like Bryce, also won the Latin essay prize as well as taking first place in the civil service examination of 1877. Aware of the dangers that had overwhelmed Rome, he proudly pointed out that the British had more separation of powers in their homeland than Rome, though power still rested comfortably on the sturdy shoulders of British imperial administrators. His work concluded by calling for the youth of Britain to embark on "imperial adventures" and to go out and "rule over others."[16] Yet, for all their brilliance, these men still reflected the orthodoxy of the age, and their works comparing the Roman and British empires are "unreflective" rather than "innovative."[17] Collectively, these works made observations about Rome that were meant to bolster a sense of national prowess that had to be jealously guarded. All these authors took the superiority of the white races for granted, thereby implying that darker-skinned people were incapable of ruling themselves. The British deployed these and other histories, even satires, to legitimize their "honorable" rule.

In most of these histories, the discourse of honor and shame was almost always present, and whether the histories were describing the noble story of the Saxon race or the fatal flaws of Roman or Indian society, these histories (consciously or not) typically subscribed to a vision of an honorable ruling race in India that was historically unmatched in imperial achievement, for no other conquering power had ever sought to rule so benevolently. Conversely, if this race fell from power in India, history seemed to show that the collapse of imperial power was followed by a Dark Age in which all the progress and material improvements of the conquering power would disappear.

Most centrally, both Rome and England were thought to produce *men*. Gandhi described Anglo-Indians as being like elephants among the ants, and such men ideally knew how to rule by example, especially since Anglo-Indians were often alone and almost always heavily outnumbered by Indians. This imperial façade had to be carefully maintained in India, but its roots could be found back in England. According to Fitzjames Stephen, Anglo-Indian men relied on their

ancestral virtues and possessed "the masterful will, the stout heart, the active brain, the calm nerves, and the strong body."[18] Honorable rule could, and would, be brought to the subcontinent by such men, but there always existed the uneasy fear that a present or future generation might not measure up to the imperial mark, for honor always exists as a precarious ideal that has to repulse continual threats to itself. Individual degeneration meant disaster for an empire; Rome was overrun only after her men fell away from the virtues that made them a conquering race, their sense of honor overwhelmed and lost under a tide of Oriental decadence and debauchery, with emperors and armies created on faraway battlefields. For the British Empire, overcoming a similar fate would require them to cling vigorously to honor and to the traditional qualities thought necessary to retain an empire. An honorable past therefore guided nineteenth-century Britons in their imperial endeavors, and by emphasizing the traits needed to rule, history acted as an immediate mentor that provided the codes to live by. As always, counternarratives to these kinds of histories existed, but the voices of doubt were for the most part muted or silent at this time. Especially in the Raj, consensus was built around a unique view of India that justified the continuing presence of the Raj, and history confirmed Anglo-Indian rule and indeed made it moral, as this chapter will demonstrate.

A Life In the Sun

Not surprisingly, considering the Victorian emphasis on manliness, the men who passed the exam also had to be physically fit. Charles Ewald, a doctor and author of a work on passing the civil service exam, examined the candidates who had passed the open competition for a period of seven years in the late 1800s. The men who passed, he noted, possessed a "general vigor and appearance"; moreover, "superior physical health and strength are generally essential to success in those competitive exams."[19] Candidates had to produce a certificate signed by a physician confirming that they had no "diseases, constitutional affection, or bodily infirmity unfitting [them] for the Civil Service of India."[20] Additionally, no one was allowed to proceed to India unless he was of "sound bodily health and good moral character."[21]

The importance of history, both English and classical, can be seen in the examinations for the Indian Civil Service. In the exam, the importance of English history is reflected in the number of marks available in that subject—1,000 (though these marks were likely to change over time). Greek and Roman history were only slightly

less important and merited 750 marks each (though combined they counted for more, unlike any two other subjects). English language and composition comprised a possible 500 marks, and the histories of France, Germany, and Italy were allocated 375 marks each. For the study of India, Ewald recommended Elphinstone's *History of India* and Mill's *History of British India,* ensuring that candidates acquired a fairly rigid and conservative view of the history of the subcontinent. Later nineteenth-century works like Risley's infamous *People of India,* photographically "placed" Indians into rigid taxonomies, in order to understand the subcontinent. The nineteenth-century Muslim educationalist Sayyid Ahmad Khan, in response to this kind of history/anthropology, posed an "obvious but central question."

> In the India Office is a book in which the races of all India are depicted both in pictures and in letterpress, giving the manners and custom of each race. Their photographs show that the pictures of the different manners and customs were taken on the spot, and the sight of them shows how savage they are—the equal of animals. The young Englishmen who, after passing the preliminary Civil Service Examination, have to pass examinations on special subjects for two years afterwards, come to the India Office preparatory to starting for India, and, desirous of knowing something of the land to which they are going, also look over this book. What can they think, after perusing this book and looking at its pictures, of the *power and honor of the natives of India*? [emphasis added][22]

Understood in the honor/shame nexus, Khan's central concern is the apparent lack of power and honor among Indians, and he realized that the British were distancing themselves from India along precisely these terms. Yet this was the India of imperial imagination that would require British redemption. Not surprisingly, imperial writers would tend to ignore or downplay the "honorable" aspect of most Indians. To bolster this sense of nobility, the civil service exams also reinforced a view of English history that was heroic, venerable, and filled with valorous and honorable events, which also meant that a uniformity of outlook was beneficial to the successful candidate and that he had the "correct view" of his own land. In order to pass the exam, the successful candidate was expected to have a broad education that was attainable only in the British educational system; additionally, a strong moral component underlay many of the questions. History, moreover, was thought to provide suitable historical analogies for the modern era, and to make the comparison with Rome even more explicit, one exam asked the applicant this question: "What lessons

with regard to the principles which should be observed in the government of British India may be learned from the history of the Roman dominions under the Republic and the Empire?"[23]

Public schoolboys typically possessed a thorough knowledge of Latin and some Greek (reflecting a general bias in favor of Rome), but perhaps more importantly, the English schools emphasized the same subjects and virtues as that of a classical education. Pliny, once asked to advise on education, replied that a good school had *severitas* (discipline), *pudor* (a good tone), and *castitas* (exemplary morals), for according to Pliny, the formation of a boy's character was regarded by sensible people as having comparable importance with the training of the mind."[24] In the ancient world, there was little to no scientific education, except for some Greek medical schools, and history was itself often reduced to exempla and historical reenactments (should Xerxes have crossed the Hellespont?). History, it was thought, provided moral instruction and also possessed the answers to most problems, making it the favored resource of ancient Roman moralists and historians (though the two were often one and the same). If Rome was not built in a day, it was also not built by men who strayed too far from the ideals learned in youth, for they seemed inevitably to lead toward dominion over others who lacked a similar code. Empire likewise demanded *pietas*, a respect for the proper order of things, which could mean respect for governmental institutions or the people who represented such institutions.

More historical than philosophical, ancient Romans focused more on pragmatic values than ethereal beliefs. Tacitus remembered his father-in-law, Agricola, saying that "as a boy he [Agricola] became passionately absorbed in philosophy beyond what was permissible for a Roman, but his sensible mother succeeded in putting an end to this intemperate enthusiasm."[25] Philosophy led inevitably to questions and tedious abstractions, and these kinds of problems were best left to the Greeks, who seemed to prefer thinking to doing. In British India, the Greek had its modern analogue in the Bengali babu, who was perceived as having similar flaws that made him unable to inspire loyalty in others, because of his fondness for "10,000 horsepower words" and an unwillingness to back his words with anything but more words. Juvenal likewise described a typical Greek as "quick of wit, unrestrained in nerves, [having] the gift of the blarney to a degree that outstrips even professional word slingers." Like an actor, a Greek was "never true to his feelings."[26] Mere knowledge did not lead to leadership or respect, either in ancient Rome or in the British Empire. For Roman and Anglo-Indian men, there were other

races that seemed smarter than themselves, though not necessarily wiser in the ways of the world. The babu, like the ancient Greek, was well educated, but a Roman or a British education had something that transcended mere education, for it instilled manlier codes that molded and channeled boys into worthy occupations and taught them the moral exercise of power. The education of the Greek and the Bengali babu did not allow them to defend their homeland from "manlier" races, but they were always useful for Romans and Britons who wished to define themselves against such effeminate races.

Real men put their knowledge to some higher use, and Rome had a tradition of *negotia publica* (public service) that embodied a variety of skills. In his career, a successful senator could be called upon to practice as a lawyer, to perform military service as a junior officer, to be a magistrate in Rome, to sit as a judge, to understand public finance, or to govern provinces. Collectively, this very public life was known as a "life in the sun," which in the Mediterranean climate was the hard way: an exposed life of constant toil without relaxation (which implied weakness).[27] Juvenal mocked historians because they were "spineless people who enjoyed lying on their backs out of the sun," and Polybius (himself of Greek origin but thoroughly Romanized) emphasized that his research had not been bookish but conducted in the "harsh glare of the sun," traveling and seeing places.[28] This stoic ideal, which resonated so powerfully among Anglo-Indians, regarded self-indulgence and inertia as sins.

The Romans called this heritage—partly absorbed in their education—*mos maiorum,* the ancestral and institutionalized customs that gave one a profound sense of what it meant to be a Roman.[29] These customs embraced wide-ranging aspects of state, society, and culture, which were all tied to the past. For Romans, this was a code to live by and a violation of it dishonored one's ancestors. It was partly through history that one learned the virtues of the ruling race. *Mos maiorum* was enshrined in codes that regulated one's behavior and comprised the virtues of fidelity, devotion, patriotism, duty, reverence, discipline, diligence, steadiness, dignity, and authority (all of which would be ideally instilled at English schools as well). A man, at least any ambitious man, should always be working at something, and Anglo-Indians, especially those in the ICS, had similar ideals, since the Raj demanded they be on call at all hours. Like the ancient Roman, the civil servant's labor was not really technical or professional, for the administrator was decidedly amateur ("trained for nothing, ready for anything," as the saying had it). Those with true technical skills, like

the men who ran the railways, were relegated to the lower echelons of imperial society in India, especially since many "Eurasians" were employed there. This was bound to lead to a conservative approach, since "the whole structure of the Raj celebrated generalist control and continuity, not specialist expertise and innovation."[30] Gentleman amateurs were decidedly generalists, but they commanded higher prestige because their actions made a "general impact on the *public* mind."[31] The study of classics was prized precisely because it broadened the mind without any evident remuneration.

The harshness of public school life was also thought to be ideal training for the "life in the sun" in India. Earlier British writers in India pointed to the debilitating nature of hot climates on the intellect and on the body, with Indians as the usual example. By the late nineteenth century, though, a more common belief in the ability of scientific prescriptions and rigid moral principles to triumph over India displaced the environmental determinism of an earlier era (though this latter view never entirely disappeared, as a later example will show). An example of this earlier view was given by the author of the *Anglo-Hindoostannee Hand-book*. He quoted a Dr. Moseley who spoke of the "bias to pleasure" found among inhabitants of hot climates, which alienated them from "serious thought and deep reflection. The brilliance of the skies and the beauty of the atmosphere conspire to influence the nerves against philosophy and her frigid tenets, and forbid their practice among the children of the sun."[32] The author of the *Anglo-Hindoostannee Hand-book*, however, believed this attitude to be an immoral and superficial view, since it furnished the "dissolute libertine with a physical excuse for his debaucheries, when the real source may be traced to a relaxation of religious and moral principles."[33] The removal of religious and moral restraint and the temptation to vice were the real causes of this "bias to pleasure," which the author assured his reader were not that much more dangerous and destructive than they were in Europe. The principal cause of dissolution for an individual was not found in the air, "but in his own breast"; therefore, Anglo-Indians had "no excuse for permitting it [dissolution] to sprout into the wild luxuriance of unbridled excess."[34] To mold imperial administrators, the only hardship for which the public school could not prepare a student was the heat, for if the public school taught anything, it was how to cope with a harsh environment without complaint. The unheated dorms, cold baths, and manly sports like rugby led the student to develop a tough discipline that would eventually be internalized, equipping the Anglo-Indian admirably for his role as imperial administrator: he would be

indoctrinated with the ideals of self-respect, self-discipline, and self-government, and be admirably prepared for his life in the sun.

The English school was therefore thought to be the best preparation for this kind of life, and in the nineteenth century, the British school would seek to instill virtues similar to those of a Roman education in its students. If the English schoolboy was not necessarily a scholar, his school still taught him how to "write a sensible essay on a comprehensive subject without being vague . . . nor lingering too long with a showy rhetorical preface . . . and all this expressed in good idiomatic English, free from any affected peculiarities of style."[35] An education prepared one to live a moral life free from "peculiarities," and even subjects like English had a strong moral component. In order to produce such capable men, candidates ideally had university backgrounds, since studies and sports there took place within the convivial atmosphere in which lifelong companionships could be formed.[36] Even though Tupp placed great emphasis on the exams, "a little roughness and want of polish was no absolute disqualification for ruling men."[37] The ICS demanded well-rounded men, he wrote, and those who had gone through the socialization of university life would possess better "moral character" than those who studied with a crammer. Tupp believed that a university education, especially if it was "public and imperial in character," gave the student a "variety of attainment," which the crammer could never hope to match, since he could not match the socialization found in the better schools. As important as an education was in achieving success on the exam, then, the codes learned and absorbed at the schools were equally important (if not more so). This is precisely where the crammer could never compete with the public schools and the universities, for one could not "cram" honor into a student—it had to be absorbed over time and by example.

Due to his upbringing and education in England, then, the Englishman was ready to shoulder the imperial burden, and if he ignored academic studies, the rigorous life at a typical public school prepared him better for the trials of empire. English schools also instilled and reaffirmed nationalism, patriotism, and the tenets of imperialism for their young students, a combination which had "served the needs of the English people well."[38] Generally, English education sought to establish ideals of selfless service to England, basing this selflessness on racial superiority and imperial chauvinism that would engender "uncritical conformity to the values of the group."[39] Collectively, perhaps the two greatest virtues lay in the development of ideals of "character and citizenship."[40] Outside of the sports ground, understanding one's history

was critical in producing character and citizenship; thus a large part of this education consisted of the study of the past, which carried important lessons for a people hoping to remain an imperial power. Although history textbooks produced during the late 1800s were never controlled by the state and the books "contained various shades of opinion about the empire," none of the books were "outright hostile."[41] Like the public schools, the textbooks sought to enshrine the myths of empire and muffle the few dissident voices to be found in England. Their goals were similar—to create a resolute community united in their support of the empire and to fill imperial needs as necessary.

According to Seeley in his popular *The Expansion of England* (1883), which sold 80,000 copies in its first two years and remained in print until 1956, history should be "scientific in its methods" and "should pursue a practical object," not merely gratify the reader's curiosity about the past. Instead, Seeley believed that history should "modify his view of the present and his forecast of the future. Now if this maxim be sound, the history of England ought to end with something that might be called a moral."[42] Since Seeley's aim was to arrive at great truths, history was therefore a form of moral arithmetic in which the virtues of the race should be exalted and copied. Roman history could also be mined for numerous examples of virtuous men who answered their nation's call to duty, like Cincinnatus forsaking his plow for the battlefield or Horace at the bridge. Duty bound such men to their beloved country, but they were themselves not primarily warriors. British imperial history would likewise echo this emphasis on the deeds of men who led by force of character (like Gordon or Baden-Powell), though again their country was not concerned merely with conquests—both countries sought instead to perfect the art of imperial government. Fighting ability was bound up in a code that was not focused exclusively on martial prowess, though this ranked near the top of imperial traits. Instead, the true character of the empire lay in the ability to pacify territory and then to make the yoke of rule as light as possible, provided there were no revolts. Unlike the early Greeks, who fought overseas wars for mere loot, the Romans, like the Britons, always tried to claim some higher purpose for their conquests, joining their territories into the nexus of the empire of honor.

In fact, in the Anglo-Indian imagination, civilization had been retreating from the East ever since the Romans left the region, and the land had not had decent and rational government since that time. Through this intimate and invented relationship with their Roman forbears, the British could and would crown themselves with

a Roman aura of moral invincibility. "Empire," intoned Lord Cromer, was the "title which makes us great," and the British should seek "in the history of imperial Rome for any fact or commentaries gleaned from ancient times which might be of service to the modern empire of which we are so justly proud."[43] The "new" Romans would spread civilization and rule much of the known world, and they would likewise civilize "backward" peoples where possible, and rule them when necessary.

Kipling is perhaps the most obvious representative of this invocation of Roman duty (and fear of decline), but other works, ranging from satires to histories, army manuals, and domestic manuals, reveal the importance of this embrace of all things Roman.[44] The more positive vision of the Roman past allowed the British to connect their own era to the golden age of Rome, and the virtues of each race were thought to be similar: a steady plodding pace to world domination, a willingness to lose every battle but the last, a pragmatic and empirical approach to political and social problems, a disdain for mere speculation, and an emphasis on masculine self-control and its importance for maintaining order, to name but a few. In thought, temperament, and background, the fin de siècle British portrayed themselves as modern-day Romans adhering to a classical ideal, in that they were persistent, alert, and brave, and they knew how to rule. The ancient examples of courage like Horace at the Bridge, the Roman sentinel at Pompeii, or even the Spartan Leonidas at Thermopylae continued to guide appropriate imperial behavior. Spartans were often lumped in with the Romans as races who knew how to rule, and the British, much like the Romans, were irresistibly drawn to Sparta rather than Athens. Moreover, Anglo-Indians had obvious parallels with the Spartans, since both societies needed to keep a large population subdued and relatively loyal, and the importance of harsh educational measure to "make men" was common to both. English public schools were routinely called "Spartan" in their approach to education, and both societies were portrayed by their critics (and even some admirers) as unimaginative and boorish, which continued to be a strength for those who lived up to the ideal. History and myth therefore provided a cultural arena in which the British posed as the inheritors of Roman (and at times Spartan) qualities who would nonetheless guard against the same errors made by the Romans. According to Bryce, there was nothing in history more remarkable than the way "in which two small nations created and learnt how to administer two vast dominions."[45] Moreover, each nation had an honorable history of overcoming early conquest, and each had undergone violent civil wars and yet emerged

as world powers. Each therefore had a somewhat parallel development, including a sure and steady march to predominance—though the cadence for the British was quicker both in their rise and in their fall. Like the Romans, the British believed that it was their imperial power that made them a great and supposedly noble people, with both the capacity and duty to "improve" faraway nations. Both empires were charged with keeping order over unruly places, and their respective success lay in organization, discipline, and a firm resolve to avenge the rare military defeat (or summarized in a word, their honor). The attributes that allowed Rome to conquer—order, drill, and military precision—were the same skills that the British prized and sought to perfect. By the end of the 1800s then, Rome was no longer a backward power lacking character, as in De Stael's Romantic formulation, but instead became an ancient mentor that taught the British how to rule others fairly, if not always democratically.

Even in their initial expansions, the powers resembled each other, since both Rome and England enlarged their empires for similar reasons, and since they both argued that the need for defensible frontiers drove them to expansion. Cromer's *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* following this accepted logic, justified imperial expansion as essentially defensive and argued that each imperial step forward had been accompanied by misgiving, "often taken with a reluctance which was by no means feigned."[46] As such, British expansionist wars were just and never fought for naked aggression or profit, and were accomplished only to cause peace and order to prevail through the land. Again like the Romans, the English were initially reluctant imperialists, eventually rising above their humble but proud origins once they decided to make themselves great.

For England, this epiphany came after the Mutiny, when the English decided to supplant the East India Company with the rule of the Raj. *Growth of the Empire* called the Raj an "empire proper" that was administered by a central government composed entirely of an "alien" race. James Bryce, in *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India* (1913), wrote that to compare British rule in India to any other empire, "it is to the Roman Empire between Augustus and Honorius that we must go."[47] In the British imagination, India therefore came closest to resembling a Roman province, and the Roman example there would continue to guide the Raj into the twentieth century. The relationship was made all the stronger by the conscious posing of the British as latter-day Romans. If the British at home did not initially embrace Rome, the earliest Anglo-Indian administrators connected their work to the Roman past, and

Warren Hastings's statue in Calcutta depicted him attired in the toga of a Roman senator.[48] Later generations of Anglo-Indians continued this tradition for many years, as they "erected statues of themselves clad in togas, their lofty brows adorned with the laurel crowns of the classic age."[49]

The reorganization of India after 1857 could likewise be compared to the Augustan reforms, which converted a loose amalgam of indifferently and often rapaciously governed states into a cohesive empire. H. P. Pelham, in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* described Augustus as "one of the world's great men, a statesman who conceived and carried through a scheme of political reconstruction which kept the empire together and secured peace and tranquility, and preserved civilization for more than two centuries."[50] Despotism was therefore defensible as long as it preserved civilization, and such notions overrode the contradictions of a democratic power (or a former Republic) ruling others autocratically. In the modern world, the demands of empire and the civilizing mission required the British presence, thus making forfeiture of India inconceivable. Whatever liberal concessions had been made, and irrespective of future concessions, Lord Cromer affirmed the simple British vow that England "had not the smallest intention of abandoning [its] Indian possession . . . the foundation-stone of Indian reform must be the steadfast maintenance of British supremacy."[51]

Historians in late nineteenth-century Britain therefore sought to explain Britain's greatness, but also asserted that such success was "not merely a fluke, but attributable to characteristics which the historians were expected to identify such that they would be nurtured and thereby ensure the continuation of Britain's unique historical role."[52] In establishing an "honorable" history, in which heroic deeds could be linked to imperial codes, many of the histories of empire were thus meant to instruct rather than dissect, and there were few long hard looks at any weaknesses of empire. Instead, the emphasis was on the weaknesses of individuals and what must be done to keep a people strong and virile, especially since the Victorians emphasized physical strength. If they were not primarily a warrior race, the British still prized strength, be it moral or physical (or, ideally, a combination of the two). Strong people equaled a strong empire (and vice versa), and though this is perhaps not terribly insightful, it explains why signs of weakness were noted with such alarm and debarred one from becoming a member of the elite ICS. Vigorous men were needed for empire, and Romans supplied the ideal type: stately, dignified, courageous, and unyielding in their pride.

As a central component of their education, then, students were thoroughly grounded in their own history and that of Rome, and in an age that saw the laws of history as all but immutable, the lessons of history were compelling and ignored at great peril. Yet it was not enough merely to know this history, for one had to live it as well, absorbing the lessons and virtues of the imperial race while attending school. Though applicants were expected to know English (more than Scottish or Irish) history, and to know the legal precedents that had been set in India, a member of the ICS would also need logic and the ability to reason from history, and he was not typically expected to make it up as he went along (though, according to Philip Mason, they often did). Instead, the ICS officer would ideally be guided by the history of his race, and should therefore possess the ability to mine history for suitable precedents. In Rome, history was credited with being able to predict the future, much as one could predict that an English schoolboy would know and perform his imperial duty once he became a part of the empire. He was able to face the future with confidence, for he knew the achievements of his race, and he was duty bound to live up to these achievements. For this, in addition to his many other qualities, he did not need to be brilliant, but rather should have a long head for plausible historical analogies and how to apply them, and he would also be kept from error by the sense of honor (and honorable institutions) instilled in him at school. Demaus in *English Literature and Composition* put it even more succinctly, for to him the highest ability of English schools centered on its ability to "turn out *men*."[53] Kipling cut right to the heart of the matter, declaring that at his school Westward Ho all that the Headmaster Mr. Price "aimed at was to make men able to make and keep empires."[54]

India did not necessarily even need *great* men; it only needed ones who could obey orders and display all the hallmarks of a ruling race. Perhaps for this reason, once an ICS candidate passed the exam, he was still subject to one more physical exam, for which he did not get a second chance. If he fell ill on the day of his medical exam and was declared unfit, there was no recourse. The Raj apparently could not afford second chances. Inevitably, then, "the ICS came to be dominated by men more at home with facts than ideas, and whose intellectual strengths were an ability to collect data and argue from it convincingly."[55] If they were not scholars, the men sent out to rule vast populations had nonetheless absorbed the lessons of the imperial race and could be counted on to ensure the primacy of the empire.

Imperium

Another moral concept derived from Rome was that of *imperium*. What has not been fully explored regarding imperial society is this sense of moral power that the Anglo-Indian possessed, for India was governed by men who had a strongly developed sense of *imperium* who ruled like miniature Caesars but were more ethical. In *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*, Sir C. P. Lucas defined *imperium* as the "full authority of the State entrusted to an individual." This included the functions of "state, military, administrative and judicial."[56] With the exception of the military aspect of *imperium,* this phrase might have been the slogan of the Indian Civil Service. Like the Roman, then, the Anglo-Indians' sense of power endowed him with unique gifts to rule over others. Bryce made the comparison explicit, for he wrote that the Raj mirrored the despotism of Rome, since whatever "may have been done for the people, nothing was or is done by the people."[57] This was because everyone "admitted it was impossible to ignore the differences which make one group of races unfit for the institutions which have given energy and contentment to another more favorably placed."[58]

Roman history therefore supplied abundant examples of a well-run society that had its foundations in the sturdy specimens of imperial manhood—each ideally imbued with gravitas, *dignitas*, a sense of proportion in life, and a devotion to work. As Quintus Ennius famously said of Rome: "the Roman state stands through its ancient morals and its great men."[59] This moral quality and peculiar characteristic of both Romans and Britons meant that defeats would always be avenged for national prestige and honor, which was itself rooted in the sense of individual honor of its men. And this ideal of the collective honor of the race had to be found in the individual first, since national honor and prestige could never be attained by a dishonorable race. When empires no longer produced such honorable men, decline was swift and inevitable, since empires were built and maintained, not necessarily by governments, but by the men of "heroic masterfulness and splendid incorruptibility" that the British race supplied.[60] Yet again, other writers believed the British outshone the Romans in this regard. Lucas in *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* wrote that all "great peoples and all empires have had their great men, without whose agency they would not have been great . . . but the ordinary individual Roman played a smaller part in the making of the Roman Empire than the ordinary individual Englishman in the making of the British Empire."[61] Another contemporary author who focused

on *imperium* was Henry James. In the opening scene of *The Golden Bowl,* he alludes to London as the heir to Rome:

> The Prince had always liked his London, when it had come to him; he was one of the Modern Romans who find by the Thames a more convincing image of the truth of the ancient state than any they have left by the Tiber. . . . If it was a question of an imperium, he said to himself, and if one wished, as a Roman, to recover a little sense of that, the place to do so was on London Bridge, or even, on a fine afternoon in May, at Hyde Park Corner.[62]

There existed many more similarities with the Romans than differences, however, especially since the British, much like the Romans, needed no laws to tell them to be imperialists. Instead, the imperial urge was just that—an instinct that resonated and emanated from every true Briton. Pericles in his famous Funeral Oration had described the Athenians as not really needing laws in order to be moral. Similarly, Anglo-Indians possessed customs that marked them as superior irrespective of laws, and national greatness was rooted in the individuals produced by such superior societies. Many of the characteristics that made both the Roman and British empires great and lasting powers were therefore expressed in terms of individual honor, which united Britons with their Roman forbears. Bryce spoke of both races as conquering powers who triumphed by "force of character." Like all truly powerful societies, a sense of honor was thought to animate British men, which led them to pursue admirable enterprises, but character always had to be displayed and approved by the public for it to have relevance. In the first century, orators like Dio Chrysostom took it for granted that the drive for honor motivated humans:

> You will discover that, among most men at any rate, there is nothing else that calls them forth to scorn danger, endure labors, and forgo a life of pleasure and ease. . . . This certainly is clear: neither you nor anyone else, Greek or barbarians who are considered to have become great, advanced to glory or power, for any other reason than that you were fortunate enough to have . . . men who lusted after honor. . . . And you could not get a single man out of a multitude to do what he deems a noble deed for himself alone, if no one else shall know of it.[63]

All truly great societies were thus thought to produce such men. Bryce described the Romans (and by extension, the English) as the ruling race of the world, small in number "but gifted with such talent

for war and government and possessed of such courage and force of will" to be able to dominate the "whole civilized world."[64]

Still, if *imperium* came to be embodied in Anglo-Indian men, the danger of it lay in its ability to corrupt Western men (both Roman and British), and both empires eventually reformed themselves to stamp out corruption. The Augustan reforms that had "professionalized" the administration of the Roman Empire and, theoretically, replaced the greedy and disorderly rule of a venal Senate with the measured and competent rule of a rising professional class, had its analogue in the reforms of the Indian bureaucracy that began in the early 1800s and reached its apogee in the latter half of the century. The early lessons of both empires seemed to be that *imperium* corrupted, and this corruption remained one of the gravest of imperial sins. But for the British, a sense of liberty could be continually renewed by visits to England and by ensuring that British schoolchildren were educated in England (or somewhat less prestigiously, in Ireland or Scotland). The wide separation between India and England, although perhaps a weakness from a military standpoint, did have a "supreme advantage" in that "on the one hand imperial rule in the dependencies has not corrupted freedom at home, and on the other hand those who exercise that rule, go out generation after generation with the spirit of justice and trusteeship ever renewed from their free homes and schools."[65] Honor was therefore not debased by living too long in the subcontinent, and this sense of renewal helped in avoiding the Roman fate.

Imperium could therefore be embodied in the individual, if that person was restrained, temperate, and just in his rule, and for a people whose history seemed to mark the increasing freedom from arbitrary and individual rule, the sense of *imperium* often sought justification outside of the British Isles. Such notions helped Anglo-Indians derive a sense of masculine power and honor from Rome, since Roman history stipulated the necessary qualities for an empire, and these lessons were ignored at great peril. History therefore served the same role that other imperial manuals did—it taught Anglo-Indians how to rule, and it intensified feelings of belonging to an imperial elite. *Imperium,* above all, implied command, but it was also a form of moral power that should not be questioned too closely, either by those possessing it or by those who came under its sway. Like honor, it bound all Anglo-Indians into a recognizable hierarchy to which all were prepared to submit, and such notions typically delineated the British from Indians, whose notions of *imperium* were quite different and unrestrained.

For all of its centralization of power in just a few men, *imperium* was nevertheless a group virtue that had been instilled during one's education (or even socialization) in England. Such notions of power were made expressly moral in an Indian context, and the virtues of the group could be seen in the men who ran India. As in ancient Rome, stories of duty, honor, and country were emphasized in the imperial narratives told by both Romans and Britons, whether it was Cincinnatus at the bridge saving Rome, or Lawrence dying nobly during the Indian Revolt for a worthy cause. Ideally, both Romans and Britons were thought to embrace death willingly rather than accept defeat or humiliation, and the invocation of Rome helped Anglo-Indians derive a sense of masculine power and honor, since it was the virtues of the group that produced such heroes that held empires fast, and which also inspired feelings of solidarity and belief in the innate superiority of one's customs, for it was the nameless and faceless centurions and administrators who were the glue that sustained empire. Such men (and women, at times) made empire honorable through their sacrifices for noble abstractions that they made tangible and real for others of the same race, and Anglo-Indians never seemed to tire of describing the various sacrifices they made in ruling India. While Rome had failed in its imperial duty, and India had not been able to repulse invaders, Anglo-Indians would ultimately triumph, because they would not allow themselves to be overwhelmed by others, nor would they stray too far from the "virtues" that led one to rule over others. Much of this discourse was naturally an ideal, but the ways in which this ideal was shaped, with the appeal to Rome and to honor, is nonetheless revealing of the ideal form of empire, which had finally found its apogee in the Raj.

Avoiding the Fall

History revealed the benefits that "honorable" rule could bestow on the nation, the empire, and the individual imperialist. If Romans now possessed "character" (before they lost it in lives of dissipation, idleness, and luxury), most of the studies of Rome sought to teach this crucial lesson for an imperial power—how to avoid the same fate that led to the fall of Rome. Britons sought assiduously to avoid the hubris that affected Romans, and the emphasis on Roman decline pointed to a need for corrective actions that would forestall degeneration. As a cautionary tale, then, Rome exerted an enormous influence on the struggles over the meaning of empire, and the implications of Roman decline taught obvious moral lessons

for late Victorian Britain, concerned as it was with its own perceived internal decay.[66] Empires rotted from within, their decay attracting predators hungry for the carcass of a once powerful creature. Though the classical past provided a heroic ideal for the individual and the nation, Rome only fell when its citizens lost the ability to fight for themselves and strayed from their simple, agrarian virtues. This deviation eventually brought Rome to ruin, and the decline of Rome warned about the dangers of luxury and corruption, as well as what happened to mighty empires when their men were incapable of defending their homeland from the barbarian threat, *imperium* having taken root in the wrong people.

Recent discoveries in the late 1800s of long-vanished empires like Babylon and Assyria also inspired many British writers to ensure that their own empire would be remembered more favorably. One of the fears of the British seemed to be that history would remember them unkindly—like latter-day Assyrians known only for oppression and violence, bemoaned by no one. As Kipling himself put it in "Recessional," "Lo, all our pomp of yesterday/ Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!" History overflowed with examples of once-proud imperial peoples who lost their empires when they were no longer able to defend themselves. Such hubristic warnings may have betrayed the anxiety felt by Britons over their treatment of conquered peoples, but if British rule was at times harsh (and it often was), they would find solace in believing that their legacy would be similar to that of Rome. Thus, such histories sought to preserve the British imperial achievement. In the end, if the benefits outweighed the harsh measures, empire could be redeemed in the present, because of the legacy that it would leave to its former colonies.

This profound moral streak also linked both Roman and British historians, who mined history for moral lessons about empire. Roman writers like Sallust were not like modern historians, writing about economic and social analysis; instead, they described people and moral character and they emphasized the moral lessons to be absorbed. This type of history was especially popular for Anglo-Indians, who—much like the ancient Romans—preferred to see complex imperial situations in simplified and moral terms.[67] In this sense, British history was often written as the epic narrative of great events and men. M. I. Finley, in his epochal *The World of Odysseus,* described epics as ultimately centered on action and not intellectual achievement.[68] Likewise, the study of the Roman past rarely emphasized intellectual history, focusing instead on the great deeds of great men. However, this narrowly conceived and prejudiced story of Rome suited the needs of Anglo-Indian society.

Roman history was reduced to a simple morality tale that established the traits needed to run an empire (or lose one), traits that were then expressed as ethical principles. British writers therefore began to extract exemplary codes of manliness from ancient imperial history, especially Rome. In *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects,* for example, a schoolmaster in India traced the etymological roots of virtue to Latin valor, which came from *vir,* the Latin word for man. The original meaning of *virtus* was not so much virtue, he said, as it was "manliness"; and valor meant much the same.[69] In this sense, virtue was divorced from its connotation of purity (as well as William Arnold's view of it), becoming more closely associated with "manliness," a word that connoted a panoply of imperial virtues that maintained prestige and the empire, but was much less concerned with turning the other cheek.

To justify his rule, the Anglo-Indian had to see himself as the healthiest ruler of India, and his rationalizations were often based on masculine perceptions of the body and the general fitness of the British male. As a result, Anglo-Indians produced an ideology of self-worship and racial exclusiveness that was tailored for their rule in India and often depended on the denigration of Indians. *The Indian Student's Manual,* mixing history and imperial ideology, noted that the "greatest nations" had devoted special attention "to the development of the bodily powers." This was the case with the Greeks, the most distinguished students in ancient times, and the Romans, "the conquerors of the world, [who] pursued a similar course."[70] Students at English universities, the author wrote, spent too much time in athletic exercises, while in India the reverse was the case: students were devoting themselves exclusively to books, with the result that "nearly all Bengalis raised to high office have died prematurely . . . the neglect of the rule of health was to blame."[71] Physically, Bengalis had proven to be unready for the burdens of rule, and such examples were typical of the kind of simple yet powerful narratives used to justify the empire, as well as the behavior that led to their decline. Empires fell, for example, when their people lost the drive for imperial glory (or their manliness), and the works of Bryce and Lucas centered on finding the moral examples and parables of history that could be applied to retain an empire. As such, this invocation of Rome, whether done to point out the causes of Roman decline or how the benefits of civilization could be spread through quasi-despotic powers, commanded respect and attention.

In this moral interpretation of history, men shaped events and national honor rested on exemplary individual behavior, which meant

that moral lapses tended to bring decline and disaster. The actions of individuals could therefore have enormous consequences for imperial powers, and such didactic warnings from historians cautioned against effeminacy, luxury, and vice, especially those imported from the East. For Roman writers, Oriental despotism did not suit a people who proclaimed their humble origins even when they ruled the entire Mediterranean basin, and violations of *maiestas* (majesty, greatness), especially by "immoral" emperors, were usually harshly punished. For Britons, history had lessons to be taught and learned, and history provided part of the moral codebook of empire that could, in a pinch, substitute as a how-to manual on the proper behavior needed to sustain and fortify an empire. More generally, this willing embrace of Rome was marked in a variety of ways, including architecture, statuary, and ideology. Romans were transformed to match the temper of the times, and happily, they now seemed to embody the same virtues that made British society so successful in ruling over vast populations. Control of the Roman past enabled the imperial present to be described in sweeping generalizations that emphasized the similar virtues of each society. Just as the Roman Empire was built and maintained by men with an unshakeable resolve to preserve Roman power, British success lay in the principled actions of its individual men, whose manly virtues and strong and noble character continually triumphed over ease and moral laxity. Fittingly, both societies (and their best men) revealed their greatness during times of duress, since, as Lord Cromer believed, "both nations [England and Rome] appear to the best advantage in critical times."[72] History therefore revealed the correct and proper behavior that had nurtured the British into their nineteenth-century prominence.

Half Savages and the Civilizing Mission

One crucial method for differentiating the British from the Roman Empire, however, lay in the ostensible causes for Roman decline. In addition to the perceived degeneration of the individual Roman, the decline of Rome could also be attributed to their lack of a true civilizing mission. Since the Romans lacked the ethical component of the British Empire, they hastened their own decline, and even though the Romans had boasted of the transformations they had wrought on backward peoples, they could not match the British achievement. In this way, the apotheosis of the Roman was actually found in the Saxon male and the just and ethical rule that prevailed under his thumb. After all, Christianity had conquered Rome, and not the other way around. The spread of Christianity did not follow any design, nor was

it directed by an imperial bureaucracy in its initial expansion throughout the Mediterranean world. Christianized by accident, the Roman Empire never had a real civilizing mission—other than subduing the proud—nor did it demonstrate any ethical progress, at least not like that of the British Empire. There was little moral reform in the Roman Empire, and it became increasingly despotic as it aged, unlike Britain, which became more democratic with time. Moreover, Lord Cromer believed that the beneficent intentions of the British delivered the people of India from war, pestilence, and famine, while "no such intention ever animated the Imperialist of Ancient Rome, or, in more modern times, the indigenous rulers of Asiatic States."[73] In this view, only the British had paid attention to the material improvement of their subjects, and this thought comforted Anglo-Indian society. Their task, moreover, was more difficult than that of the Romans because of the fragmented nature of the British Empire. The Raj in 1900 was larger than the entire Roman Empire, since the British subcontinent covered 1,802,629 square miles.[74] In *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* Lord Cromer asserted that Rome had no rivals, unlike Britain, and if Rome created a desert and called it peace, the British emphasized that their task was more difficult than that of Rome, since they were hampered by modern notions of limited government and liberal notions of the inalienable rights of man. Rome was therefore embraced when convenient for the British and surpassed when the British wanted to show that any parallels between the two must be resolved in favor of Britain, owing to the greater difficulties of rule in the modern world and the fact that Romans lacked the restraint thought to characterize the British as rulers. Still, if nothing else, Rome seemed to show that some people would continue to need imperial rule indefinitely, and Rome was therefore linked to "strategies of exclusion" and to the "illusion of permanence" already mentioned in this work. National and individual honor implied honesty, integrity, and fairness in the beliefs or actions of the ruling race, and it would be these traits that most separated Britons (or, depending on the author, Saxons or Anglo-Indians) from Indians and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Britons from ancient Romans.

The Raj, Cromer claimed, existed as the closest parallel to the glory of the Roman Empire but surpassed it in many ways, since it was governed not for British, but for Indian benefit. India therefore belonged to the British by right of conquest, but as Arthur Jose triumphantly asserted, "we hold it for its own sake far more than for ours."[75] Jose claimed that the Raj did not demand the tribute that Romans demanded of their provinces (an argument that conveniently

ignored the crucial role of India in providing favorable balance of trade payments for England, as well the payment of taxes by Indians to support the Raj). This line of reasoning allowed Anglo-Indian society to assert the honorable nature of British rule and differentiate the Raj from the worst excesses of the Roman Empire (or Asiatic empires). Thus, where the Romans had ultimately failed, the Raj would triumph. In *Indian Unrest,* for example, Chirol praised the establishment of European science and literature in the great cities of the East and asserted that the inhabitants were grateful for the barrier against barbarism erected by the British.

Although both empires, Roman and English, bore the burden of civilizing heathens, the British claimed to be better at ruling and civilizing an Asiatic people, since, according to Chirol, the Greek and Roman Empires had long ago disappeared, "leaving very little beyond scattered ruins."[76] While the Romans were successful in *western* Asia, Chirol wrote, they were never able to fully subdue the Parthian empire and effectively control the area further east. G. O. Trevelyan, writing in the *Competition Wallah* noted that

> it has generally been found that a manly valiant race, which has imposed its yoke upon an effeminate, and unwarlike people, in course of time, degenerates and becomes slothful and luxurious. . . . Thus Mark Antony . . . and his followers became half Egyptians under the influence of the lovely Begum of Alexandria. . . . With the English in the East precisely the opposite result has taken place. The earliest settlers were indolent dissipated, grasping, almost Orientals in their way of life, and almost heathens in the matter of religions, but each generation of their successor is more simple, more hardy, more Christian than the last.[77]

Successful rule in the East was the hallmark of the British Empire, meaning that the British had surpassed the Romans, though they would continue to look back, if only to convince themselves that the pupil had now become the master. Even Americans were impressed, for, according to Teddy Roosevelt, never had such a tiny elite controlled such a huge population with so little coercive force, and the Raj was "the most colossal example history afforded of the successful administration by men of European blood of a thickly populated region in another continent. It is a greater feat than was performed under the Roman Empire."[78] Writing at roughly the same time as Cromer, Roosevelt admitted that some "mistakes had been made," but the successful administration of the Indian empire by the English signified one of the "most notable and the most admirable achievements of the white race during the past two centuries."[79] The British

imperial "gift" was therefore greater than that of Rome, and significantly, the Briton had outstripped the Roman in the manly art of governance. Roman technical and martial superiority had allowed them to reign over millions, but this had little to do with possession of a higher culture, since in the ancient world, "Persians, Macedonians, and Romans all had inferior culture to the people they conquered."[80] With the rise of British imperialism, history ostensibly had the first example of a ruling power that possessed a superior civilization to its subjects. The British had many of the same manly attributes of the hardy Aryans or Mughals, but these conquering races had been mainly known for their military prowess. The British, on the other hand, possessed not only the martial prowess but a superior culture and a better-organized society. They fought like barbarians when necessary, but ruled like enlightened despots the rest of the time. The journalist G. W. Steevens wrote "of the wonderful Englishman who can make himself into half a savage to make savages into half-civilized men."[81] If the British did not grant citizenship, their greater gift was the bestowal of a superior civilization in the East and the moral uplift that accompanied their rule.

Ultimately, occasional acts of brutality could be justified if they kept the status quo in place, and the "torch of civilization" could only be lit and sustained by the British, and Lord Cromer flatly asserted that relinquishing this torch would "almost certainly lead to its extinction."[82] Britons, moreover, believed they refrained from all-out massacres characteristic of Roman rule. If they jealously maintained their "escalation dominance," they did so for the good of the colonized, and this sort of logic was found compelling in British imperial society. For if Britons had a relentless need to compare themselves to Romans and to other empires, this was because history revealed what happened when such rule disappeared. Besides, however barbaric their rule might be at times, the British always liked to point out that Asiatic rulers (or even Rome) had been much harsher. Almost always, the British saw themselves as the best hope for keeping "chaotic" Indian society from devouring itself, or from being devoured by other predatory nations. In the end, even if the conquest of India had not been accompanied by noble intentions, honor bade that the British stay, for the real shame would be in leaving Indians to the not-so-tender mercies of other Asians.

Citizenship and Race

In comparing the Roman and British empires, the issue of citizenship had to be dealt with carefully, since Romans had extended their citizenship to those it conquered and Britain did not. In *The Indian*

Student's Manual, a work written for the instruction of Indian boys, however, the author decried the patriotism of the Greeks and Romans, since it was supposedly based on defective ideas. Rewriting Greek and Roman history, the author John Murdoch ignored the extension of Roman citizenship to the provinces so that he could mine Roman history for examples of improper imperial behavior. To Romans, all men outside their own nations "were regarded with contempt and indifference, if not with absolute hostility," and conquest represented the only recognized form of national progress. Ancient nationalism was essentially a zero-sum game in which the interests of nations were directly opposed, and the "intensity with which a man loved his country was a measure of the hatred which he bore to those who were without it."[83] Books like *The Indian Student's Manual* sought to apply British methods of moral instruction to Indian students, and the objective of this particular book was to stress "moral excellencies" rather than mere intellectual attainment, and the introduction justified its harsh tone: "When a boy is learning to write, the teacher points out his defects. Though less pleasant, this is far more profitable than mere praise. It is the same with nations." The Romans, lacking true morals, never learned to incorporate other peoples into their empire, according to Murdoch, and the Roman subject existed for the empire. In the British Empire, however, the empire existed for its subject.[84] Echoing Jose's claim about the British, Murdoch emphasized the unity that existed between Indians and the British, which meant that Indian students could admire British rule and still love their own land, primarily because the British ostensibly had only the best interests of the Indians in mind. Contrary to what the Bible said, it was indeed possible for a man to serve two masters without hating one or the other.

A more accurate assessment of Roman citizenship came from Seeley's *The Expansion of England,* though his interpretation of the expansion of citizenship reveals more about British anxiety over the issue than it illuminates the expansion of Rome. To Seeley, Roman history taught the futility of offering equality between colonizer and colonized, and his ideas implied that the Indian nationalist demands could be safely ignored. He believed that the extension of Roman civic institutions to the rest of Italy began the breakdown of the Roman Republic.[85] Rome could have had both empire and republic, he claimed, but squandered its chance because they acquiesced to the demands of other Italians for Roman citizenship. Jose, echoing Seeley, contended that Rome had won its empire exclusively by conquest and the subjection of various peoples, yet Rome had faltered by its

hasty extension of citizenship to all its subjects, which undermined its core strength of "blood Romans" united in their devotion to Rome and imperial duty. As early as the 1840s, W. D. Arnold discussed the lessons of Roman provincial policy with Anglo-Indians concerned about the Northwest Frontier, and Arnold was "haunted lest the tragedy of the Roman Empire, whose extremities grew at the expense of its heart, should repeat itself."[86] Classical history therefore showed the British the dangers of allowing the provinces to overwhelm the metropole, which provided another compelling lesson on avoiding or containing similar threats. Empires could not be based on equal relationships if they wanted to remain empires, even when run by republics.

This also held true for Anglo-Indians in the Raj, especially when the two societies (British and Indian) ostensibly differed so in martial qualities, manliness, gentility, and ability. Because they were such a tiny minority in India, Britons cultivated a dignified individual manner (or *gravitas*). All Anglo-Indians were expected to sustain and fortify the empire by commanding the respect, loyalty, and subservience of the Indian. To paraphrase Juvenal, Romans fell into decline when they were no longer Roman. Being an Anglo-Indian, whether a bureaucrat, a memsahib, or even a soldier, meant that one possessed a number of virtues that marked one as superior and a member of the ruling race, though such traits could differ according to status. "Blood Britons" might perhaps be born with a number of imperial traits, but behavior would have to be constantly verified and bolstered by other Anglo-Indians in order for one to remain within the good graces of imperial society. Bryce, for example, asserted that Anglo-Indians were better protected in India than natives, since "race prestige" kept the Anglo-Indian from being attacked, and any attack on an Anglo-Indian "would bring about swift punishment."[87] In India, therefore, those who possessed more honor also deserved more protection, since they were a little more equal than anyone else.

Race prestige rested on a number of such social prescriptions already described in this book, although such ideas of prestige existed alongside reforming ideals in British India. Like the early Christian church, the Raj remained a noble ideal bent on converting a sizeable population to enlightened ways, but there always seemed to be much work to be done in civilizing a "heathenish" people. Indians should therefore be grateful for British intervention, since no other empire had taken so many pains to provide for its subjects. The failure of Indians to recognize the superior talents of

the English stemmed from a false sense of their own abilities, which the British believed they had developed, and in many cases, overdeveloped. *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* quoting Byron, carried the dire warning that the British were nursing "the opinion which is impelling the steel into their own breasts."[88] Indian nationalism was flawed, and Murdoch wrote of the "pseudo-patriotism springing up among some in India which defends everything national through thick and thin, and when anything wrong is pointed out, simply attacks those who make the complaint."[89] The Pax Britannica had established tranquility and good government without granting democratic reforms, but everyone benefited from peace, whether they ruled or not. The Raj therefore concentrated not on citizenship for Indians—although it wanted them to feel loyalty to the empire and the sovereign—but on the other available avenues for Indian advancement that were ostensibly unique among any current or historical imperial power.

In addition to ideas of citizenship, Rome was also problematic in that it did not have the same conceptions of race found in the modern world. Lucas, like Lord Cromer, believed that any kind of "fusion" of races between the Briton and the darker-skinned imperial subject would be impractical, if not impossible. This was a crucial difference between the Roman and the Briton, but one that would protect the British as imperial masters. Before the rise of Christianity, the polytheistic nature of Roman religion made it much easier for Rome to incorporate people with religions different from their own, which caused much less imperial stress. Intermarriage was also easily accomplished in the Roman Empire, especially since—according to Cromer—the various peoples of the empire lacked any "physical and conspicuous distinctions between [the] races."[90] This was an absurd claim to make, for Romans readily differentiated races, though they clearly did not have the same conception of race found in Victorian England. The ostensibly more homogenous culture in Rome arose from their empire being centered largely in the Mediterranean basin, meaning that the Romans simply did not have to deal with the same racial problems experienced by imperial England. Yet, according to Lucas, had the Romans extended their rule into "Africa or Farther Asia, we might have heard more of the color question in their Empire."[91] In other words, the Romans might have been more properly "racial" (and more like the British) had they conquered (and more importantly, held) some of the same territories ruled by the British. The fusion of races could never work in India, since the alien benefactors who ran the country had to maintain a separate cultural and racial

identity. Lord Cromer concluded that these tougher problems faced by the Raj allowed it to withhold citizenship for Indians, based on racial "difference."

According to Jose, history provided another more immediate example regarding the dangers of racial fusion, since Spain "threw away its chance at imperial greatness" by trying to rule like ancient empires, eventually being brought down by miscegenation. Their conquering race in the Americas was soon absorbed in the "greater mass of the resident population, [while] the South American republics became the prey of a succession of dictators, and the intrusive Spaniard became gradually indistinguishable from the races over whom he had once held sway."[92] The Spanish Empire in the New World and the Portuguese empire in India both served as reminders of what happened when a formerly imperial race fell into degeneration and decline. Both empires had gone wrong through miscegenation with "native" races, bringing inevitable collapse. These imperial lessons were also necessarily conservative, since change was rarely good for empires, and Anglo-Indian society preferred to remain true to the values that had sustained their empire, especially after the Indian Revolt of 1857. These immutable laws of history (and of empires) were ignored at great peril. The lesson seemed to be that when a European power failed to rule, chaos ensued, harming both colonizer and colonized. Thus the social distance of the Anglo-Indians may have been regrettable, but was apparently historically necessary in order for the conquering race to maintain its distinctiveness. If the sun never set on the British Empire, it was because individual Britons stayed true to their codes of duty, honor, fair play, paternalism, and authority, and historical works showed the inescapable logic of maintaining a separate cultural identity.

The British also preferred to remain distinct in language. While late nineteenth-century nationalist movements relied on a standardized language to create bonds of national identity, the English language did not act as a similar bond between Englishmen and Indians. Though many Indians were learning English, this was never enough to make one thoroughly English (and therefore capable of running an empire). In *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* Lord Cromer emphatically stated that language could never be, as in the case of Ancient Rome, "an important factor in the execution of a policy of fusion. Indeed in some ways, it rather tends to disruption, inasmuch as it furnished the subject races with a very powerful arm against their alien rulers."[93] Cromer described the ancient Gaul as one who wanted to be Romanized, but English, unlike Latin, could never be the basis of

"imperial fusion and brotherhood." The Indian continued to complain "in shrill tones" that opportunities for him were insufficient, but the motives that impelled the ancient Gaul to learn Latin rose from his desire to become "a true Roman," and his linguistic success knit his race to that of his conquerors. Most importantly, he had no wish to subvert the Roman Empire in any way. Cromer then asked: "Can the same be said of any of the Asiatic or African Races who, being the subject of modern European powers, have learnt the language of their rulers?"[94] However much the African or Asian might learn English and mimic his master, he could never fully absorb the customs of the superior race.

To Cromer, imperial races wanted to learn the English language without following the other codes of the "superior" civilization, and it was doubtful whether such races could ever navigate and absorb the protocols of the ruling race. Such judgments on the strong connections between the English language and how it was spoken or written had compelling political implications about the ability of such races for self-rule, as evidenced by Demaus at the beginning of this chapter. Demaus closely linked the ability to command the English language with the ability to command other humans. Though Indians might, at times, mimic the English language or English customs, their motives for doing so were deemed to be impure. As John Strachey pointed out at the time, the Bengali's aptitude for passing examinations in no way related to his ability to rule. Strachey wrote:

> Not the least important part of the competitive examination of the young Englishman was passed for him by his forefathers, who have transmitted to him not only their physical courage, but the powers of independent judgment, the decision of character, the habits of thought, and generally those qualities that are necessary for the government of men, and which have given us our empire."[95]

Fusion was not possible with a people whose desire for union did not arise from a true longing to become like the ruling race. As in so many other tenets of imperial ideology, Cromer and others defended and justified the lack of racial fusion by blaming Indians. Though some authors proffered a straightforward defense of race prestige, Cromer, typically, placed the blame for his own prejudices on "natives." Indians, especially those who mimicked English customs or learned the conquerors' language, regularly became the

straw men of imperial arguments—they could be propped up and knocked down easily by writers determined to attack their motives and abilities.

Ultimately, the Romans abandoned their ancient morals and no longer produced the kind of men to counter the threats to their empire. Rome had been driven to recruiting barbarians, according to Bryce, "for want of Roman fighting men." Yet even though the Indian Army—much like the Roman Army—recruited from "barbarian" Gurkhas and Pathans, "England guards against its risks by having a considerable force of British troops alongside her native army."[96] Bryce also believed there could be no cultural or racial fusion between the British and Indian races, since the English race was "enfeebled after the second generation in India, and would die out, at least in the plains."[97] A distinct unease is evident in Bryce's fear of the effect of India on the British, and even though India was the Jewel in the Crown, it was also the source of the greatest anxiety as well, for echoes of the Mutiny and the loss of control it represented would always haunt Anglo-Indian society. Honor, like the Raj itself, was under continual assault in the Raj, and the terror of losing both remained a central preoccupation of Anglo-Indians.

Finally, if Rome appeared to be more ethical in granting citizenship, this had to be construed not as civilizing but as crippling and degenerative and ultimately dishonorable. Though the Roman example could not always be directly applied to imperial problems, certain of their virtues certainly resonated in Anglo-Indian society, which sought methods to shore up uncertainty over their actions. The strict separation of races could be considered just, ethical, and honorable if it kept the best government India had ever experienced in power, and such thoughts allowed the British to continue to cloak themselves in an aura of morality even when their actions may have been, strictly speaking, construed as immoral or unenlightened. Yet the appeal to Roman history helped assuage guilt over the treatment of Indians, since ultimately, the tonic of just governance would theoretically bring more benefits to the subcontinent, although the medicine may not have always been pleasant for Indians. If Rome, ultimately, bettered the people she ruled, her legacy was secure, and countries that had been a part of the Roman Empire were better off than those who had not been conquered. One had only to look at the differences between England and Ireland for "proof" that nations were ultimately better off to have been a part of the empire, especially for those countries fortunate enough to absorb the virtues that led a

country to prominence, for eventually these virtues could lead one to become a ruling race.

Vanished Supremacies

Partly to maintain their identity as a ruling race, the nobility of English and imperial history would continually be contrasted with the degeneration of Indian society. Typically, India was not thought to possess real historical works—only the legends of thirty-foot-tall, five-hundred-year old kings. The author of *The Indian Student's Manual* wrote that India "is as destitute of historical works as it is of books of travels."[98] Therefore Indian history revealed all the flaws of the race: the irrationality and grandiloquent boasting about impossible acts, monkey-kings as heroes, and a general tendency toward wild exaggeration.

British descriptions of India confirmed a sense of mastery and superiority over India and its customs. *Curry and Rice,* a satirical look at Indian and Anglo-Indian customs, described a group of sick people outside the bungalow of the English priest: "Did you ever set eyes on such a mass of infirmity, decay and human disorganization? There you may see a real, living picture of those crowds of impotent folk who thronged the highways of Judea some eighteen centuries ago, and who waited expectantly by Bethesda's pool for an anticipated cure."[99] In this widespread view, India was a land filled with archeological ruins and populated by a similarly decrepit population locked in historical stasis and unable to develop the mastery needed to overcome their own flawed culture. Visiting or residing in India thus allowed one to observe a living museum of humanity and watch people from the past. As a spectacle, India was hard to beat, and this sense of India's difference—its "biblical" people mired in historical impotence—enabled the British to fit India into a subordinate position, and also to conjure up an India that needed imperial rule and protection.

As a repository of mankind, India was also a bit of everything from Europe's past. Nearly all of the historical European traditions could be found there—Teutonic villages, the heathen world of classical antiquity, medieval kingdoms run by feudal lords, and even the more modern coastal cities, which resembled (and in many ways rivaled) the urban centers of Europe.[100] Part history lesson and part museum, India blended many historical eras, and Anglo-Indians continually remarked on the blend of civilization and savagery that coexisted there as nowhere else in the world. One author wrote, "You can step

from a drawing-room with fine china, a grand piano and vocal score of the latest opera, into the settlement of a criminal tribe."[101] This of course was an exaggeration (British society in India was never known for the refinement of its culture), and the "criminal tribe" is an oversimplification that conveniently fit a British taxonomy of Indian tribes. However, most Anglo-Indians believed that civilization never seemed to put down deep roots in India, at least not rational, European roots. "If you look beneath the film spread over the face of things by University degrees and government reports," one author reported at the time, "you will quickly see that the morals and manners of the people have so little changed from the times when Christ walked by the Sea of Galilee that there is no perceptible difference."[102]

Moreover, Indians were not seen as fit for the material progress brought by England. In *Meeting the Sun,* the author argued that Indians had recently regressed, since their arts and manufacture were ruined by scientific machinery and their finest modern houses were but "grotesque copies of the magnificent creations of past centuries."[103] Indian civilization somehow survived, Tracy believed, but in mutated forms and imperfect copies. Another conservative author, Valentin Chirol, echoed a similar view of Indian history, which he described as "the vast congeries of peoples we call India, a long slow march in uneven stages though all the centuries from the fifth to the twentieth."[104] India was not ready to be a full member of the modern world.

In a cunning argument that would be often used against the subcontinent, the nation could not be humiliated since there was no national state. There could be no foreigners in a land that was not a nation and where a Bengali in Delhi "was as much a foreigner as an Englishman in Rome."[105] No national unity existed in the subcontinent, and without an empire to "bind" it together, India would degenerate into a thousand scattered provinces, all at each other's throats. General consensus held that it would be disaster for the British to leave India, or as the French intellectual Boell put it (as quoted by Cromer), the question "is not whether England has a right to keep India, but rather whether she has the right to leave it."[106] "Open all the cages in the zoo," one Indian supposedly said, "and you'll see the result of "India for the Indians."[107] The image of the Anglo-Indian as a zookeeper is a potent one, and highly representative of how they saw themselves as rulers. Once the Raj undertook its great responsibility in the East, one author warned, "we shall certainly fail in one of our duties unless India is provided with a strong and efficient army, trained to the highest pitch, ready for instant action, and composed

of men of the right stamp. National honor demands that each of us should do his little best towards that great end."[108] The noble action lay in preserving imperial power over a people who would only hurt themselves if granted self-rule. In the idiom of honor and shame, it would simply be dishonorable to leave, yet the Indian felt no shame in being conquered, for this was the "natural" state of India.

Conversely, Anglo-Indian writers tended to ignore the much more substantial impact that the Aryans or Moghuls had on India, or they dealt with them in an offhand or dismissive manner, focusing especially on their degeneration and decline. Though at times the British found common cause with their Indo-European forbears, many others chose to diminish the history of the Aryans, at least during the late Victorian era. According to Stuart, the Vedas and other Aryan works only threw a "dim light" on the early condition of India, while "the brilliant achievements of the British Raj made it preferable to pass lightly over the dark ages of early conquest and devote the full space demanded by India's modern history."[109]

As an example of a race that lost its martial vigor, the Aryans did exemplify the usual pattern of Indian history in which the land seduced the unwary conqueror. The anthropologist Risley wrote that each wave of conquerors who entered India were eventually absorbed into the indigenous population: "Their physique degenerated, their individuality vanished, their energy was sapped and dominion passed from their hands into those of more vigorous successors."[110] Aryan decay began through their intermarriages with Dravidian populations and through the enervating effects of the Indian climate. Before the inevitable decline set in, the heroes of ancient India could be admired, since they had once possessed "moral excellence" and sought the "perfection of athletic development and of beauty of form which enabled their feats of prowess and athletic skill."[111] These "ancient cousins" had practiced outdoor sports of prowess, but this ability "is not what it was, and some of the old Aryan sports have gone with it."[112] This was an especially appealing link for a modern Anglo-Indian to make, since he believed that his sports kept him fit and able to rule, and the excessive emphasis on polo or hunting emphasized his own masculine prowess. The decline of sports therefore symbolized the decay of a society and the codes it lived by. The Aryans had once followed a code that was close to the heart of many in Anglo-Indian society, and *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects* summarized the goals of their education in just three points: Shooting with the bow, Riding, and Speaking the Truth. Ideal Anglo-Indian creeds were likewise rarely complex. Their virtues were based on simplicity

and purity, like those of the Aryans before their precipitous slide into historical oblivion, in which they ostensibly became indistinguishable from their former slaves in India. The Anglo-Indian was determined that this should never happen to his society.

A fresh infusion of martial spirit arrived with the Mughal invasions. In *The Citizen of India,* the author portrayed the now-effete Hindus, with a top-heavy Brahmin class, as being unable to contend with the "big white men" who lived in the countries northwest of Hindustan. Just as the dark-skinned inhabitants of ancient India had been unable to contend with their own "fair-complexioned Aryan" invaders from a thousand years earlier, the Hindus now found themselves the easy prey of Arabs, Turks, and Moguls—"fierce Muhammadans eager for plunder and spoil . . . who took into their hand the government of nearly the whole country."[113] Masculine ideals determined historical success, just as "manliness" usually pointed to the most powerful rulers. The new tribes appearing in India supplied much of the "fresh blood" found in northern India. The conqueror Babur, another ruler of "squabbling" Indians, was depicted as a "keen player of polo, a magnificent swimmer, an ardent sportsman, a gentleman to the marrow of his bones." Like Anglo-Indians, Babur hated the heat, and his soul longed for the cool northern breezes. Still, "he stuck to his task of trying to weld Indian into an Empire, just as we are doing today."[114] The Mughal Empire, however, began to decline with the young Mughal princes, who, "unlike Englishmen, did not play games or take cold showers."[115] Generations of living on the plains of Hindustan brought the once hardy Mughals down to the level of the Hindus and caused these people to lose their strength and skill at arms.[116]

In the modern world, the history of India confirmed that Indians could rarely be trusted to rule themselves. An Indian government run by Hindu males was usually equated with deceit and disorder; self-rule meant that the Indians "could rule in their own fashion, handling all public moneys, dispensing their ancient substitute for justice."[117] Since Indians had "always been ruled by others," they were inured to most deprecations, and their history of rule by outsiders had left its "mark on their character . . . which has sapped their political backbone. The [Indians] are hopelessly ignorant . . . what this nation of agriculture requires is peace, order, universal education, unbiased and unbought administration of justice."[118] The British had conquered India not from the peasant and landholder, but from "their master, substituting a just and kindly rule for the tyranny and oppression of their predecessors."[119] "To their credit," one contemporary American

wrote, the British should also be remembered for raising the standard of living and of education and for fighting plague, for which they had been under no obligation, "other than moral, to do."[120]

Such "history" completely ignored, for example, the famines that wracked India in the late Victorian era, and the Raj's answer to these famines was near-silence, for such famines were the "natural" state of India. From Seeley's *Expansion of England* the reader learned that India had "achieved nothing in modern times" and was most like Europe after the "irruption of barbarians and the fall of ancient civilization."[121] Unlike Europe, however, India had been unable to rouse itself, even in the face of invasion. Only with the arrival of the British did Indian civilization begin to stir and resemble a true civilization, albeit a faint version. Lee-Warner, characteristically for the age, began *The Citizen of India* with "we learn from history" (a phrase monotonously employed by Anglo-Indians) that there were three great dangers which the people of India endured before British rule began. First, the coasts of India exposed the subcontinent to invasion by the sea, and second, the Northwest Passage failed to check incursions of manlier nomadic races. Lastly, the fighting classes failed in their duty to protect India, due to their long residence in the subcontinent. All of India therefore suffered because it was "cut off more or less from the rest of the civilized world," and was therefore unlike "other civilized nations."[122] Like other authors mentioned in this chapter, Lee-Warner denied Indians any true national sentiment, which also meant that the British were not really foreigners—no more so than Indians' previous conquerors. Again, no national pride could exist in India, since it had never been a nation. Anthropology was used to buttress such arguments, and Risley argued that the people of the subcontinent could be divided into seven different groups, but there was "no national type" and "no nation in the ordinary sense of the word."[123] Thus there would be no "India" without the British, and thus no jealousy of the foreigner.

Anglo-Indians were, in this sense, defying the typical pattern of Indian history, which—"properly" understood—showed the weakness of native claims to nationhood, as well as the importance of empire for a people who could not achieve nationhood on their own. The themes of Indian history were immutable and fixed, and the logic of such histories was thought to be persuasive. The "natural" condition of India was to be conquered by more valiant, manlier races, which nevertheless always had to be concerned with and obsessed about their own decline. Such beliefs, in retrospect, reveal the Britons' fear for the loss of control, as well as a justification for their

distinct imperial identities, along with a refusal to mingle too much with Indians. As in so many other patterns of imperial behavior, the arrogance of the British as rulers could be blamed on the perceived faults of Indian society. Imperial honor was maintained through such beliefs—as well as the empire—and conversely, India was kept in her dishonorable state: impotent, supine, and weak.

Dominion (Almost) Without End

Time and again, the imperial example that most animated Anglo-Indian society and riveted their imagination was that of Rome, and Anglo-Indians and Britons often felt a sense of oneness with ancient Roman values. For the authors who produced these texts, history was a guide to the art of empire and filled with didactic, moral lessons. Rome also connoted permanence, or at least a very long span of time in which a powerful state had ordered affairs and kept the peace for the benefit of mankind. Many other imperial countries (and their leaders) would embrace Roman symbols, from the czars, to Charlemagne to twentieth-century Italian Fascists. Yet, for the British, the clear linking of Rome and Britain added the weight of history to moral arguments about empires and their benefits, while the legacy of Rome seemed to be one of relatively benign institutions that minimally kept the peace so that subjects could go on about their business undisturbed, assured that as long as Roman power held sway, business transactions were safe, travel was easy, and the empire was the best guarantee for stability in an otherwise unstable world. A world without empire, almost regrettably, was a world in which chaotic powers threatened to overwhelm civilization; therefore, power could be use constructively and autocratically, especially if doing so imposed peace.

Finally, if Rome had dominion without end, it was only because it possessed honor. Such notions of honor worked to naturalize British rule in India, and ultimately, if the benefits of Roman rule outweighed the harsh methods of rule, empires could be conceived as beneficial enterprises that worked to improve the lot of humankind. Such appeals to Roman history were constant and thought to be persuasive during the late Victorian and early Edwardian era, so that Rome stood as a form of shorthand for more complex arguments about the benefits of empires. What both Romans and Britons did feel was a keen sense of honor about themselves and their empires, and honor perceived was honor claimed, making it foundational to both empires.

The works of Cromer, Bryce, Lucas, and many others therefore centered on finding the moral examples and parables of history that could be applied to the modern era. In an age when historical principles were expressed in highly moralistic terms, this invocation of Rome—whether done to point out the causes of Roman decline or how the benefits of civilization could be spread through quasi-despotic powers—remained an important lesson. If the ubiquitous effect of Rome on Britain and India and the empire is impossible to measure, it is even more difficult to avoid. Steeped in a classical past and thoroughly knowledgeable about classical history, British authors constantly alluded to the ancient world, and Rome seemed to exhibit, by comparison or contrast, virtually any imperial virtue or vice. Still, the central lesson of Rome seemed to be that empires were won and kept by the actions of noble, honorable men who did not flinch from their imperial duty. Spectacular empires could therefore be achieved by an unspectacular people through hard work, organization, a devotion to duty, and an unwavering commitment to national and individual honor. Yet one had only to study Rome to see what happened to once proud empires when both individual and collective honor were lost.

Chapter 4

The Bungalow: A Clearing in the Jungle

The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord.

—Matthew 10:24

The Indian Nowker (servant) exhibits very much the same traits wherever he is found and under whatsoever name.

—Preface to Behind the Bungalow

Edward Aitken's *Behind the Bungalow* is one of those curious relics of empire that was extremely popular in its day but then vanished from historical memory. Part domestic manual and part satire, it chronicled the activities of a typical Anglo-Indian bungalow and its attached servants during the late Victorian India. For modern historians, the most unusual aspect of the work lies in its evident humor for Anglo-Indian society. *Behind the Bungalow* is an unkind caricature in which Indian servants could be cuffed for minor infractions, but the overall tone of the work is one of light satire and amusement. Generally, Aitken's work expresses the somewhat typical frustrations experienced by Anglo-Indians with their servants, and his work must have seemed especially poignant to a society in which servants were an almost universal preoccupation and a constant conversational topic. As a part of the imperial landscape in the British Raj, servants were ubiquitous, cheap, and available to almost all Anglo-Indians. The viceroy's palace had hundreds (if not thousands) while the lowliest British army private awoke each morning freshly shaved, since a servant took care of this daily duty for the soldier while he

still slumbered.[1] Winston Churchill, who spent three years in India, described the morning ritual: "Just before dawn . . . one was awakened by a dusky figure with a clammy hand adroitly lifting one's chin and applying a gleaming razor to a lathered and defenseless throat."[2] That other great apostle of empire, Kipling, was likewise spoiled by having servants perform minor tasks. When he visited American friends in Pennsylvania, he became very angry when made to sit next to the driver of a cab, and the servants of his host were also puzzled by the writer's demand that "a barber shave him in bed."[3] The respect that one automatically received as a sahib was always a central aspect of Anglo-Indian identity, and habits acquired there were difficult to shed in nonimperial settings. If the Anglo-Indian always possessed more power than his brethren back home, the keeping of servants was the ultimate marker of this enhanced power and status, and respect and honor, those most powerful drugs for the Anglo-Indian, were abandoned with reluctance.[4]

The British, moreover, tended to think of most Indians as servants dependent on the British for their livelihood. That Anglo-Indians bore this "burden" with continued good humor only confirmed their rightful place as rulers, and by seeing servants as another encumbrance to be endured, Anglo-Indians strategically lessened the exploitation inherent in imperial relationships. Indian servants were an unfortunate burden to be suffered through, and Anglo-Indians tended to ignore how dependent their society was on Indian menials, whose labor eased the rigors of living in a subtropical climate for the British. Because of this dependence, the British were almost continually surrounded by servants, and in the bungalow the face-to-face exercise of power on a daily basis refracted the power relationships inherent in imperialism through notions of ideology, power, economics, and honor. In the bungalow, therefore, claims to power were translated into action for virtually all of Anglo-Indian society, and although legal codes ostensibly regulated contact between master and servant, these were often ignored, and the power nexus was much more informal and idiosyncratic. However, Anglo-Indians possessed strict ideas on the importance of creating hierarchical structures, and they sought to make their rule of India more regular and defined, which buttressed their perceived mission of bringing order out of the perceived chaos of India. This worthy task began in the bungalow, and the obsession with decorum and proper behavior was largely self-imposed and demonstrative of the apparent British ability to rise above "backward" India. Ultimately, such hierarchies often rested on claims of honor—who had it and who lacked it—and, as in the rest

of India, honor ensured that the effective and moral example of rule would begin in the Anglo-Indian household, for there were few other restraints on Anglo-Indians in this regard other than the opprobrium of the group.

The bungalow was also a useful training ground of the empire, as it seemed to have all the inherent problems of the subcontinent: squabbling Indians, arcane questions of caste, irrationality, superstition, and hierarchy, to name but a few. Yet being able to run the bungalow efficiently was characteristically thought to be the gift of Anglo-Indians. If one could manage the separate factions in a sweltering bungalow, one could ostensibly handle most other imperial problems as well. The methods of rule would be similar to those of the Raj as well, for Anglo-Indians often exploited the divisions of the servants (and by extension, India) to make the servants solely dependent on the master to sort out their problems. Supposedly, only the master could keep the servants in line and from each other's throats, and the benign overlord settled household quarrels that seemed to mar his (or her) daily routine, but this was the true burden of empire, for his power caused Indians to look to him for justice and benevolence. In Colesworthey Grant's *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life,* the author neatly summarized the approach. Grant first describes the servants as being wholly devoid of the "moral principle of truth," which he blames on the climate and want of "healthy mental excitement." The servants, however, are "patient, forbearing," and Grant believed that with "strict and consistent discipline . . . regular payment of wages, and careful administration of justice in the various little disputes and grievance arising amongst themselves . . . much may be done toward gaining their respect attention, and even attachment."[5] The Anglo-Indian had to ensure that these servants were properly trained along British lines so that "just as imperial rule had, according to the British, brought order and unity to the chaotic Indian subcontinent, so too, British housekeeping principles would instill efficiency and discipline among domestic servants."[6]

The Open House

A well-run bungalow also staged for a vast audience the ideal version of empire and the moral authority of the Raj. India was often described as a blank slate, a land where one's will, if strong enough, could be imposed with minimum fuss or bother, and India had none of the excessive regulations that restrained typical bureaucracies

in England. The maintenance of power required an impenetrable imperial façade that could rarely be taken off while in India, and this emphasis on appearances and a devotion to strict, social codes permeated the Raj throughout its history. One's private life in India was never all that private, and Anglo-Indians learned that their actions were always subject to public scrutiny. Ruling over unfree men who understood little except power meant that gaps in the imperial façade must be quickly repaired or hidden. In this type of society, sociability, prestige, and honor had to be carefully maintained, and people's adherence to these norms was a constant concern. Anglo-Indian institutions seemed alien to British visitors, but they rarely seemed irrational or useless to the old India hands conditioned to preserve one's sense of imperial dignity.

As a microsite of imperial rule, the bungalow has received increasingly historical attention in the past twenty years. A recent historical emphasis has begun to examine sociological relations with servants, as well as the bungalow itself, as sites for establishing imperial power, and these cultural projects cannot be easily separated from the political realm. Mary Procida's recent work best exemplifies this focus on the "collapsed spheres" of the British Raj.[7] Her focus is specifically on the women of empire and how they became a crucial component of the maintenance of imperial rule. I intend to make a similar argument about the everyday points of contact between colonizer and colonized, but I will focus instead on issues of masculinity, the White Man's Burden, and honor, since these typically marked key differences between colonizer and colonized for Anglo-Indian society. If history gave the Briton an honorable past, this could only be sustained by the methods outlined in works like *Behind the Bungalow,* which sought both to establish the correct way to run a bungalow (or empire) and to establish why Indians needed constant oversight in the imperial endeavor.

Collapsing divergent methodological approaches in order to produce a better understanding of the Raj, the new historians of empire are beginning to mine such everyday artifacts of the British Empire like *Behind the Bungalow* and other domestic manuals. As with other historical fields, the emphasis has shifted from political history to a new kind of cultural history that examines how these artifacts were linked to empire and their role in manufacturing knowledge about the colonial subject—knowledge that is inextricably bound to notions of power. Dane Kennedy, in a perceptive historiographical essay, concluded that the "new" approach to the study of empire, dealing as it does with microprocesses, is not all that different from the previous

political, military, and economic histories of empire, because both are concerned with manifestations of power and the "efforts of the British to impose their will on other peoples."[8] This type of cultural history gives one of the clearest portrayals of how the Raj was ruled on a daily basis. The routines and myriad, minor practices of the imperial bureaucracy in India are also crucial in understanding the political aspects of British rule, since the decentralized and largely autonomous imperial agents of the ICS had enormous power over their districts, and most Anglo-Indians, similarly, also had wide latitude in what they could do to Indians. The bungalow thus served as a metaphorical Raj in which the household had to run smoothly, but just as important was this symbolic meaning of a well-run household. Although this preoccupation with servants may seem trifling and alien to the modern reader, it was generally believed that "loyal servants would uphold and protect the physical and ideological dignity of the British, their homes, and their empire."[9] Thomas Metcalf adds to this same theme, echoing Flora Annie Steele's *Complete Indian Housekeeper,* stating that the cult of orderliness started at home with the belief that an Indian household could no more be governed peacefully without dignity and prestige than an Indian empire.[10]

Though men and women had separate roles in the Raj, the need for racial and imperial discipline often triumphed over gender differences. Victorian notions of separate spheres mattered little here, and in the Anglo-Indian community, these gender differences and private/public boundaries eventually eroded, having been reconstituted for imperial needs. What mattered more in Anglo-Indian society were looks and appearances, and—since it was the site of the most continued and intimate contact with Indians—the bungalow was also the most basic component of British rule. Governmental policy may have flowed downward in the Raj, but the bungalow represents the ground zero of empire in India—the site where the practicalities and difficulties of running an empire were often made most explicit. In this sense, the bungalow helped establish Western rhythms and laid down the geometric grid of civilization.[11] As the cornerstone for an entire ideological scheme, the bungalow became the arena in which the British worked to incorporate and transform Indian values by hiring servants and training them to Western standards. In doing so, the rituals for work, space, and time could all be defined by the Anglo-Indian, although in many instances the imperial community was following the customs of India.

Though Anglo-Indians found it perfectly natural to retain large numbers of servants, many griped that caste divisions unnecessarily

swelled their numbers, when one or two English servants could have accomplished the same amount of work. Indians were believed to expect such generosity, especially when the previous conquerors of India had all kept large numbers of servants, and Indians supposedly would have despised conquerors who did not know how to maintain a large household. In this regard, Anglo-Indians took the comforting position that it was better to follow tradition than adhere to humanitarian or moral arguments. In Grant's *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life,* for example, the author related a particularly useful phrase to all questions from servants: *dustoor ca muffie* (do according to custom)."[12]

In India, the size of most British household staffs actually shrank during the late 1800s (even while the middle classes in England were rapidly acquiring servants as a marker of bourgeois respectability). In the early history of the East India Company, a journalist who was not considered wealthy nevertheless employed sixty-three servants—when he was not in debtors' jail—and a "staff of a hundred or more was by no means a rarity."[13] Like families in medieval England, early settlers in India dressed their servants in distinctive liveries, with colored sashes and turbans worn over white muslin. During the late 1700s, this elevated lifestyle, which in many ways surpassed that of medieval Europe, allowed the English "to imagine themselves a chosen people, a nation of superior taste and ability, and to build up a colorful image of themselves in their imagination, which was further intensified as the victories of their armies carried their dominion steadily deeper into the heart of the Indian subcontinent."[14] Such Oriental display was only made possible by the obsequious manner of the Indian servants, who seemed destined to work for other men. One early commentator described them as "so diligent and discerning . . . that they read the command of the Company with their eyes, and seem created for the sole purpose and sole ambition of serving the Europeans."[15] The link between running the Indian bungalow and running the empire was already well established then, going back to at least 1810 when Captain Thomas Williamson published *The East India Vade Mecum* (Latin for "take with you"). Williamson described the servants of the bungalow as being useful, though they often were a "double-edged sword . . . who, while pretending to serve, may be pillaging his employer."[16] Yet these servants seemed to be a sly and treacherous lot, and early imperial authors like Captain Williamson envisioned themselves living among an army of thieves.[17]

When run properly, however, the bungalow displayed for all of India the benefits of British rule. Because of this "noble" rule, obedience

and affection were the most prized characteristics of the servant (as well as the proper response to British rule), while impudence was among the worst of sins. In Anglo-Indian society, an inability to order the immediate environment disqualified one from any imperial aspirations, and too much indulgence was the mark of a weak master. Ruling should come naturally to a ruling race, or it must be learned very quickly in the subcontinent, if one did not want to be taken advantage of. Such race discipline, when followed, allowed Anglo-Indians to triumph over the perceived slackness of their servants, and any society built upon such carefully circumscribed and unequal relationships had to justify its existence and the reasons for such inequality, and the Indian was seen as accepting, rather than questioning, such inequality.

Ultimately, in domestic manuals like the *Vade Mecum* and *Behind the Bungalow,* the problems with servants were equated with the problems of empire. At the core of *Behind the Bungalow* lies the notion that the Indian lacked the ability to think rationally and raise himself to the level of an educated European, but perhaps even worse was the servants' duplicity and obsequiousness that could mask his true desires, unless one understood the "Indian mind." Ruling as an elite minority over hundreds of millions of Indians served to reinforce this stereotype. The Oriental was thought to be a hero worshipper who lacked sovereignty and the means to rule his own land; otherwise, the British would never have been able to conquer India and sustain their imperial rule in the first place. The British, continually on guard against the "Oriental laziness" of the people and their excessive flattery, as well as the effect of the climate, believed that they must cling to the prescriptions mentioned in these manuals to maintain their imperial rule. In both the empire and the bungalow, the wily natives should always be monitored for any signs of subversion, evidence of revolt, or moral backslide into their mystical, "Oriental" ways. Especially after 1858, failure to preserve one's authority and provide the requisite moral example of the benefits of British laws and customs threatened not only peace in the bungalow, but peace in the empire as well, due to the importance of the moral example that the British were believed to maintain. Conversely, if you ran your empire like your house, kept a constant eye on the natives, stepped in if quarrels looked like they were becoming dangerous, locked away all dangerous items, and in general preserved your authority when necessary, then all would be well. Otherwise, your servants, like the country, were only going to be intriguing.

Fathers and "Sons"

Contemporaries called Edward Aitken a "humorous naturalist," and he was widely read and admired by Anglo-Indians. Aitken was born in 1851 to Scottish missionaries serving in India. He married a reverend's daughter in 1883 (thirty-two being a typical marrying age for men in India, who tended to marry late). Aitken had been educated at Bombay and later became the Latin Reader at the Deccan College from 1880 to 1886. He then entered the Customs and Salt Department and served in various lower-level posts of the Raj, so his experiences are somewhat typical of a minimally distinguished civil servant. However, his reputation from *Behind the Bungalow* and his works of natural history made him a known commodity among the Anglo-Indian community. *Behind the Bungalow,* for example, was widely praised:

> *Home Review*—Of this book it may be said that it does not contain a dull page, while it contains very many which sparkle with a bright and fascinating humor, refined by the unmistakable evidences of culture.
>
> *Englishman*—A series of sketches of Indian servants, the humor and accurate observation of which will appeal to every Anglo-Indian.
>
> *The Tribes on My Frontier* [a previous Aitken book] humorously described the Animal Surrounding of an Indian bungalow, the present work portrays with much pleasantry the Human Officials thereof, with their peculiarities, idiosyncrasies, and, to the Euro, strange methods of duty.
>
> *The World*—These sketches may have an educational purpose beyond that of mere amusement; they show through all their fun a keen observation of native character and a just appreciation of it.
>
> *The Graphic*—Anglo-Indians will see how truthful are these sketches. People who know nothing about India will delight in the clever drawings and the truly humorous descriptions.
>
> *Saturday Review*—The author of *Behind the Bungalow* has an excellent sense of humor combined with a kindliness of heart which makes his little book delightful reading.
>
> *World*—There is plenty of fun in *Behind the Bungalow.*
>
> *Athenaeum*—Drawn with delightful humor and keen observation.
>
> *Illustrated London News*—Every variety of native character, the individual as well as the nation, caste, trade or class, is cleverly portrayed in these diverting sketches.[18]

For a work that strikes the modern reader as irrevocably racist, the reviews focus on the author's "good humor" and "kindliness of heart." It can often be difficult to determine what amused previous

generations, and *Behind the Bungalow* clearly struck many Anglo-Indians as a pleasing divertissement based upon strict notions of "Indian character," yet it was also meant as something more. In another context, George Dangerfield brilliantly described the value of second-rate literature in *The Strange Death of Liberal England:*

> Important writing, strange to say, rarely gives the exact flavor of its period; if it is successful it presents you with the soul of man, undated. Very minor literature, on the other hand, is the Baedeker of the soul, and will guide you through the curious relics, the tumbledown buildings, the flimsy palaces, the false pagodas, the distorted and fantastical and fairy vistas which have cluttered the imagination of mankind at this or that brief period of its history.[19]

There was never a Wodehouse in British India, and it is all but impossible to imagine Jeeves or Wooster existing there. Light comedies did exist, though few of them have endured, and most of the Anglo-Indian style of humor died with the Raj.

Still, Anglo-Indians must have found *Behind the Bungalow* both humorous and true, and what has not been explored closely enough in imperial historiography is this simple question: what did Anglo-Indians find funny? The obvious answer was Indians themselves, and such humor had obvious benefits in the justification of imperial rule. Conversely, the sense of being surrounded by the masses of India made them clannish and unwilling to stand for derision—especially from Indians. A few Anglo-Indian works mocked some of the usual predilection of certain imperial types (the "heaven-borne ICS, the hard-drinking planter, the somewhat lowly *box-wallah*), but certain lines were not crossed, and as in all societies built on the honor code, members of a small society had to constantly find ways to trust each other even when they did not like each other. The very opaqueness of Anglo-Indian humor therefore serves as a guide to imperial thought. Anglo-Indians seemed to enjoy the type of satire that used the Indian as an eternal comic foil to the venerable Anglo-Indian straight man, and the antics of Indians continually test the patience of the imperial master. For all the descriptions of such works as "light" or "light satire" or even "fun," the humor of the Anglo-Indians always seemed to be overloaded with a political dimension, and the "jokes" sink under a mass of cruel caricature in which Indians are primarily objects of amusement.

At the beginning of *Behind the Bungalow,* for example, Aitken set the tone of derision by describing "the boy" who served his master

dutifully and faithfully until "service gives way to worship."[20] Such worship, though, required the master to offer permanent employment to the servant, since any master who continually fired servants quickly developed a bad reputation among Indians, and, according to Aitken, "every dismissal weakens your position. Believe me, the reputation that your service is permanent, like service under the *Sircar* (government) is worth many rupees a month in India."[21] "The boy" in this instance might be a mature adult, but Aitken, as did so many other Anglo-Indians, distinguished Briton from Indian through masculine status. The virile British male in *Behind the Bungalow* exercises nearly complete autonomy over his effete and boyish Indian servants, whose intellect "ripens about the age of fourteen or fifteen, and after that the faculty of learning anything new stops, and general intelligence declines."[22] In turn, the sahib receives respect and deference from his servants, partly because the Indian is by nature a hero worshipper whose own race has been mired in ancient and corrupt traditions.

If stability and honesty were two of the described virtues of Anglo-Indians and their institutions, this meant that the permanence of the Raj was reflected in the master's bungalow, for it provided employment to large numbers of Indians, and fickle masters could never build and retain empires or inspire loyalty. Hence the particular genius of the British lay in their perceived ability to command Indians patiently and benignly in tasks that they would otherwise never perform on their own, both on an individual and a national scale, and dignity was therefore brought to both races by the effective rule of the sahib. This brand of paternalism, especially in regard to the treatment of servants, represents one of the clearest indications of the attitude of authoritarian benevolence that characterized much of Anglo-Indian society. The modern historian Doug Peers notes that both liberals and those of a more authoritarian temper in the Raj tended to see Indians as being in need of such paternalistic guidance. This authoritarian-liberal tension was often manifested as the struggle between those liberals who would graft Western ideals onto Indian society and those authoritarians who saw Indian society as hopefully flawed and all but irredeemable. Yet, in practice, both extremes (and those in between) tended to "share the same sense of superiority. In other words, their debates, over issues such as suttee, women's education, religious practices, and so on, were more about means than ends."[23]

Chronically adrift without Anglo-Indians at the tiller, India would be directionless and defenseless in a dangerous sea without the reassuring presence of a stern commander who could both protect the

country and impose a steely discipline upon an otherwise fractious crew. In the absence of Indians capable of performing such duties, it fell to Anglo-Indians to assume this mantle almost by default. If imperialists were harsh and unlikeable, it was because they possessed an ostensibly greater vision of the dangers to India, and ultimately, how to avoid them. Like fathers with defiant sons, Anglo-Indians were "burdened" with innumerable black sheep in need of constant surveillance, yet they could rarely be seen to enjoy the ordering about of menials, since their dignity would be demeaned in the process. In *Burmese Days,* the aristocratic Verrall kicks a servant at the club, and Ellis, a wretched and racist imperialist, protests that it is *his* right to beat the servant and not Verrall's, since Verrall is not a member of the club. Verrall easily intimidates Ellis, however, and chastises him for allowing the servant of the club to relapse into his more "natural" state of slothfulness. If Verrall was a bully, his bullying was intended to remind both the Indian servant and Ellis that white prestige could not be allowed to falter. Asians needed occasional reminders of the power of the sahib to inflict punishment on minimal pretexts, since honor demanded immediate retribution for acts of insolence, especially from the lower orders. Ellis, in his "defense" of the servant, managed to treat the Indian as less than human and more as a piece of property that Verrall had no right to mishandle or damage, due to his outsider status. "What most angered Ellis," writes Orwell, "was the thought that Verrall quite possibly suspected him of being *sorry* for the butler—in fact, of disapproving of kicking *as such.*"[24]

If the power to coerce vanished so did honor, and for Anglo-Indians, this sense of superiority had to appear effortless and natural, and manuals like *Behind the Bungalow* (and its more famous counterpart, Flora Annie Steele's *The Complete Indian Housekeeper*) performed the crucial work of teaching Anglo-Indians how to rule by tapping into what were thought to be natural Anglo-Saxon virtues. Yet Aitken's work cannot be read simply as an assertion and reflection of imperial dominance, since *Behind the Bungalow,* like other domestic manuals, disseminated hubristic warnings about improperly running a household, while also representing the anxieties of a caste obsessed with the dangers of degeneration and decline.[25] If Anglo-Indians were "naturally" superior, why did they need such manuals? The Anglo-Indian fear of decline, and the need for current and successive rulers to understand the methods of this rule, drove them to produce myriad texts in various genres that showed imperialists how to be proper rulers. The anxiety behind these texts was camouflaged by an emphasis on the "natural" state of Indian servitude, and to

shore up any uncertainty, texts like *Behind the Bungalow* disseminated enduring images of ruler and ruled and made such images viable and relevant to Anglo-Indian society. Aitken's work therefore expressed the somewhat typical frustrations experienced by Anglo-Indians with their servants, but it also reassured Anglo-Indians of the essential justness of their rule, since Indians were incapable of properly ordering their own lives (or their country).

The British, moreover, believed the Indian caste system circumscribed Indian society and riddled it with unnecessary taboos, and this was contrasted to Anglo-Indians typically depicted as autonomous agents controlling their own destiny. Even though Anglo-Indian hierarchy was notoriously strict, it was, at least, perceived to be rational. The limitations of Indian society, expressed ad nauseum in many imperial texts, theoretically guaranteed the impotence of Indian rule, and the servants in *Behind the Bungalow* are routinely depicted as passive, feminine, and weak—almost a different species. The positional superiority of the Anglo-Indian gave the Anglo-Indian the upper hand, and the separation between East and West in an Orientalist discourse could be clearly seen in the bungalow. Such divisions in their society meant that Indians had proved incapable of ruling or defending themselves, thereby forfeiting that right (and their honor) to the British. How else could the tiny British nation conquer and rule a land of 300 million? The answer, clearly illuminated in Aitken's text, rests on the claim of a superior civilization organized along rational and honorable lines of correct conduct and action, and one in which the Indian servants recognized the greater honor of a race who finally made India "work."

Running the Little Empire

Though Anglo-Indians routinely bragged of the tremendous amount of work they accomplished, it was the servants who performed all of the actual labor in the bungalow. They did the shopping, cooked, looked after the children, and put together meals at the last minute if needed. In fact, some Anglo-Indian women did not have to learn how to cook until their return to England.[26] Though the number might vary, a typical number of servants in an Anglo-Indian household was seven, since the caste restrictions dictated the jobs servants would and would not do. John Masters, the twentieth-century author of *The Road Past Mandalay* and *Bhowani Junction,* finally realized the absurdity of the situation and asked himself, "What am I doing with ten servants?"[27] Christopher York said of his servants that "you had

a lot of them and you paid them very little."[28] Few in England could afford to employ the same number of servants that the typical bungalow employed, unless they were extremely wealthy. An "average" bungalow of a middle-class Briton had a bearer, often a Muslim or a Sikh, who was in charge of all the other servants. He was typically the "manliest" of the group and least likely to be depicted as feminine. A good bearer could tend to the rest of the servants, and he typically made all the arrangements for travel, "but was not too lordly to mend his masters' socks and sew on his buttons."[29] Some Anglo-Indians might even take their bearer back to England for short visits (expecting him to work along the way). A larger household might have a *khitmagar,* who was an assistant to the bearer and often waited table. Before marriage, an Anglo-Indian bachelor typically had a "boy" who could take care of many household duties, but he was usually dropped upon marriage. A *gharawalla* (sometimes called a syce) maintained horses. *Chowkidars* were the night watchmen, and the effective ones supposedly all belonged to the same criminal caste, affording a kind of insurance for the bungalow, and failure to hire from this "criminal" caste imperiled one's possessions. There was also a cook (*khansama, bawarchi*) who might be a Christian from Goa, since they did not have the food restrictions of Hindus and Muslims. The *hamal* dusted; a *dhobie* washed clothes; and an ayah—the only female servant—acted as wet nurse, and took care of the children. A gardener (*mali*) tended to the yard and flowerbeds, and a *punkah-wallah* kept the bungalow cool by operating a large curtain which hung from the ceiling, moving it back and forth across the room by means of a rope tied to his toe. The greatest problem with the *punkah-wallah* was his ability to work while dozing off, which was a threat to British sensibilities. In the absence of a *punkah-wallah,* a "boy" might splash water on a grass mat that hung on the verandah to cool the bungalow. Of all the servants, the bearer was the best paid, making about fifteen rupees a month (in the early twentieth century). One could employ nine or ten servants for one hundred rupees or about seven or eight pounds per month—about one-fifth of the average monthly ICS salary.[30] By the 1920s, a bearer and cook and ayah might make twenty rupees a month, while the lowly sweeper made eight.

Also, because most of India lacked sewage, a sweeper (in various provinces called a *jemadar*, *mehtar,* or *bhangi*) cleaned household latrines or "thunderboxes." As an outcaste and because of his life's work, he had a separate entrance to the household. John Masters explained how the whole operations worked: "Once finished, you shout "mehtar" and you are done. The sweeper, always within earshot

of his life's work, comes in and cleans the thunderbox with a broom and by hand."[31] He would then dispose of the ordure by burning it in an oven or disposing it in a pit.

There were two basics types of servants in India. The higher rank lived in the servants' quarters inside the compound along with their master's bungalow, either with or without their families. These servants often moved with their masters. The bearer, cook, *khidmatgar*, syce, and ayah were typically of this group. The others might work for a British family during the day but stayed in one area, hoping to be hired by the next occupant of the bungalow.

Aitken described these, and other, servants in his work, but since he was ranked lowly in the imperial bureaucracy, the racist strains that permeate his work are perhaps more typical of those further down in the Anglo-Indian hierarchy. As part of the White Man's Burden, however, Aitken's *Behind the Bungalow* mirrored the blueprint for the British rule of India. Both in the empire and in Aitken's work, the central problem remained that of maintaining supremacy over a culturally "inferior" but numerically superior race with minimum expenditure and manpower, which could be accomplished partly by forming alliances with "hardy" minorities like Muslims. Originally written as a series of newspaper sketches, *Behind the Bungalow* was first published in book form during the 1880s, but it continued to be read until the end of the Raj in 1947.[32] Although *Behind the Bungalow* seems to be fairly innocuous and filled with good humor about the servants of empire, an undercurrent of racist thought pervades nearly every page. The message of the book was clear: the British were rulers and the Indians were servants, and little could ever change this central fact of imperial life.

Establishing dominance was among the first tasks of an Anglo-Indian new to the subcontinent, and the first test would come in the hiring of servants, which could be accomplished in various ways. Some Anglo-Indians might find a suitable bearer and then let him do all the hiring, or sometimes servants might come with a bungalow. Some servants might already have long-established connections to an Anglo-Indian family, in which case the bearer might meet the transport ship dockside and start their employment on the spot. Edith Dixon recalled that her father's Sikh bearer, Bhur Bhor Singh, had been a childhood friend of her father. The two of them had played together as children, since Singh's father had likewise served Mr. Dixon's father. This was not unusual, and the connections between masters and servants might routinely stretch back a couple of generations, linking families together. According to Edith, Singh "served

my father all his life until my father retired, and then he went down to Bombay with my father when he left for England. He went on board and he knelt down and he kissed my father's shoes. And he cried. It was just that there was absolute and complete devotion."[33] This was of course the ideal. Other Anglo-Indians, who did not have long-standing traditions of service to India, would have to hire servants when settled. Typically, though, once the British found good servants, they tended to keep them, or at very least they kept the bearer who would move with the English family. This commitment symbolized the mutual goodwill of an idealized master-servant relationship, and a sense of noblesse oblige was expected of the next generation of Anglo-Indians charged with protecting India and taking care of familial obligations toward the servants. Here, as elsewhere in the Raj, the "heaven-borne" of the ICS had the easiest time in attracting good servants, since they typically remained in India the longest, reflecting their greater commitment and service to the Raj, as well as the prestige that went with serving in the house of a *burra* sahib (great man).

Aitken was all too keenly aware of the pecking order which seemed to allot the best servants to the exalted ICS, but he also described the need for imperial knowledge when first hiring servants, and an important component of Orientalist discourse of the time centered on mapping the Indian mind and studying Indian behaviour as it conformed to caste type, as seen in Aitken's discussion of this first real test for the Anglo-Indian in hiring servants. A griffin would be beset with any number of Indian con men looking for an easy mark, and Grant in *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life* related that "griffinage" was the middle state between English and Indian life for those who quit the "tight little island" for the shores of India.[34] In order not to be taken advantage of, *Behind the Bungalow* describes a descending scale of servant "types" who would present themselves for employment. These Indian men would approach the griffin for employment, with the first being a "person of imposing appearance . . . with gold on his turban [and] ample cummerbund."[35] Aitken wrote that the griffin should quickly dismiss this overpriced servant and ask him to come back when the Anglo-Indian had been made a district commissioner.

By "knowing" the various types of Indians, knowledge could be put to use in spotting troublesome Indians before they were hired and were thus able to threaten the sanctity and order of the bungalow. Moreover, submissive but loyal servants were equated with white security. The author Rumer Godden spoke fondly of one servant who was "an avowed fool. But she never bangs, she never flounces,

she never tries to control or contradict anyone."[36] Though Anglo-Indians often spoke of the affection they had for their servants, Indians ideally possessed even more affection for Anglo-Indians, which was the proper response to the just rule of the Raj. Conversely, the prime example of shame for Indians (and to a lesser extent, Anglo-Indians) was the Mutiny, which was described as a time when the servants had unduly revolted against their masters. In 1857, the Anglo-Indian press focused on the role of "Muslims and of hitherto loyal household servants of the European expatriates in fomenting violence."[37] The term "Mutiny" even implied the sense of betrayal felt by Anglo-Indians, who after 1858 would seek to instill a proper sense of loyalty in their servants until the last days of the Raj.

The Revolt also reminded Anglo-Indians of their precariousness as rulers, due to their small numbers, while the ratio of Anglo-Indians to Indians in the bungalow reflected the vast numerical superiority of Indians. There were very few British civilians in India, since the home island limited the number of British in service there—further reinforcing notions of precedence and hierarchy among those "thin on the ground" in India, all of whom fit into a highly stratified hierarchy of rule. During the 1930s, 4,000 British civil servants were in turn supported by 60,000 white soldiers, ruling a land with a population of 338 million.[38] Such superficiality of numbers further reinforced conformity and regularity for the overseers of the Raj. Their bungalows, their clubs, their sport, and their topics of conversation all constituted a common currency throughout Anglo-India and differentiated the Britons from their imperial subjects. This "difference," expressed in the uniformity of Anglo-Indian culture when compared with the staggering array of Indian subjects under their rule, contributed to the self-perception that all Anglo-Indians inhabited the same cultural landscape. Being in a strange land with strange customs made them cling to British institutions whenever possible, which reaffirmed their British identity in a country with more ancient institutions than their own and attempt to reach some kind of consensus on the "correct" approach to empire. The sense of being "aliens under one sky," surrounded by a hostile climate and people, drew the Anglo-Indian community closer together, and most Anglo-Indians knew each other well or at least knew of each other.

One's reputation was important in sustaining such visions of the Raj, and there were few secrets in Anglo-Indian society. Servants, however, could likewise spread stories about British families to other Indians, who could in turn relate these stories to *their* Anglo-Indian families, so that gossip could cut both ways. Ayahs were thought to

be prone to this vice and likely to quarrel with the male servants, especially since ayahs maintained a close relationship with the mem-sahib, making them the near equal of the bearer. Flora Annie Steele described the ayah, with very few exceptions, as "singularly kind, injudicious, patient and thoughtless, in their care of children: but to expect anything like common sense from them is to lay yourself open to certain disappointment.[39] The "humorous" *Curry and Rice* depicted the Anglo-Indian penchant for gossip:

> Now, we all know, for instance, and we heard it through Mrs. Brisket's ayah (one of those Oriental creatures of the genus lady's maid) who had been in Mrs. McGhee's service, who told Mrs. Nutkut's ayah who whispered it to Mrs. Garlic, who mentioned it to Garlic, who repeated it at mess, that Mrs. McGhee often whips Barbara because she doesn't get married. But ayahs are shockingly given go embroidery, and are as spiteful as loquacious. [40]

The stories emanating from the bungalow carried great moral significance for both communities, and Aitken zeroed in on the importance of reputation for both communities: "In truth, we occupy in India a double social position," since one position rested on one's friendships, while the other emanated from the servants and determined one's standing in the markets, where masters were discussed each morning by the servants, and the reputation of the sahib rested upon the "virtue of our servants." Conversely, only Indian loafers would take a job with a master who had worked through "eleven butlers in twelve months."[41] In fact, Aitken claimed that in India it was more important to have worthy servants than worthy friends. Anglo-Indian virtues had to be lived out every day in order to maintain one's position in the hierarchy of the Raj. Servants were integral in maintaining this prestige, so much so that the British attempted to limit scandalous talk about themselves by hiring servants who understood little or no English. Many domestic manuals recommended this course of action—especially for those in the military—although Indian servants probably knew more English than they let on.

As described in earlier chapters, the customs of Anglo-Indian society sprang from the venerable English aristocracy. If India was frozen in feudal customs, Anglo-Indians would rule them based on even older notions of honor, which were inextricably bound up with one's servants. The basis for this aristocratic dominion over the "lower orders" therefore had roots in England, where servant-keeping status had been a hallmark of this elite and where not-so-subtle

distinctions within the aristocracy in England often rested on the ostentatious display of one's servants dressed in the livery of one's clan. During the American Revolution, Lord North introduced a tax of one guinea per head on male domestics to meet the costs of the war. He estimated that 100,000 men would be covered by the tax, though the law was subsequently widely evaded.[42] Daniel Defoe once mistook a chambermaid for the hostess of a party, since the maid was the best-dressed woman at the party. Jonathan Swift, in his book *Directions to Servants,* advised servants, "When you have done a fault be always pert and insolent, and behave yourself as if you were the injured person."[43] Another common complaint arose over English servants' notorious demands for constant tips for the smallest of services from guests, from informing the master that his guests had arrived to providing a pack of cards to household guests for gambling. Such complaints were a staple of servant-holding classes, who often decried their ability to "find good help," but proved willing to claim credit for training worthy servants. British law also stipulated that the master could regulate the conduct of his domestic servants. Anglo-Indians who regulated the behavior of their servants thus took part in an ancient English aristocratic tradition, albeit one that was becoming increasingly middle class in England in the late Victorian era, since it was the ambition of most middle-class English families to hire a servant, though they would never be able to afford the large numbers of servants found in an Anglo-Indian household.

Even though the British attempted to distance themselves from Indians and their beliefs, the Indian could never be entirely repudiated. The historian therefore cannot always separate the two races, since much of Anglo-Indian identity was formed in reference to Indians, especially Indian servants. A heightened sense of power was derived from running the bungalow smoothly and sorting out the problems with servants that seemed to be endemic to Indian society. Since servants conferred status and reflected—for good or ill—on their masters, honor demanded that servants be well trained. Reputations were built on possessing loyal servants who would not embarrass at social functions, and wisdom from early modern England confirmed this, for Francis Bacon wrote that "discreet followers and servants help much to reputation. All reputation proceeds from servants."[44]

To bolster this sense of fealty, photos of the Victorian era, in England and in India, usually pictured the family with their servants as a part of the family, which augmented their status and reputation. This ability to inspire loyalty and obedience, always the hallmark

of successful ruling classes, was carried to an extreme in India and displayed in the photograph in front of the bungalow with servants as an integral part of the family. Servants shored up one's reputation and were equated with status, and Nietzsche, in a broader context, described the sense of honor as coming from the "realization that at one's feet is another human creature who lives and breathes only for one's self, as a surrogate for one's power, [and] as a living embodiment of one's manhood and honor."[45]

Echoing this aristocratic view, and as a testament to the powers of Western values, Aitken wrote that "in India, if you are not a hero to your own Boy, I should say, without wishing to be unpleasant, that the probabilities are against your being a hero to anybody."[46] The "boy," additionally, was very much "a reflection of his master."[47] Doing what came (almost) "naturally" to the British therefore earned the gratitude of the Indian, whose notions of honor and masculinity were severely restricted by his environment and customs. Ideally, he could be made to conform to the desires of his patron (and there were many similarities between Anglo-Indian society and the patron/client system of ancient Rome, in which the more powerful person looked out for someone under his protection in exchange for loyalty). It was, however, "natural" that the Indian "boy" looks for a hero to worship, since such worship was a part of his essential nature, and Indians were often snidely dismissed as "worshippers of tin" for their Hindu beliefs. The servant, if he wanted any kind of prestige or status at all, must ally himself to a *burra* sahib or worthy master, and Aitken again reminded other Anglo-Indians that the Indian, with no apparent agency, was "the ornament of his master."[48]

Another similar example comes from an oral history with Colonel C. A. K. Innes-Wilson, who remembered a telling episode that took place on a crowded railway station in Bengal with thousands of people on the platform on both sides:

> I suddenly saw Nuz Mohammed [Innes-Wilson's bearer] with a large pole in his hands, a sort of cudgel, beating some wretched Indian on the head standing on the railway line between platforms, the train due to come in any moment, beating this man. I didn't intervene. I saw it from some distance away. The stationmaster went out to intervene and Nuz Mohammed hit him on the head, too. So I said I must go round and find out what was going on. And Nuz Mohammed said this man had said something offensive about his sahib. That was me. I hustled Nuz Mohammed away. He was that sort of person, you see, very loyal.[49]

Such displays, especially in front of so many Indians, clearly augmented the status and honor of the master, and the Raj was thought to be run on these very types of quotidian activities that became a relentless demonstration of prestige. Status could be enhanced by having menials who were willing to protect one's sacred name, but since the servant usually lacked this ability to inspire others, he allied himself to someone nobler than himself. Though both master and servant could be made more honorable through each other's actions, the servant could only bask in the reflected honor of the master that he helped to create and protect. Yet, even though servants' honor was therefore somewhat limited by his race and occupation, he took part in the same system all the same, and Anglo-Indian narratives are replete with similar stories of "loyal" Indians defending the reputation of their masters, or defending the Raj itself, for even they realized its greater honor.

Therefore, Aitken believed, the master was the source of servant prestige, since "fate having made him a servant, his master is the foundation on which he stands." Aitken had one "boy" who wore an outrageously large purple turban, for which he had spent many months' pay, and the "boy" defended his choice by stating that everyone would want to know whose servant he was. Other worthy servants would also make demands in the master's name: for tea, instead of coffee, for example. Or the servant might find a slight defect in a rented carriage and demand another. The symbiotic relationship between the servant and served bound them irrevocably together, and each shrank without the other.

This idealized relationship in which the servant beat others for the honor of the master was only possible (when at all) with the bearer. At most other times, the Anglo-Indian sought to distance himself from the Indian as much as possible, just as he sought to distance himself from the India outside his bungalow. Crowded train stations, for example, could be tricky to navigate for Anglo-Indians, unlike the more closely controlled bungalow. For all the noble actions of the bearer, the rest of the servants were not nearly so virile. The Anglo-Indians' sense of honor and benevolence allowed them to visualize their servants as modern serfs who needed to be protected from the uncertainties of the outside world, and from the damage they were likely to inflict on themselves or each other. Stern rule was thus justified, since it was in the best interest of the servant class. The servant had made his choice, or had it made by him through his ancestors. Historically, Indians had "always" made the same choice, and Aitken wrote that "if he [the Indian] had lived in the world's infancy,

he would have sold himself and his family to someone who would have fed him and clothed him, and relieved him of the cares of life. But Britons never, never, never shall be slaves."[50] The Indian then, incapable of ruling others, and unable to produce the benign order usually achieved by the British, must "attain his end in an indirect way, and lives thereafter in such happiness as nature has given him capacity to enjoy."[51] At some point, he or his family had chosen life over honor and his submission bound him to the master, on whose largesse he depended.

Nietzsche even described the need for honor as being more important than life itself. To prefer life to honor betrayed a degraded mind; thus, "one should die proudly when it is no longer possible to live proudly."[52] The Anglo-Indian looked at his Indian servants and saw a people who had traded their honor for the protection provided by a superior race. Not all Indians, of course, were servants, but India had historically failed to maintain its honor in Anglo-Indian eyes, as was evidenced by their endless history of invasion and surrender. There were always exceptions to such formulations, but the British preference for certain kinds of servants mirrored their preferences for certain "types" of Indians as well. Just as the Raj was most comfortable with the monotheistic Muslim, as with Nuz Muhammad, a loyal bearer (especially a Muslim one) who eased the experience of the Anglo-Indian received no end of praise. Muslim servants in general were preferred to Hindu ones, since they would wait on Anglo-Indians at table, while Hindus would not because of caste restrictions. The hierarchy of the bungalow therefore reflected the "natural" divisions and hierarchies of Indian society and the collaborative effort of empire. If the Raj depended on native princes or native soldiers to sustain imperial rule, the bungalow likewise had the bearer, who ideally kept the other servants in line, and whose sense of honor and loyalty surpassed that of other Indian races. Ultimately, however, it was always the Anglo-Indian who possessed paramount power in the bungalow.

Even though servants and employers lived in a shared world, distancing strategies kept servants perpetually at bay. In the British view, these hierarchical relationships were ostensibly accepted by Indians, since the Indians who worked in Anglo-Indian bungalows witnessed the superior virtues of Anglo-Indians firsthand, which meant that working in the bungalow of a sahib brought more prestige than working in an Indian-run household. Similarly, Indians were thought to prefer the autocracy of the British as overlords to the tyranny of Indian rule. Although native princes (men who ruled two-thirds of

India with British political agents acting as advisors) possessed autonomy in their districts, Anglo-Indians commonly believed that local princes and other Indians of the servant-keeping caste mistreated their workers. It was thought that most Indians preferred employment in Anglo-Indian bungalows, for the very same reasons that most Indians preferred British rule to native government. Mary Procida's insight is again instructive: "Indians' misrule of their household was thus, to the British mind, not unlike Indian misrule of their own country, where despotism, violence, and extortion held sway until the British imposition of justice and equity."[53] If Hindus did complain of being looked down upon by the British and ill treated by the Raj, the Anglo-Indian, who was thought to be capable of transcending caste restrictions in his role as feudal overlord, could always remind the Indian that "their treatment of one another, especially of untouchables, was worse."[54]

Even though Anglo-Indians and Indians lived cheek by jowl in the bungalow, strategies of separation typically made the Indian somehow "different," and imperialists often believed that they "defined the identity of servants and the nature of their relationship."[55] The servants' identity was flattened out, and there was little sense of them as individuals with lives and identities of their own—the servant was more a thing than a person. The master-servant relationship could "only operate smoothly in situations where servants and employers are considered different from each other. These differences are constructed and informed, as much as possible, by essentialist notions of race, culture, sexuality and class."[56] Viewing culture through "English spectacles" was not always possible, asserted Aitken, and Indians thus gained little from the "anti-tyranny agitation and philanthropies" and "misplaced sympathies" of liberal reformers. By erecting barriers and distancing themselves—often constructing their identity against the Hindu—the British came to see themselves as benevolent overlords whose rule benefited India, which was better and more efficiently run than England. "What a splendid capacity for obedience there is in this ancient people!" Aitken wrote, "and our relations with them have certainly taught us again how to govern, which is one of the forgotten arts in the West. Where in the world today is there a land so governed as this Indian Empire?"[57] Good servants only served to reinforce Indians' servile nature and the belief that the Anglo-Indians were worthy masters who deserved obedience.

Servants also freed Anglo-Indians from anything mundane, leaving them to what they thought of as their greatest ability—the exercise of moral power: "While in his [the servants'] hands, nothing petty

invades you. Greatmindenedness becomes possible."[58] In order to "prove" that Indians could not "understand" democracy and its institutions, Aitken wrote that "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity are monstrous conceptions," to which the Indian would not "open his mind if he could."[59] Aitken's statement provides another succinct encapsulation of the Raj. "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," the touchstones of the French Revolution (or more broadly, the European Enlightenment), could only be "monstrous conceptions" to the Indian mind. Denying Indians any sense or conception of freedom, Aitken legitimated imperial rule, for if Indians could not understand freedom, they certainly did not deserve it. Anglo-Indians nonetheless believed that they adhered to their Western ideals even while ruling an Eastern and "subservient" people, thus making India the best of all possible worlds. Their bureaucracy retained the ability to govern, unrestrained by the normal conventions and limitations of popular sovereignty, and yet the system worked well—precisely because of the "fairness" and "honor" of the overseers, who knew what was best for their imperial subjects, even if the subjects did not.

Often exasperated by the "inscrutable" nature of the Indian, the British still managed to convince themselves that they could "know" Indians better than Indians knew themselves. This is reflected in the fiction, guidebooks, and histories produced by Anglo-Indians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Regularizing and controlling India thus became a matter of understanding the native, and provided a classification index of the various castes so that the Briton could "know" his imperial subjects, and thus enabling him to rule more effectively, by mapping the Indian mind and studying Indian behavior as it conformed to caste type. In hiring servants, Aitken reminded the Anglo-Indian that he had to study the "chit" given by a former employer closely, and that discerning employees could understand the marks that would reveal the "occult qualities of Boys and divide them into genera and orders. The subject only wants its Linnaeus. If ever I gird myself for my magnum opus, I am determined it shall be a 'Compendious Guide to the Classification of Indian Boys.'"[60] Constructing a type, then looking for various Indians who conformed to these types, usually posed no problem for this scholar of the "Indian mind," and there is similar imagery all through *Behind the Bungalow* that promised to give the newcomer to India much-needed insider knowledge of its mysteries. The "dog-boy," for instance, was hired at an early age to care for and walk the sahib's pet. Aitken wrote that he "is not a species by himself, but represents the early, or larval, stage of several varieties of domestic servants."[61]

Aitken deployed more animal imagery and caste restrictions to represent the stable boy, or syce. The main complaint about him seemed to be that he ate the food reserved for the horse so that the "*syce* became stout while the horse became gaunt." Aitken suggested that one might defile the horse's food to obviate this sort of thievery, but there remained the problem that the syce may be of lower caste than the horse.[62] Aitken solved this problem by letting his syce know that he expected his horse to remain plump and the syce to remain lean.

Another Indian, pitted against Aitken in an unusual steeplechase in which the servant raced on foot while Aitken rode a horse, managed to defeat the author. According to Aitken, this was a curious result, but understandable because the fleet-footed contestant depended on his "curious looking limbs without any flesh on them, only shiny black leather stretched over bones."[63] Everywhere Aitken looked, he experienced the wonder of an India filled with strange and resilient people who seemed to spice his life pleasantly, much as one might enjoy a day at the zoo. As people, though, servants remained curiosities with coarsened outer exteriors, who were inured to the dangers of an exotic world by centuries of misrule and corrupt institutions, making them barbaric but also strangely passive and accepting of others' dominance. Like animals, the natives were dangerous only in large numbers, but when firmly confronted with the campfire of culture, Indians tended to skulk off. The biggest mistake one could make when facing dangerous—but often cowardly—creatures was to show fear. A few resolute Englishmen (more often backed by loyal, native troops) constituted a formidable enough threat to deter most uprisings, or so most Anglo-Indians thought.

Imperial Space and the Bungalow

Part of imperial honor thus lay in ruling the bungalow, but its very architecture also symbolized the characteristics of the ruling race. The bungalow, although dark, had few inner sanctums and provided little sanctuary from prying eyes. Indeed, its very openness was contrasted with the cramped and disease-infested native quarters of towns. Nothing was hidden there; the open verandah and large rooms were thrown open to all, as another example of successful British customs. In India the private and public spheres overlapped, and the bungalow demonstrated the moral worth of Anglo-Indian society. Conversely, architecture in India provided a visible manifestation of degeneration in India. As the nineteenth-century architectural historian James Fergusson noted, "All the south Indian builder sought was a place

to display his powers of ornamentation and he thought he had accomplished all his art demanded when he covered every part of his building with the most elaborate and difficult designs he could invent . . . there were no lofty aims and noble results which constitute the merit and greatness of true architecture."[64] The bungalow, although invented in Bengal, remained a "primitive" structure in Indian hands. In Williamson's *East India Vade Mecum,* the author criticized native bungalows for the weakness of their floors and their excessive ornamentation, which was provided "by dipping the palms of their hands into solutions of ochre, chiefly red, and then imprinting the walls with their hand thus colored . . . these prints are put on irregularly, by no means proving the taste of the owner, who, nevertheless, consider their huts to be beautified."[65]

There were few intermediate architectural types between the Indian palace and the hovel, which was seen as another flaw of Indian society.[66] How could stability come from a people with no real, sensible middle class? These two stereotypical views of Indian architecture reflected the prevailing assumptions of an Indian society split into two feudal camps of humble cultivators and native princes. Opulence and splendor in India was superimposed over misery and squalor, the two often in proximity to each other. British architecture in India, however, stood for law, order, and proportion, the very characteristics of British rule. Eschewing Oriental and ornamental excess, the British focused on an ordered beauty, especially for their government buildings, and neoclassical was the preferred style, in an attempt to link the British Empire to the glorious example of Rome. Calcutta, the most European of the cities in the subcontinent, had "palatial homes in the style of classical mansions . . . [and] even bungalows built with pillars."[67] British buildings had to look more modern (especially government buildings) to underscore the power, rationality, and scientific prowess of the West.

Atkinson's' *Curry and Rice* was one of the first works to describe the "station" in India and all its color. The station was outside the larger cities, and even separate from the Indian town from which it took its name. This was British rule at its most meaningful, as in "when the whole station turned out." The ideal Raj existed at the district level. Coming from the Indian town, one first came to the cantonment where the military was housed. Next came the civil lines, "often very spaciously laid out, in which were situated the club, the church or churches and the jail."[68] In this compound stood the bungalow, separated from the rest of India and secure in its European environs.

The bungalow served other imperial needs as well. As one contemporary novelist remarked, "an Englishman's house in India is not his castle, but a thousand better things—a casual ward, a convalescent home a rest-house for the strayed traveler; and he himself is the steward of it merely."[69] The bungalow was the best of British institutions, exemplifying a willingness to take care of the sick, the value or sanctity of human life, and a largess of spirit and camaraderie in the Anglo-Indian community. Maud Diver described British India as being "the land of the open door," and Anglo-Indians could be assured that they would find an extended family there, since distance and home and the nearness of danger drove Anglo-Indians to an implicit trust of each other.

The openness of the bungalow was therefore thought to represent the security of Anglo-Indians as rulers.[70] The bungalow was central in mapping out an imperial space in which European rhythms could be plotted and put forward, and one aspect of maintaining race discipline required the relative openness of Anglo-Indian institutions, especially when compared with the filth and dirt and disease of "native" India. Thus, "honorable" rulers—unlike the earlier despots who ruled India—lived in the open with nothing to hide. Even though it was an Indian invention, the bungalow came to be seen as the antithesis of the "Indian" way of life. While most Indians lived in cramped, disease-ridden quarters, the bungalow was open, spacious, and on its own grounds.[71] The Indian home was seen as a "breeding ground for moral and physical corruption, [whereas] the openness of the British bungalow dispelled any notions of unsanitary living or ethical degeneration."[72] Although it sat on a compound apart from the rest of the Indian community, the bungalow was still an "open" structure, which indicated the security of the British in their position as imperial rulers of India. Procida wrote, "The British home embodied the ideal of the empire, it was within India, but apart from it, it was open and incorruptible, and it commanded respect from the colonized population."[73]

The bungalow was also believed to mirror the Anglo-Indian character, and mapping these characteristics of the bungalow onto the imperialist reveals their striking similarity. The bungalow eventually came to be seen as a typically "British" structure, ill suited to Indian lifestyles. If anything characterized the "space" of empire, it was this dwelling and its compound, which further underscored "the unity and uniformity of the imperial community . . . the residences stood as a testament to the continuity of the empire."[74] Reputation was also key in maintaining this prestige, for bungalows typically had no locks

on the doors, again reinforcing Anglo-Indian institutions as superior, and Anglo-Indian rule as just, honorable, and obviously better than native dwellings. Honorable lives were those conducted in public and under scrutiny from both Indians and other Europeans, and one of the bedrock virtues of Anglo-India was that of an exemplary life lived in public (which meshed with the classical ideal mentioned in Chapter 3 of a "life in the sun").

Because of this need for an exemplary life, there were certain places in India, like native bazaars, where Europeans rarely went unless they were "loafers" or those already ostracized from the Anglo-Indian community. Since Anglo-Indians rarely went to native bazaars, servants did most of the shopping for the bungalow. As in England, servants mediated many of the day-to-day contacts for their masters, but in India they bore the additional charge of prolonged and exposed contact with Indians outside the bungalow. This kept Anglo-Indians separated from native society and buffered them from having to haggle with locals in the local bazaar or being taken advantage of in a transaction. Anglo-Indian women never went unescorted into native bazaars and most Anglo-Indian males loathed the bazaar "with a truly masculine hatred."[75]

The rise of the bungalow also mirrored the growth of the empire in India. Seldom heard of before the late 1700s, the bungalow became a worldwide phenomenon as the model dwelling of the British.[76] It had existed before, coming originally from Bengal (literally, a "bangla house"), but was little mentioned by Europeans, but eventually the bungalow was "improved" by the British and then exported to other parts of the empire as the prototypical dwelling for imperial rule in subtropical climates. Built using local labor, technology, and materials, the bungalow was cheap to build and flexible. Not fully exploited until the Anglo-Indian adapted it for imperial rule, it was typically ramshackle and "Indian" until the Anglo-Indian used it in a more "scientific" manner.

As Anglo-Indians retreated to the club during the late nineteenth century, and as they enforced the race mystique of a separate and conquering race, the distance served to keep the threatening Indian world at bay. Other institutions served a similar function, such as the military cantonment and the hill station, but this separation spoke also of unease, and of an unwillingness, to live among the masses.[77] The compound and the bungalow distanced the Anglo-Indian, both metaphorically and physically, from India, even as it provided the living embodiment of British mastery of India. As this sense of separation and mastery expanded during the post-Mutiny era, the bridge

between the heroic postures of the British and the actualities of that existence became harder to overcome, especially for the bourgeois elites who did not fight noble wars or conquer enemy territory. The bungalow, however, was one arena in which the British could pretend to have total control, and as part of the fantasy of empire, the bungalow allowed the Anglo-Indian to have almost any desire granted, allowed him or her to live a life of minisplendor. Every day, there were orders to be issued, meals to plan, horses to be groomed, and the countless other functions of a British dwelling in India. One description of this life comes from *Twenty-One Days in India*: "The Briton lives in a grand old bungalow . . . everywhere trophies of the chase meet they eye . . . low and heavy punkahs (India was often called "Punkahland") swing overhead; a sweet breathing of wet khaskhas grass comes sobbing out of the thermantidote (another mechanism to keep cool); and a gigantic but gentle *khidmatgar* (server) is always at our elbow with long glasses on a silver tray."[78]

The Anglo-Indians therefore saw the bungalow as they saw themselves—they were in India but not actually *of* India—and the bungalow could only be held together by the efforts of the Anglo-Indian, who alone could bring order out of chaos. Imperial institutions such as architecture thus represented the need for distance from India, even while colonizing the "space" of empire. That Indians equated bungalows specifically with the British is related in an anecdote related by Anthony King in his work *The Bungalow*. Indians who wanted a haircut that resembled that of a sahib (master) asked for a "bungalow haircut."[79]

(Avoiding) the Legalizing Mission

In an attempt to regulate Indian servants, Lieutenant J. E. Power's *Vade Mecum* (1912) stipulated that servants should produce chits, which showed name, age, occupation, parents' name, and character. As in England, the chit was an informal requirement but one that should be insisted on, although the author noted that many chits were stolen, forged, or borrowed. If believed to be genuine, the chit could show the master "how long the man has served with previous employers, [and] how long he was out of work between periods of employment."[80] One good chit showing constant employment was believed to be better than half a dozen for short periods. Since there was no shortage of those looking to get these jobs, fifteen to twenty potential servants might show up with credentials and certificates from previous employers, and the extreme deference they exhibited

was thought to be typical of servile flattery. One wrote that if hired, "he would ever pray to Jesus Christ (esquire) whom your honor so nobly resembles."[81] Colonel W. A. Salmon sent his bearer a Christmas present, and in returned received "a wonderful letter" that ended with, "And may the great almighty God, which gentleman your honor much resembles, grant you health, wealth and a long life."[82] Aitken warned against hiring a servant who might show up with no references, but for comic effect, he stated that a typical applicant might claim his "chit" burned in a "mysterious fire."

When hiring a bearer, especially, Aitken reminded his readers that they should look closely at his chits, and even here, like so much else in India, there was a distinct hierarchy at work. Aitken describes a descending scale of bearers who apply for jobs in *Behind the Bungalow,* from one who demanded thirty-five rupees per month, down to "darker" applicants with questionable chits. One Muslim applicant facetiously described by Aitken had no certificate at all, and when questioned closely, replied that there had been a disagreement between himself and the cook in which the master took the side of the cook (who was perceived as being notoriously difficult, like chefs elsewhere). Since the bearer's *abroo* (honor) was concerned, he resigned. What the bearer did not relate, Aitken slyly added, was that the argument culminated in the bearer chasing the cook around the compound with a carving knife and threatening that he was "quite prepared to cut the throats of all the servants if honor required it."[83] This was the irrational, primal "honor" most closely associated with Muslims, which unfitted them for higher tasks in life. Quick-tempered and prone to violence, such men lacked the restraint of the Anglo-Indian administrator, whose manly restraint was the essence of his rule.

As noted, loyalty, possibly above all other virtues, was most prized in servants, but the perceived impossibility of receiving fair and accurate information about India always vexed Anglo-Indian society, who could never be sure that their control was absolute, especially since Indians were prone to employing excessive flattery toward Anglo-Indians. Even when the Indians salaamed a European, it was essentially a claim rather than a tribute, and a recognition of his rights and public recognition from the sahib. Though many servants were either illiterate or unable to read English, many masters still took the precaution of writing disparaging postscripts on their chits in French, to indicate the unsuitability of a particular servant. "Abdul, cook, left me on account of ill-health—my ill-health," wrote one master. Anglo-Indians also kept these chits in their custody once the servant

was hired, since an employee with a legitimate chit should have no objection if it was his own chit.[84] Such informal codes regulated the day-to-day existence of Anglo-Indian society and demonstrated their ability to stay one step ahead of the duplicitous servants.

As in most relationships of unequal power, Indians were seen as being endlessly creative in trying to outwit Anglo-Indians, so the typical imperialist had to become adept at spotting subterfuge. The military sought to have servants registered at the cantonment.[85] Empires always demanded vigilance from their enforcers and overlords, and though laws in India regulated the master-servant relationship, many of them could be sidestepped with impunity. One British officer confided to his diary how he had kicked his servant: "I must never kick him or strike him anywhere again, except with a whip, which can hardly injure him."[86] Thus, in order to enforce obedience, Anglo-Indians at times stepped outside their own codes of law. The *Handbook of Indian Law* stated that masters could not beat their servants.[87] Generally, Anglo-Indian society frowned on heavy beatings, though light cuffs were condoned. Aitken wrote that masters were only allowed to cuff their own servants, for "a cuff from his master (delivered in the right spirit) raises his dignity, but the same from a guest in the house wounds him terribly.[88]

Anglo-Indians who did hit their servants were careful to aim them at the body of Indian servants. Punches to the face left ready marks and evidence while body blows were much harder to prove. Frank Richards wrote that most inhabitants of the plains of India, due to their biological inferiority, had "enlarged spleens, and a good punch in the body hurts them more than what it would us."[89] Generally, the abuse of servants continued, but there still lingered the fear that the "natives were getting cheekier every day."[90] The blame for this decline was often attributed to weak or liberal viceroys. In *Meeting the Sun,* which predated *Old Soldier Sahib,* a captain in the army advised an American that, because of the viceroyalty of Ripon, "he must not hit a native."[91] Generally, this restraint was not for ethical reasons, but for the legal trouble it might cause. One European hit a syce, and police said the only way to get rid of the Indian was to put him in jail for six months.[92]

Chits were also protected by law, and masters were not obliged to give their servants a "character." These civil codes were listed in a *Handbook to Indian Law,* published anonymously in 1895 by a Calcutta barrister. This book, intended for the nonlegal public and for students, was an abridgment of the criminal and civil law prevalent in British India. No suits could be filed against a master for his refusal to

give the servant a testimonial, and if the master gave a bad reference, but did so in good faith, he was not guilty of libelous or slanderous behavior, and no action for defamation could ensue. Convenience required that these characters, as "fair communication between man and man," were privileged if done without malice.[93] Such disciplinary power assured the Anglo-Indian of the legality of most of his or her actions, and also the servants' lack of redress or recourse for libel.

The *Handbook* likewise stipulated that a master could dismiss a servant for reasons ranging from incompetence and "want of reasonable skill" in discharging his duties, or for permanent disability or serious and lengthy illness.[94] In England, servants usually had contracts of one year, but in India the terms of service were fixed by the contract, which was usually presumed to be a monthly one. Servants were not entitled to pay for a partial month of work, but only for the complete month; for example a servant dismissed for misconduct on the twentieth of the month was not entitled to any wages for that month, except in the unlikely event that the servant died, in which case his family could claim a salary based on the partial month worked. If the servant, however, quit during the middle of the month, he could be called upon to "compensate the master for any trouble, damage, or inconvenience he may have sustained. No domestic servant who is hired by the month has a right to leave his employment without sufficient reason."[95]

The *Handbook* also stipulated that servants' wages would be paid at the conclusion of the month for work performed. Keeping the wages in arrears instituted a certain loyalty from the servants, if they hoped to receive their wages. Some manuals even stipulated keeping the wages two months in arrears, to ensure that the servant would not walk out without notice. Minors could also enter into contracts of service, since their employment was "for the benefit of minor, who was thereby enabled to earn their own living."[96] In addition to servants, these master-servant laws applied to tutors, governesses, managers of tea gardens, banks, cotton mills, et cetera, and workmen and clerks were also considered legally to be servants.[97] Many forms of employment were therefore regulated by this master-servant relationship, which could, therefore, be applied to Anglo-Indians lower down in the imperial hierarchy, though the vast majority of such employees would have been Indian.

In the Raj, paternalism was thus codified in imperial laws, and masters had rights of action against a third party for injuries to his servant in which the master had been deprived of his menial's services. A master could likewise "maintain an action against a man for

the seduction of his servant; but the girl herself cannot maintain the action."[98] A father, moreover, could bring a charge for the seduction of his daughter. Such charge, however, had to be brought within a year from the day when the "loss" of his daughter occurred.[99] Paternalism in India rested on claims of honorifics and the regulation of servants' (and childrens') lives, whose failings reflected badly upon the masters, almost more so than upon themselves. For a *paterfamilias*, the women and the servants of his household had the ability to shame the master, since his own reputation partly depended on the firm control of his bungalow. Though memsahibs possessed broad-ranging powers in the bungalow, no women were employed in the ICS or in higher positions of government in the Raj. Thus they possessed enormous capacity to shame the men in their family, specifically husbands and fathers.

Another serious offense by Indian servants could occur during voyages to England or on other lengthy journeys. A criminal breach of contract, punishable under the India penal code, applied to servants, *palki*-bearers (sedan-chair carriers), and coolies, for stranding an Anglo-Indian, who was most at the mercy of Indians during long trips (especially if to "uncivilized" regions). If loyalty could not always be earned, the attempt was made, at least, to command it. Behavior on trains or ocean liners could be closely monitored, and since Anglo-Indians almost always traveled first or second class, the danger was minimal. But on longer trips, when they had to rely on numerous servants, the penalties for servants who failed in their duties became substantially harsher.

Another fear centered on large cities, which were notorious for producing inferior servants. After the opening of the Suez Canal, most new arrivals to India arrived via Bombay—a city known for producing unreliable servants.[100] Anglo-Indians generally preferred villagers to city dwellers, since the size of Indian cities made close control more difficult, and consequently cities produced less tractable servants. Large cities, then, were rarely the India of imperial imagination, at least not in much of the literature produced in the Raj. The servants who hailed from Bombay "loafed around the arrival stages" and European hotels and hired on with innocent strangers "whom they will frequently rob and leave in the lurch when they have made all they can out of him, taking advantage of his ignorance." As their "chits" would likely be forged or borrowed, this author recommended that newcomers consult with an Anglo-Indian of experience to avoid this fate—or, even better, to find someone who had brought a servant to Calcutta and was about to return to England. "In this case you

may take his servant, who will naturally be anxious to get back, if you are going his way at your expense, and so save the return fare received from his master."[101] Guides also spoke of the need to establish oneself immediately upon arrival and not be taken advantage of. If possible, it was best not to even hire a servant in Bombay, if traveling upcountry, but to wait until the destination was reached to make this crucial decision. Easier to control, servants from smaller villages were the ideal type of Anglo-Indian imagination, and confirmed their unique vision of an India that was largely feudal and dependent. Since they could not be controlled as easily, cities also housed potentially rebellious Indians students or large numbers of middle-class Indians, and the British preferred to ignore *them* whenever possible.

The kind of esoteric knowledge regarding Indian servants was always deemed to be more important than a strict understanding of legal codes, for what Indians did seem to respect was power. Because of this, reform was always a dangerous word in the Raj. Liberal reforms could incite native unrest that could lead to rebellion, and most Anglo-Indians thought it much safer to stick to what had worked, ruling India without apology and with very little mercy. Flora Annie Steele, in her short story "The Potter's Thumb," wrote that "half of the British mistakes in India are blamed on the false British notion of kindness in treating the Indian as the British themselves would like to be treated."[102] She goes on to note that, regarding justice, "we might as well give a child the right to appeal against his mother when he has disobeyed her. What chance would the child have, to begin with, and then what good would it do?"[103] Whatever British laws guided imperial behavior, British customs were much more closely followed and led to the continued dominance of imperial society. "Men, not measures," was the standard to be followed, and Indians, especially servants, were irredeemably "other," and to treat them as equals was not only ludicrous, but harmful as well, though the example of Nuz Muhammad should not be forgotten in which a servant defends his master's reputation.

Conclusions

Since control was paramount to an imperial power, *Behind the Bungalow* spells out how to maintain this control by providing part of the imperial code that legitimated the Raj and by demonstrating the forms of Orientalist knowledge about running the empire and her people. Still, the British could never directly control all of India but instead preferred a mixture of direct and indirect government. Being

able to properly control the spaces under their direct rule, however, demonstrated the fitness of the Raj and the Anglo-Indians who resided there. Though these "typical" Anglo-Indian virtues became the basis for a heightened sense of race, and white skin conferred obvious advantages in an imperial setting, race, in and of itself, did not wholly explain the professed superiority of Anglo-Indian ways. Just as attitudes toward prostitution can serve as a microcosmic account of the "Victorian" mind,[104] attitudes toward servants can likewise demonstrate an imperial ethos that should be followed and observed for the British to keep the upper hand in India. If nothing else, *Behind the Bungalow* is a system of ethics, values, and norms that contrasts the colonial subject, properly understood, with the dominant and worthy sahib. This seemingly facetious account of servants depended on continually contrasting "advanced" Western traditions (though ruling in India seemed to lead them to their own paternalist past) with a "decadent" East, so that the British could pose as a stabilizing and civilizing influence. This was an established and familiar justification for empire. The British, as seen in *Behind the Bungalow* and many other texts, usually associated themselves with culture and the possession of regularized systems of thought, technology, and government—all of which enhanced their control over themselves, over nature, and over India. The particular genius of Anglo-Indian rule could thus be found in texts like *Behind the Bungalow,* and such works could ostensibly only be produced by Europeans.

Although sometimes inscrutable, Indians could still be "understood" by Anglo-Indians because of the British sense of their own rationality. In *Behind the Bungalow,* no matter how eccentric the various servants are, they generally conform to caste type. In the text they are an endless and amusing parade of character actors destined to play their role in the melodrama that seemed to be Indian life. Without a benevolent but firm father figure, Indians would remain slaves to their willful, passionate nature, and India would continue to be a backward land—or so many Anglo-Indians thought. This aristocratic ideal, so reminiscent of politics in Georgian, and even Victorian, Britain, appeared to be a natural birthright for the Anglo-Indian, especially since British working classes had started to demand a more liberal franchise. Fortunately for the British, India beckoned to those who could still comfortably assume the mantle and aura of worthy leaders. Benevolent paternalism may have fallen from favor in nineteenth-century Britain, but in India it remained a worthy and serious ideal. Those who subscribed to this view, such as Aitken, saw themselves as latter-day feudal barons who dispensed justice with an even and judicious hand and always kept the

lower orders' interests in mind. It seemed to Aitken to be a divinely ordered universe, in which a "naturally" subservient people recognized the better abilities of the Anglo-Indians to rule. In fact, Aitken produces no Indians in *Behind the Bungalow* possessed of any redeeming characteristics other than an ability to obey a sahib.

Anglo-Indian superiority could, however, be justified if Indians were actually being protected by the conquering race. The duties and burdens of the Anglo-Indian were many and varied, but they often emanated from the bungalow first. The apparently sycophantic nature of the Indian convinced the British that they must rule them, since the Hindu seemed to "have a natural aptitude for discerning, or even inventing, your wants and supplies them before you yourself are aware of them."[105] Indians were thus endlessly creative in finding ways to be servile in an effort to please their overlords. The Anglo-Indian saw themselves as protectors of these otherwise vulnerable Indians, who seemingly justified British rule. These "simple" rustics, thought to be the least threatening to the Raj, deserved the greatest protection by the British, since they seemed to be at the constant mercy of unscrupulous Indian moneylenders. Servants might be preyed upon, then, by other immoral Indians and protecting Indians from each other justified British rule.

The Indian servant, yoked to an "inferior" social/religious system with little foundation in rational European thought, possessed no similar "enlightened" institutions capable of running India as well as the British. Obedience seemed to be his natural state, but the compliant nature of most Indians could be dangerous if it turned Britons into despotic, "oriental" rulers. "What a picture!" Aitken tells us, "Look at yourself as you stand there in purple sublimity, trailing clouds of darkness from the middle ages whence you come, planting your imperial foot on all the manly traditions of your own free country, and pleased with the groveling adulations of your trembling serfs."[106] This sentence encapsulates the elements of masculinity, feudalism, "burden," and Anglo-Saxon superiority, as Aitken portrayed them. It was not in the true nature of the British to become despots, but such "groveling" people deserved little better. These traits developed in the Anglo-Indian partly because of the passivity of the Indian; if the British occasionally did become despotic, the Indian was to blame, since his submissiveness brought about the Raj in the first place. Indians should consider themselves lucky that Anglo-Indians showed remarkable restraint in the face of such adulation, although Aitken does remind his readers to refrain from all-out despotism, even though the Oriental mind naturally craved it.

Aitken, while admitting that some Anglo-Indians did succumb to these "Orientalist" tendencies, offered a clever way out of the apparent impasse brought about by the Indian's obsequious manner, but one that further demonstrated what he saw as the primary burden of empire. "The only view possible to the primitive intelligences over which we exercise domestic lordship," he wrote, was a vision in which the Anglo-Indian was considered as a "synonym for channels by which the hard-earned rupee, which is our life-blood, flows from us continually."[107] This is another crystalline statement about the "burden" of empire that rested on British, not Indian, shoulders. If the Anglo-Indian, by sheer dint of willpower, somehow managed to avoid Oriental autocracy, he necessarily exposed himself to a constant drain of his lifeblood—money. Everywhere he turned in India, the imperial agent seemed to encounter another supplicant with open palm looking for the "gift" of empire expressed in his need for stable government and want of undeserved largess. Shouldering the burden would be a thankless task because of the Indians' "natural" inclination toward laziness, which was another stereotypical aspect of the Kiplingesque "half devil, half child," and a large part of the ubiquitous White Man's Burden. Much as in the ancient world (or even medieval and early modern England), where the wealthy Greek or Roman was expected to distribute largesse to those with lesser status, the Anglo-Indian saw his status as merited due to his superior virtue. Aristotle believed in aristocracy, which was the rule of the best, but he also insisted that those who ruled should really *be* the best, or morally superior.[108] Rupees were channeled away from Anglo-Indians and into Indians' hands, and as the Anglo-Indian climbed the imperial hierarchy, his servant adapted the "gauge of his pipe to regulate the flow" of rupees to himself. The "moral beauty" of the system was the beneficence derived from "watering a wide expanse of green pastures and smiling corn," but "if you dried up, they would droop and perhaps die."[109]

In the end, British opinion of their servants reflected their attitude toward the country itself—one of possessiveness mixed with scorn, but also of great affection for "loyal" servants. "You got attached to your own servants and would sort out their problems," said R. C. A. Edge, even while noting that it was the Indian's "improvident" habits that got him in trouble in the first place.[110] Perhaps the popular saying of southerners about African Americans explains the paradox for a people who often "hated the race but loved the individual," an attitude that cloaked racist thought about a race in warm feelings about individuals from that race who are loyal to those of the dominant race.

There are a number of ways to frame these themes found in the *Behind the Bungalow;* all of them are to a degree intertwined through the discourses of masculinity, the burden of rule, and honor. Such notions were clearly explicated in *Behind the Bungalow,* and each theme represented legitimizing aspects for the rule of India. The thread that binds them all together, which is woven throughout *Behind the Bungalow,* is the simple notion that India, in its dishonored state, did not deserve self-rule, and therefore needed to be governed by the dispassionate, logical, and virile British, who were the complete antithesis of "typical" Indians. These relationships were naturalized by Aitken, but he also spotted the usual ominous clouds of equality and independence then brewing in India, and he was of course wary of granting equality to Indians. Although Indians attempted to counter these stereotypes, and other Anglo-Indians were neither as racist nor as dismissive of Indians' abilities, many Anglo-Indian authors continually emphasized their manly traits in imperial texts, and this masculinity was proportionally a very important component of their rule. And yet the judgment on masculinity was not absolute, for Anglo-Indians could find admirable Indians, especially if they were concerned about maintaining the honor of the sahib, like Innes-Wilson's bearer Nuz Muhammad, willing to fight to protect his master's reputation.

The bungalow reveals how British imperial domination functioned at ground level, disclosing the way in which Anglo-Indians gave meaning to their imperial experience. As the most intimate site for inculcating Western values, it represents the clearing in the jungle only a stone's throw from barbarity; and this is why it became important as a technology of power. A well-run bungalow staged for a vast audience the ideal version of empire and the moral authority of the Raj, and the cult of orderliness that was evident in all of Anglo-India began in the bungalow. Aitken's book was certainly overblown, as it was intended to be, but the enduring popularity of *Behind the Bungalow* attests to the perceived correctness of its approach. Like the roads of imperial Rome, the bungalow enabled the institutions of empire to be plotted and carried forward through various points of contact with Indian society. Yet, Roman roads also tell us something about Roman imperial ideology. Just as the carefully constructed highways of an ancient age reveal a "Roman mind," concerned with commerce and the maintenance of law and order, *Behind the Bungalow* (and the bungalow in general) is a lens through which the ideologies of masculinity and the burden of ruling over a dishonorable people are often made most explicit and accessible to the historian. Once the modern

reader understands most of the humor in *Behind the Bungalow* and its implications, he or she cannot help feeling a little nearer to understanding the imperial mind.

The singularity of *Behind the Bungalow,* as evidenced in the opening quotation about the *nowker,* is that it clearly articulated the unofficial policies and the unwritten rules and norms of British rule in India. To get the "feel" of British rule and thought about India, the bungalow provides an understanding of day-to-day imperial relations—to run a bungalow was both to wield power and to maintain status as a keeper of servants. One distinctive element of imperial life lay in this ability to have one's wishes fulfilled by a menial; Kipling in America could not shake his desire for servants to attend to his minor needs. The "natural" order of India was to serve its imperial master, but the country would receive many benefits in return. In *Behind the Bungalow,* themes such as the incapacity of Indians to rule themselves and the dependence of Indians on the British to impose order were clearly drawn for the reader. Nearly all the components of the British imperial ideology can be found in this guidebook on ruling one's Indian servants, and the work therefore reveals a number of themes that are not always explicit in more official documents. More broadly, in colonizing India, the British sought to transform the subcontinent through institutions such as public buildings, public works, railroads, and canals. They emphasized strict record keeping, census taking, and the division of Indians into tribes and castes, and they made other attempts at colonial control. Ideally controlled from above, progress in India marched in lockstep with British aspirations for a more rational—and hopefully more loyal—Indian society. *Behind the Bungalow,* as an imperial manual, condensed and crystallized the elements that legitimated the Raj, so that Aitken's text also serves as a map of the constitutive elements of British ideology. *Behind the Bungalow* contains both the blueprint *and* the justification for the rule of India; in other words, it is the Raj writ small.

Behind the Bungalow also depicted an Indian population largely without honor, for the honor code always required some nearby group to live in shame, and the Anglo-Indian never had to look too far to find an example of a human who had thrown away his honor in return for security. Yet, in the bungalow, Anglo-Indians sought to establish an honorable, imperial "space," which would partly redeem Indians in the process. Because the bungalow was a central feature of Anglo-Indian society, the master-servant relationship found there cannot be underestimated, since the dwelling also signified the honorable intentions and methods of Anglo-Indians. In this regard, honor

was not limited to humans, for it could also be applied to nations and their customs, or even to their dwellings. In other words, the bungalow constituted an honorable space in an otherwise dishonorable land, for, as Kipling wrote "In the House of Suddhoo":

> A stone's throw out on either hand
> From that well-ordered road we tread,
> And all the world is wild and strange;
> *Churel* and ghoul and Djinn and sprite
> Shall bear us company tonight,
> For we have reached the Oldest Land
> Wherein the Powers of Darkness range.[111]

The bungalow represented the clearing in the jungle that radiated strength and honor for a people who often imagined themselves surrounded by superstition and occult darkness. Ultimately, honor had to be maintained in the face of constant temptation for it to have any relevance, since in honor cultures "shame exists as a menacingly permanent threat."[112] Eternal vigilance was the price of empire, and manuals like *Behind the Bungalow* demonstrated the proper form of running the bungalow. Yet the "light" never seemed to penetrate too far into the jungle, for honor demanded that only the bungalow could be sacred and inviolate, much like the Anglo-Indian himself and his government in India, and for the Anglo-Indian honor and power intersected somewhere in his (or her) household, which also happened to be the site of the closest and most enduring contact with Indians.

This page intentionally left blank

Conclusion

The Policeman's Finger

The Policemen: We charge you yield—in Queen Victoria's Name!
The Pirates of Penzance: We yield at once, with humble mien, because, with all our faults, we love our Queen.

The Pirates of Penzance

Now this is the Law of the Jungle—as old and as true as the sky;
And the Wolf that shall keep it may prosper, but the Wolf that shall break it must die.
As the creeper that girdles the tree-trunk the Law runneth forward and back—
For the strength of the Pack is the Wolf, and the strength of the Wolf is the Pack.

Rudyard Kipling, The Jungle Book

In Sir William Lee-Warner's *The Citizen of India,* the author described a typical London street thronged with millions of foot passengers and hundreds of carriages, all in a hurry and moving in opposite directions. However, "one unarmed constable can in a moment stop a line of carriages or any number of people by merely raising his finger."[1] Because of the respect that the English had for the policeman and the law he represented, the constable could easily direct traffic and avert disaster. Some may have refused to obey the constable's commands, Lee-Warner intoned, but a majority of citizens were willing to follow his directions, "since sensible people know that it is for their own good to place themselves on the side of the police, whose duty it is to maintain order."[2] Lee-Warner, like most other Anglo-Indians, had few doubts about the superiority of

British civilization, and he casually divided Britons and Indians based on such anecdotes, perpetuating a stereotypical sense of difference between the two races.

Though Lee-Warner wanted Indians to uphold the dignity of the Raj and follow the "policeman's finger," he reminded Indians that "bribes would not be taken if they were not offered, injustice would not be done by courts of law if false evidence were not given, and disease would not spread if it were not first produced and diffused by neglect of proper precautions."[3] The constable's finger, to Lee-Warner, represented the authority, obedience, and ultimately the honor of British institutions. Even the pirates of Penzance eventually yielded, for they remembered that they were loyal and honorable subjects of the queen. The policeman was equally accustomed to being obeyed, not by force, but through what he represented—civilization. Without him, chaos ensued, but it was not so much fear of the law but respect for it that made the British notable, for it was their customs, and not necessarily their laws, that made them great. In British India, belonging to the honor group often implied a certain way of talking, writing, or behaving that Lee-Warner aptly demonstrates, and by posing as gentlemanly rulers, Anglo-Indians assured themselves that they *were* gentlemen, so that this metaphorical system of signs was the reality by which the individual related himself or herself to the larger categories of imperial identity and power.

As gentlemen, Anglo-Indian males typically thought of themselves as patrons, who, much like the queen, were deserving of loyalty from their subjects. Many Indians, unfortunately, proved to be unreliable and disloyal clients, ostensibly looking only for baksheesh. Still, patrons saw it as their duty to provide for India and Indians, though Anglo-Indians complained loudly and often about this "burden" of their rule, and they simply *knew* that civilization in India would disappear without the British to sustain it. One Anglo-Indian told Louis Tracy, a widely traveled and well-known author, that the railways, roads, canals, law courts, revenue administration, and rigid departmental bureaus had somewhat altered the physical geography of India, but as for the people, the veneer of civilization sat so lightly on them that it "could be obliterated more easily than a schoolboy smudges a figure off his slate."[4] Many Anglo-Indians likewise doubted the "advisability of grafting western institutions upon the gnarled trunk of eastern superstition and ignorance," and the Oriental is not happy, Tracy was told, "unless he makes money by some sort of trickery. He would sooner make one rupee by guile than twenty by hard work."[5] India apparently seethed with graft and corruption, and

even the impressive monuments of Indian civilization, such as Indian palaces, glittered on the surface, but beneath the marble halls were "horrible dungeons." The Anglo-Indian also reminded Tracy that he should not be too taken with the "idyllic simplicity" of the Indian but should instead inquire from a police officer concerning the "inner existence of the calm, patient toiling millions."[6] Outwardly subservient, Indians still lacked the crucial ingredients of civilization, and this deference could also mask the Indian's true intentions, for his two dominant modes seemed to be extreme complaisance, which Anglo-Indians believed was performed in their hope for future favors as part of a continual plot to fraud and deceive, or the mob, with little room for civil protest in between. This was the danger in spreading a thin veneer of civilization over an unruly people, for Indians seemed to be able to absorb only so much of British institutions before becoming nationalist agitators. The sense of respect and honor for good governance found among Anglo-Indians was thought to be almost wholly absent among Indians, who could be compelled to follow the law only grudgingly or from self-interest. Indians could theoretically never become the policeman themselves, for their less developed sense of honor destined them to remain followers, since they could never be completely trusted with power. Ultimately, the policeman's finger could only work among a people who honored and respected the law.

In his work *Lectures on Colonization* published in 1861, Herman Merivale, as befitting his senior position in the Colonial Office, wrote that what made the British an imperial people was their "sense of national honor, pride of blood, tenacious spirit of self-defense, the sympathies of kindred communities, the instinct of a dominant race, the vague but generous desire to spread our civilization and our religion over the world."[7] The exhibition of mastery, a behavior that augmented honor, was also central in this ideological system, and one could never hope to rule others while lacking self-control. Even the somewhat archaic customs of the Raj—the order of precedence, social calling, and the fussy protocols—reflected the self-mastery of a dominant society bent on remaining dominant, and these protocols mattered in a society that had to visibly manifest its sense of mastery over the bungalow and its servants, over nature, and over India. This sense of mastery was itself rooted in a belief in the honorable intentions of the Raj and of the individual honor of the Britons living there, while Indians were of course thought to lack this sense of self-mastery. For imperial society, self-control could be seen in the various microsites of empire, such as their bungalows, and this self-mastery was continually

contrasted with the decadence, entropy, and anarchy of Indians. There were many other such dichotomies in India, but perhaps none so potent as the metaphor of civilization set against the tides of chaos and barbarism that perpetually lapped at the narrow islands of Anglo-Indian rule. The historian Alice Conklin has written that "to be civilized was to be free from specific forms of tyranny: the tyranny of the elements over man, of disease over health, of instinct over reason, of ignorance over knowledge, and of despotism over liberty."[8] Liberty, however, could only lead to anarchy for Indians, because honor was rarely considered by Anglo-Indians to be a guiding principle in the conduct of native affairs, except perhaps when it was the reflexive or perverted honor of the Indian male cruelly mistreating Indian women or obsessed with blood feuds.

Whenever the honor of the Raj was challenged, moreover, the usual defense typically consisted of a sharp attack on the ineptitude of India and Indians. In the historian Jack Gallagher's formulation, the British Empire was like a "gouty old man who shrieked with pain each time anyone came near his swollen extremities."[9] This was due to the infringement upon the honor of the empire, which caused any perceived slight at the noble work of empire to be defended in earnest, and if Anglo-Indians rarely overburdened themselves with too much theory ("over-engined for the beam," as Kipling dismissively described such "thinkers"), they instead stressed lives of work and action as a rebuttal to their critics and as an antidote to self-doubt and introspection. Anglo-Indians obstinately claimed that the empire was kept intact only by their actions, but honor could be lost in the imperial community by a failure to live up to the codes that regulated imperial society. Although belonging to the white race almost always signified power, being white was, however, not enough, since the crucial test of race was exemplified in one's behavior. Holding fast to individual and group values thus became an integral part of the Raj, and if allowed to go unchecked, the vices of the few could threaten the virtue and moral authority of the many. Even those Anglo-Indians who were immune to vice but held liberal opinions about British rule could find themselves ostracized or even passed over for promotion, forcing them to take early retirement.[10]

What appear to us today as the dichotomies of the Raj—Indians being made to lick up blood after the Amritsar massacre while the British steadfastly claimed their moral superiority over these same Indians—were in fact easily reconciled by many in the Anglo-Indian community, since moral and physical power emanated from the same source. Imperial texts were therefore much less concerned with

rational explanations of the politics of the Raj than in shoring up the shared rituals of an elite, as demonstrated during the Ilbert Bill and Amritsar. Indians were rarely seen as rational beings, and honor represented the best method for ruling over the multitudes where the Enlightenment would never hope to be understood. Collectively, such beliefs rested on the honor and dignity of the Raj, which could of course never fully grasp why it was so hated. For a government based on prestige and the sacrosanct figure of the British male and female, the ability of Indians to shame Britons had to somehow be contained. The "honorable" men of the Raj constantly spoke of the need to protect their families and all those belonging to the British race, and the greatest menace to these noble institutions was not death. Instead, the supreme threat to the sanctity of the Raj was dishonor and public humiliation. Anglo-Indians continually emphasized that they belonged to an honorable race, a race that lived in a world of chronic mistrust in which the white herd must stay together, especially during times of crisis. Honor therefore united British society abroad as rulers and provided them with common institutions and protocols that became the bulwark of imperial life, meaning that honor had to be carefully maintained and cultivated, since no empire could endure without the prestige associated with honor, as Rome amply demonstrated through its perceived moral decline.

The codes that regulated the Raj therefore emphasized moral character, masculinity, and gentlemanly behavior, all of which collectively sought to make Anglo-Indians into the honor group. Anglo-Indians thought of themselves as latter-day Romans, changing and shaping the world through patient but relentless action. Questions of dress, talk, language, speech, right conduct, and behavior were never idle questions for a small community that ruled over three-hundred million people, and Anglo-Indians were inherently distrustful of philosophers, artists, or any other interlopers who could spread seditious ideas. A cult of congratulatory self-worship pervaded the rhetoric of Anglo-Indian society, and the men and women who lived by these codes and conceptions of duty were elevated and made sacred in the process, and their otherwise mundane work was infused with a special purpose. Honor thus became the ideological backbone of imperial society, connecting the cortex of imperial administration to the body and ultimately descending to the lower strata of Anglo-Indian culture, becoming less noble the further down it went. It also stiffened the resolve of the Anglo-Indian to rule justly, for the Oriental backbone (at least of the "toiling masses") was ostensibly that of the contortionist, always bending and yielding and likely to double up upon itself.

Honor, most simply, explains how imperial society operated and also distanced itself from those deemed to be inferior, for teaching honor to another race was an arduous and difficult process (when possible at all), for self-rule could not work in a land that lacked large numbers of honorable gentlemen to make it function. Without honor, the empire too closely resembled an all-out despotism with no redeeming features. With honor, Anglo-Indians could cloak themselves in a self-righteous moral aura that shielded them from criticism, especially from those who stood outside the sacred circle of honor such as Labour MPs visiting India during the cold weather, "degenerate" whites, Eurasians, babus, and most anyone who criticized the honorable intentions of the Raj. Honor conditioned the Anglo-Indian to think of himself as a benign ruler in whose hands power became an almost divine instrument that was employed primarily for the material, if not political, progress of India. Notions of honor therefore kept Anglo-Indians tethered to India and to their own society, which always had to remain strong, for the strength of the pack was the wolf, and the strength of the wolf was the pack.

Notes

Introduction

1. John Buchan, *A Lodge in the Wilderness* (1906; repr., London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1950), 33. Buchan's novels, now mainly forgotten, inspired much of the "Tory imagination" of his literary and sentimental heir, Ian Fleming.
2. William Arnold, *Oakfield, or Fellowship in the East,* vol. I (reprint; New York: Humanities Press, 1973), 205. This edition reprints the 2nd edition of the work from 1854, which used Arnold's real name. The 1853 version had been published under the pseudonym "Punjabee" and caused much comment in India and in England, due to its unflattering portrayal of much of European society in India.
3. Philippa Levine, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (New York: Pearson/Longman, 2007), 66. The East India Company (EIC) for many years mistrusted missionaries, and the attempts to outlaw sati in the 1820s reflected the waning power of the EIC. Christian missionaries had long been forbidden in India, only being grudgingly accepted in 1813 by the EIC, and even then were required to petition for licenses and were carefully watched. It took another twenty years before they gained "complete freedom of mobility and organization in India," 73.
4. E. M. Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy* (reprint; New York: Harcourt Brace, 1977;), 197. Forster, responding to Arnold's critics one hundred years after the fact to this "attack" on an "honorable body of men" wrote, "How well one knows the phrase!"
5. Throughout this work, I use Anglo-Indian in the historical sense, meaning people of British descent living in India. It does not denote its more modern meaning of people of mixed Indian and British descent. As a signifier, the term clearly evinced the dependence of the construction of an "Anglo" identity on Britons residing in India, as well as the importance of thinking of themselves as being somehow "Indians" separated from England—a crucially important distinction to their sense of self-worth as rulers. In a recent article, John Gascoigne has shown how the imperial experience "helped to shape colonizers' own conception of who they were." See John

Gascoigne, "The Expanding Historiography of British Imperialism," *Historical Journal,* vol. 49, no. 2 (2006): 578.

6. Arnold, *Oakfield,* vol. I., 302. Oakfield had also assaulted an officer serving as "second" to Stafford, striking him repeatedly with a riding whip.
7. The general theme of this book is the explication of honor in an imperial setting, which no historian has fully examined. A further description of honor follows in the first chapter, but this introduction will examine W. D. Arnold's *Oakfield,* Frank Richards's *Old Soldier Sahib,* and an oral history of Margery Hall—Anglo-Indians of various backgrounds—to show how they could tap into a system that could confer prestige upon them for their exemplary behavior. I begin with such stories and anecdotes (even fiction in the case of *Oakfield*) since stories are an essential part of history, and such anecdotes and stories circulated in India in proximity to honor. Honor could not exist without people to demonstrate its ideals, and such characters personified honor (and its opposite, shame) throughout the history of the Raj.
8. Arnold, *Oakfield,* vol. I., 302–329.
9. Ibid., vol. II., 85–86.
10. The British would of course continue conquering territory into the twentieth century, annexing parts of Burma, for example, in the 1850s (and the rest of it in the 1880s) on a flimsy pretext involving the "honor" of two of its captains who had been taken hostage there. The free trade advocate and critic of empire Richard Cobden responded to this conquest (which the English government really did not want) with his infamous 1853 pamphlet, *How Wars are Got up in India: The Origin of the Burmese War,* which pointed out that these sorts of high-handed actions were usually at the expense of weaker nations. Although the Governor-General Lord Dalhousie and the captains spoke of the humiliation of the British as well as the need to maintain their prestige, the conquered parts of Burma contained the Pegu gold mines, adding another powerful incentive to the conquest. Honor, therefore, often cloaked more prosaic motives, but it was useful all the same in such instances. For a description of the incident, see John Newsinger, *The Blood Never Dried: A People's History of the British Empire* (London: Bookmarks, 2006), 68.
11. Frank Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib* (USA: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1936), 211.
12. Ibid.
13. Douglas Peers has convincingly shown that the heightened race consciousness in British India was formed in the army during the 1820s and 1830s, and it should always be remembered that the army comprised the largest contingent of Europeans in India at any given time. See Douglas M. Peers, "The Habitual Nobility

of Being: British Officer and the Social Construction of the Bengal Army in the Early Nineteenth Century," *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 25, no. 3 (July 1991).

14. The debate over the decision to go to war over the Falklands was often voiced in the language of honor and shame. Jonathan Raban captures the tenor of the debate in his book, *Coasting.* After Thatcher's speech, the MP for Taunton claims that "we have nothing to lose now except our honor." When a moderate voice pleads for diplomacy, he is shouted down, with a few (albeit faint) cries of "shame." See Jonathan Raban, *Coasting* (London: Collins Harvill, 1986), 105–106.
15. Frank Willcocks, a member of the RAF, sent photos home to his father, who asked him why he was never wearing a hat. Willcocks responded that none of the RAF men wore theirs, because they were like "Boy Scout hats." Apparently the RAF men were some of the first to give them up. See Frank Willcocks Interview, MSS Eur R185. Oriental and India Office Collections, British Library.
16. Raymond K. Renford, *The Non-Official British in India to 1920* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), 391. This also marked the eclipse of the "non-official" English in India, who had brought the government to heel during the Ilbert Bill, yet now their threats were empty and easily ignored.
17. James Bowman, *Honor: A History* (New York: Encounter Books: 2006), 113.
18. Arnold, *Oakfield,* vol. 1, 184.
19. Margery Hall, interview by Frank de Caro for T. Harry Williams Center for Oral History's Oral History Project, audiotape recording, 1 February 1978, 4700.0576/838, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA. (I have shortened all subsequent references to these "sahib" interviews done by Professor de Caro in the 1970s to the name of the interviewee and the call number in the LSU library.)
20. Ibid.
21. See Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941–1945* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2006). Their work relates many such examples of the preoccupation in the Raj with status, though it should be kept in mind that when American critiqued the British in India, they usually ignored their own treatment of African Americans.
22. Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (London: Meridian Books, 1951), 427.
23. Katherine Tidrick, *Empire and English Character* (London: IB Tauris, 1990), 268.
24. Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib,* 244.
25. Barbara J. Fields, "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the US of A," *New Left Review,* no. 181 (May/June 1990): 110, 118.

CHAPTER 1

1. Sir William Lee-Warner, *The Citizen of India* (London: Macmillan, 1907), 9. The book arose from Lord Ripon's administration in the nineteenth century, when it was decided that every school should provide lectures of the duties of "man and citizen" to its Indian pupils. Originally intended for colleges, this edition was aimed at younger students. The book is clearly an attempt to bind the two peoples together, though what is more significant here is the use of the term "honor" in relation to empire.
2. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society," trans. Philip Sherrard, in *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society,* ed. J. G. Peristiany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 228. These introductory quotations starkly reveal the contradictory impulses of honor, especially in an imperial setting, and these themes will be further explored in the chapter. The Raj demanded that Indians be loyal "citizens" even as they withheld the rights of citizenship from them.
3. I am excluding here the white dominions like Canada and Australia.
4. I am not asserting that critics did not exist, only that their voices were largely muted during the "high tide" of empire. Even during the less jingoistic 1920s and 1930s, Orwell, miserably living in Burma, only felt comfortable "damming the British Empire" when he had determined that the stranger traveling on the train with him was "safe." Only then did Orwell and the stranger begin to speak of "forbidden things" and criticize the empire, though, by daylight, the two men parted as "guilty as any adulterous couple." See Orwell's *The Road to Wigan Pier* (Fort Washington, PA: Harvest Books, 1972), 145.
5. See Thomas Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) and Uday Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Although both mention honor, they do not elucidate how it operated in an imperial setting, nor do they give a systematic definition of honor.
6. Dane Kennedy, *The Highly Civilized Man: Richard Burton and the Victorian World* (Cambridge: MA, Harvard University Press, 2005), 204.
7. Ibid.
8. A. P. Thornton, *The Imperial Idea and its Enemies*, 2nd ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985), vii. "In a world of shifting opinions," Thornton wrote, the imperialist was assured that only he "saw the world straight" (xxxiv).
9. I use discourse here to mean a discernible pattern of linguistic usage and its attendant logical assumptions, and how such terms and ideas were employed to attempt to exercise power and control over other peoples. This discursive approach examines "not only how language

and representation produce meaning, but how it connects with power, regulates conduct, focuses on specific language or meanings, and how they are deployed at particular times, in particular places . . . it is the way representational practices operate in concrete historical situations. Catherine Hall, "Introduction," in *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Catherine Hall (New York: Routledge, 2000), 12.

10. J. E. Lendon, *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 27.
11. Ibid., 28.
12. For a general description of this methodology, see Alice Conklin, *European Imperialism* (Boston: Houghton-Miflin, 1999), 5.
13. Robert H. MacDonald, *The Language of Empire: Myths and Metaphors of Popular Imperialism 1880–1918* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 3.
14. Even during World War II, the British were obsessed with nonexistent plans that Japan and Germany sought to link up in British India, the Germans driving down from Russia while the Japanese invaded from the east.
15. Daniel Headrick, *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 3.
16. Andrew Porter, *European Imperialism, 1860–1914* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1996), 3–4.
17. John MacKenzie, "Introduction," in *Imperialism and Popular Culture*, ed. John Mackenzie (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), 5.
18. Frank Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib* (USA: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1936), 29.
19. Andrew Porter, "Introduction," in *Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century,* ed. Andrew Porter (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 6. Please note that I have shortened all subsequent references to this series as *OHBE* and designated the volume only. Full bibliographic information on this series can be found in the bibliography.
20. The bungalow, which will be discussed in a later chapter, was typical in that it was modified in India and then exported to Africa. These methods did not always work, however, as in the Mesopotamian example after World War I, when Arnold Wilson tried to run Iraq like a district officer from India, with disastrous consequences.
21. Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880–1930* (London: Penguin Press, 1972*),* 18.
22. Dane Kennedy, "The Imperial Kaleidoscope," *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 37, no. 4 (October 1998): 467.
23. Ibid.

24. The loss of the term "Anglo-Indian" in the 1911 Census of India to "Eurasians" marked a victory for those of European and Asian descent, since they largely despised "Eurasian." This semantic shift brought a concomitant loss of prestige for those Britons living in India, who did not believe that those of mixed-race ancestry could live up to the high standards set by the elite nondomiciled Britons. "Pure" whites never found a replacement term that was convenient and appropriate, marking the perceived decline that took hold in this era (and decreasing "honor" for those ruling the Raj). For a discussion of the initial change, see Elizabeth Buettner, *Empire Families: Britons and Late Imperial India*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 12.
25. For example, see Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity*: *The "Manly Englishman" and the "Effeminate Bengali" in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester Press, 1995) and Philippa Levine, ed., *Gender and Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).
26. Frank Henderson Stewart, *Honor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 63.
27. Ainslee Embree, "The Rulers and the Ruled," in *The Last Empire: Photography in British India*, *1855–1911*, ed. Ainslee Embree and Clark Worswick (New York: Aperture, 1976), 142. Curzon also forbade the singing of "Onward Christian Soldiers" at an imperial durbar since it contained the lyric "Crowns and Thrones may perish / Kingdoms Rise and Wane."
28. William O. Horne, *Work and Sport in the Old ICS* (London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1928), 2–3.
29. James Morris, *Farewell the Trumpets: An Imperial Retreat* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), 479.
30. One example (of many) of frustration with the ICS comes from Secretary of State John Morley, who complained that the ICS was "soaked in self-esteem," and others criticized the service for its "arrogance and assumptions of racial superiority." See Andrew Thompson, *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid Nineteenth Century* (New York: Pearson/ Longman, 2005), 137.
31. Ibid., 17.
32. Saro Coswajee, *Studies in Indian and Anglo-Indian Fiction* (New York: Harper Collins, 1993), 158.
33. The word "Raj" was constructed to have a specifically English meaning. Raja, originally an Aryan term for a king, was increasingly used during the 1800s to denote the English rule of India. The cooption of the term Raj by the British indicated how the process of colonization involved constructing a usable past that legitimated a continuing British presence in India, and that the British were not really aliens at all, since India was accustomed to foreign rule from outside conquerors.

34. David Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 10. Cannadine also argues that the empire was not based merely on race, but on the "more venerable color-blind ranking of individual social prestige" (9). Moreover, India was never a settler colony, since prestige was more difficult to maintain in large societies, and prestige remained almost exclusively the realm of whites. Even Curzon, who is depicted in *Ornamentalism* dressed as splendidly as any maharajah, believed that "native officials commanded little respect and were prone to absent themselves whenever there was an emergency." Lawrence James, *The Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 303.
35. Bernard Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 121.
36. J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers, "Introduction," in *Honor and Grace in Anthropology,* ed. J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 4.
37. Even in the eighteenth century, the term was elusive. The eponymous villain of Fielding's *Jonathan Wild* (1743) says in a speech about honor:

    > But Alas! Gentlemen, What Pity is it, that a Word of such sovereign Use and Virtue should have so uncertain and various an Application, that scarce two People mean the same Thing by it. Do not some by Honour mean Good-nature and Humanity, which weak Minds call Virtues? How then! Must we deny it to the Great, the Grave, the Noble, to the sacker of Towns, the Plunderers of Provinces, and the conquerors of Kingdoms? Were not these Men of Honour? And yet they scorned those pitiful Qualities I have mentioned.

    Quoted in Stewart, *Honor*, 31–32. Fielding's point, as Stewart describes it, is to point out that few people agree on what constitutes honor. Even in the modern sense, we use it to describe sexual purity, our judges, our heroes (The Medal of Honor), or "honoring" a check, to name but a few.
38. Hamish Blair, *India: The Eleventh Hour* (London: Chawton, 1934), 17.
39. M. Sinha describes the distinctiveness of the Anglo-Indian clubs to the imperial social formation, which had to be more racially exclusive in an imperial context, yet also include Anglo-Indian women, who might lose their cultural moorings if "left to their own devices." See Mrinalini Sinha, "Britishness, Clubbability, and the Colonial Public Sphere: The Genealogy of an Imperial Institution in Colonial India," *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 40, no. 4, (Oct 2001): 502–504.
40. The classic definition of honor is that of Julian Pitt-Rivers in "Honor," in *International al Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* 18

vols., ed., David Sills, (New York: 1968), VI, 503–510. The concept of honor/shame societies grew out of studies of the Mediterranean and spread to studies of the American South.

41. George Orwell, *Burmese Days* (New York: Harcourt, 1962), 17, 47.
42. Ibid., 69.
43. Ibid., 191.
44. Ibid., 69.
45. Ibid.
46. Lendon, *Empire of Honour,* 24.
47. As an example, Major-General R. C. A. Edge, in an oral history recorded in the 1970s, told a story about one of his servants who habitually garnered fifty extra rupees for himself by haggling at the market for food and keeping the difference between what he was given for food and what he actually paid. Edge scolded his servant and informed the servant that he would pay him an extra fifty rupees per month—a system he used until his servant became quite miserable and begged to go back to the old system, since the more honest system deprived him of one of the greatest pleasures in life, stealing. Anglo-Indian society had many similar stories of native graft that reflected the "real nature" of Indians who preferred dissembling to telling the truth and graft to honesty. R. C. A. Edge, interview by de Caro. 4700.0586/859.
48. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (New York, 1958), 83. Quoted in Abraham Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," *Albion,* vol. 12, no. 4 (1980): 338.
49. Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 338.
50. Bernard Mandeville, *An Enquiry into the Origin of Honor, or the Usefulness of Christianity in War* (London, 1732), 42–46, 84–84. Quoted in Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 338.
51. Francis Hutcheson, *A Short Introduction to Moral Philosophy* (Glasgow, 1747), 53–54. Quoted in Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 338.
52. For the linking of honor and virtue, see Julian Pitt-Rivers, "Honour and Social Status," in Peristiany, *Honour and Shame,* 48.
53. Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, "Introduction," in Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, *Honour and Grace,* 4.
54. Pitt-Rivers, "Honour and Social Status," 24–25.
55. Samuel Johnson, *English Dictionary* (Philadelphia: Kimber and Sharpless, 1839). sv. "honor."
56. Pitt-Rivers, "Honour and Social Status," 23.
57. For the idea of the permanence of the Raj, see Francis Hutchins, *The Illusion of Permanence* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967).
58. Stewart, *Honor,* 13, 21.
59. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 14. This

book, and its abridgement, *Honor and Violence in the Old South,* are fundamental to my work.

60. Ibid.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., 15.
63. Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, "Introduction," in Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, *Honour and Grace,* 5.
64. Julian Pitt-Rivers, "Honor," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* vol. 6 ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 503.
65. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor,* xv.
66. Elliot Evan Mills, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire: A Brief Account of Those Causes which Resulted in the Destruction of our Late Ally, Together with a Comparison between the British and Roman Empire* (Appointed for use in the National schools of Japan. Tokyo, 2005) (Oxford: Alden, 1905), 19. (The phrase in the quotation is Gibbon's, specifically linking Roman and British decline). Mills published the book under a Japanese pseudonym (though he mistook a Chinese name for a Japanese one) and fictitiously set the book in Japan in the year 2005, after the "fall" of the British Empire.
67. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj,* 177, 181.
68. See Ranajit Guha, "Dominance without Hegemony and Its Historiography," in *Subaltern Studies 6: Writings on South Asian History and Society,* ed. R. Guha (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989).
69. Anne Chisholm, *Rumer Godden: A Storyteller's Life* (New York: Greenwillow Books, 1998), 55.
70. Bourdieu, "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society," 212.
71. Ibid., 211.
72. Rudyard Kipling, "The Conversation." Quoted in Hugh Ridley, *Images of Imperial Rule* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 113.
73. David Gilmour, *The Ruling Caste: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), 253.
74. MacDonald, *The Language of Empire,* 4.
75. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 252. Malcolm Darling, born in 1880s and in the ICS from 1904 to 1940, described one colleague as that rare specimen in Anglo-Indian, a "lover of books." Another civilian wanted to prevent himself from turning into a stereotypical Anglo-Indian, a "Philistine, strong-hearted, curry-eating, self-important and antiquated," 252.
76. Steevens, *Egypt in 1898* (London: Dodd, Mead, 1899), 253–254.
77. David C. Potter, *India's Political Administrators* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 77. Potter points out that Anglo-Indian members of the ICS often had a high regard for Indian members of the same service. Individual relations between the two, based on a mutual

admiration of the masculine qualities of the other, were possible, although there is no doubt that "a majority of ICS men held more or less strong feeling of racial superiority vis-à-vis the rest of Indian society and culture," 80. Indian members of the ICS did have to initially attend some sort of schooling in England, which was thought to bring about a certain unanimity of outlook and allowed Indians to absorb gentlemanly qualities from their original breeding grounds, English schools.

78. *Bombay Gazette,* December 10, 1904. Quoted in A. N. Wilson, *After the Victorians: The Decline of Britain in the World* (New York: Picador, 2005), 22.
79. Pitt-Rivers, "Honor," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* 510.
80. Richard Humphrey, *Georges Sorel* (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), 220. Quoted in Alan Sandison, *Wheel of Empire* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967), 112.
81. James Mill, *The History of British India,* 365. Quoted in *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, ed. C. H. Philips (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 418.
82. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire,* 81.
83. J. S. Mill, "Considerations on Representative Government," from *Three Essays* (reprint London: Oxford University Press, 1966), 150.
84. Grant Duff draft memo for Dufferin, June 1885, Grant Duff papers. Quoted in Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 22.
85. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 22.
86. H. S. Cunningham, "The Coeruleans," Quoted in Bhupal Singh, *Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*, 2nd ed. (London: Curzon Press, 1975), 27.
87. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire,* 89. As James Mill put it, "A thought must be crude to come into its own action," 81.
88. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj,* 106.
89. Ibid.
90. Ibid., x.
91. Hutchins, *The Illusion of Permanence*, 72.
92. L. C. Dunsterville, Paper read to the Kipling Society on June 20, 1933, by and published in the *Kipling Journal,* no. 26, 49–55 (June 1933). Collected in Roger Green, ed. *Rudyard Kipling: The Critical Heritage* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 374.
93. Dunsterville, Kipling Society Paper, 374.
94. Edmund Burke, *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents,* 530. Quoted in Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 341.
95. Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 337. Though Kriegel is discussing the European contest of honor, it equally applies in British India.
96. Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," 55. Quoted in Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 26.

97. David Hume, "Enquiry Concerning Principles of Morals," in *Hume's Moral and Political Philosophy,* 184. Quoted in Kriegel, "Burke and the Quality of Honor," 345.
98. Valentin Chirol, *Indian Unrest* (London: Macmillan, 1910), 308. This statement was prompted by Montagu's speech in which he said the viceroy should be an agent of the secretary of state for India.
99. Lieutenant Colonel Alexander George Stuart, *The Indian Empire: A Short Review and Some Hints for the Soldier Proceeding to India* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1927), 97. Before World War I, this book was published as *Our Indian Empire,* but the possessive was dropped after the war, signifying a change in the imperial relationship.
100. Mill, "*Considerations,*" 200.
101. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj,* 133. Mrinalini Sinha's, *Colonial Masculinity* explores in detail the logic of colonial masculinity but, like Metcalf, Sinha does not discuss honor in any detail.
102. Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity,* 38.
103. Ibid., 40.
104. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor,* viii.
105. See Guha, "Dominance Without Hegemony."
106. Orlando Patterson, "The Code of Honor in the Old South." Review of Bertram Wyatt-Brown's *Southern Honor* in *Reviews in American History,* vol. 12, no. 1 (March 1984): 24.
107. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor,* xv.
108. Mehta, *Liberalism and Empire,* 63. Mehta is discussing these norms in the context of "breeding gentleman" but they are equally applicable to honor.
109. Peristiany, *Honor and Shame,* 11.
110. Kenneth Ballhatchett, *Race Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Their Critics, 1793–1905* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980), 101.
111. R. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude: A Social History of the European Community in Calcutta* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1912), 175. The danger of race-mixing was clear to Anglo-Indian society because of the legacy of Haiti, where the uprising was carried out by the "mulattos," who were the product of mixed marriages between European men and African women.. As a result, in 1791, the East India Company forbade Eurasians from covenanted employment in the Company.
112. James Bryce noted these exceptions, naming two Indians, Sir Syed Ahmed of Aligurh and Trimbak Telan of Bombay, who possessed this "force of character," but Bryce noted that Indians, "with a few remarkable exceptions," did not possess the qualities needed for "leadership in war or for the higher posts of administration in peace." James Bryce, *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India* (London: Oxford University Press, 1913), 41.

113. Burke, "Speech in Opening the Impeachment" in *Works,* vol. 4, 289. Quoted in Isaac Kramnick, *The Rage of Edmund Burke* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 137.
114. For a detailed explanation of the power of the memsahibs, see Mary Procida, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics, and Imperialism in India 1883–1947.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).
115. James, *Raj,* 221.
116. For this link, see Procida, *Married to the Empire.*
117. Ann Laura Stoler, "Cultivating Bourgeois Bodies and Racial Selves," in *Cultures of Empire,* ed. Catherine Hall (New York: Routledge, 2000), 90.
118. Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality* (USA: St. Martin's Press, 1990), 120.
119. James, *Raj,* 283.
120. Ibid.
121. Ibid., 287.
122. Nancy L. Paxton, *Writing under the Raj: Gender, Race and Rape in the British Colonial Imagination, 1830–1947* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990), 111.
123. Angela Woollacott, *Gender and Empire* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 45.
124. Flora MacDonald, *Englishman*, March 13, 1883, 2. Quoted in Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity*, 56.
125. Edward J. Bristow, *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movements in Britain since 1700* (London: Gill and Macmillan, Rowman and Littlefield, 1977), 76.
126. A. Claude Brown, *The Ordinary Man's India* (London: Cecil Palmer, 1927), 120.
127. Horne, *Work and Sport,* 23.
128. Ibid., 47.
129. Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor,* viii.
130. Rosalind O'Hanlon, "Gender in the British Empire," in *OHBE*: *Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century*, 389.
131. Philippa Levine, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (Great Britain: Pearson Education, 2007), 145.
132. Ann Laura Stoler's work amply demonstrates the obsession of Europeans in Asia with degeneration and the need to maintain prestige among Asians. See her *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
133. Letter to *The Times,* June 6, 1908. Quoted in James, *The Raj,* 422.
134. Derek Sayer, "British Reaction to the Amritsar Massacre, 1919–1920," *Past and Present,* no. 131 (May 1991): 130.
135. *Hansard*, 5th ser. (Commons), cxxxi, col. 1725. Quoted in Sayer, "British Reaction," 131.

136. *The Times*, July 12, 1920. Quoted in Sayer, "British Reaction," 158.
137. Helen Fein, *Imperial Crime and Punishment,* (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1977)xii–xiii. Quoted in Sayer, "British Reaction," 133.
138. Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, "Introduction," in Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, *Honour and Grace,* 11.
139. John Alfred Wyllie, *India at the Parting of the Ways: Monarchy, Diarchy, or Anarchy?* (London: Lincoln Williams, 1934), 129.
140. Tim Coates, ed., *The Amritsar Massacre 1919: General Dyer in the Punjab,* rev. ed. (London: The Stationery Office, 2000), 137.
141. Purnima Bose, *Organizing Empire: Individualism, Collective Agency, and India* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 37.
142. *The Amritsar Massacre 1919,* 31, 33.
143. *Hunter Committee Report,* 1087–1088. Quoted in Sayer, "British Reaction," 142. The Hunter Committee, led by Lord Hunter, a Scottish Jurist, was set up to investigate the events at Amritsar.
144. Piers Brendan, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007), 262.
145. Paul Scott, *The Day of the Scorpion* (New York: Avon Books, 1979), 64.
146. Jenny Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of the Woman in the Colonial Text* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 8.
147. James, *The Raj,* 471.
148. Ibid., 473.
149. Ibid., 474.
150. *Daily Mail,* May 4, 1920. Quoted in Sayer, "British Reaction," 134.
151. *The Amritsar Massacre,* 64.
152. Ibid., 70.
153. Sayer, "British Reaction," 147.
154. Sharpe, *Allegories of Empire,* 2.
155. Bose, *Organizing Empire,* 38.
156. Bourdieu, "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society," 214.
157. As a reminder, I am using honor in this sense. Character, which is often confused with honor, I also take as an internalized ideal, like guilt, that if not displayed before the ruling public, did not necessarily matter. In India, when character was displayed, it inevitably changed into honor, and into a system based on honorific principles. As Bertram Wyatt-Brown puts it, "The shame-honor ethic is realized in external appearances, so that the individual knows who he is by reference to what others say and think about him. Thus, if he commits a dishonorable act and no one knows, he feels no disgrace. If it is exposed, then he is stigmatized and considered an outcast in extreme cases. Conscience, though, is based on internal motivations

and sense of self-worth, so that if the man of conscience does something he knows is wrong, he feels guilty and, if he has character (or honor as it is sometimes designated to make matters confusing), he will make amends, confess, or otherwise seek to undo the wrongdoing. Christian faith, of course, at its best, rejects the honor-shame nexus." Personal communication with Bertram Wyatt-Brown, 10/15/2007.

158. Alex von Tunzelmann, *Indian Summer: The Secret History of the End of an Empire* (New York: Henry Holt, 2007), 43.
159. Ibid.
160. Nehru, *An Autobiography* (London: John Lane, 1937), 43–44. Quoted in Von Tunzelmann *Indian Summer,* 44.
161. Potter, *India's Political Administrators*, 36.
162. Edward Thompson, *The Other Side of the Medal* (London: Hogarth Press, 1925), 117–118. Quoted in Ian Baucom, *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 105.
163. Sir Richard Temple, *India in 1880,* 3rd ed. (London: John Murray, 1881), 136.
164. Tunzelmann, *Indian Summer,* 43.
165. Leslie Stephen, *Life of Fitzjames Stephen* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1895), 295.
166. Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib,* 187–188.
167. Stuart, *The Indian Empire,* 22.
168. Violence was most commonly associated with lower Anglo-Indian classes and with planters remote from "official" society (who were themselves not considered to be "top drawer" in the hierarchy). Anglo-Indians received light punishment for offences against Indians. In 1901, out of 199 cases of Europeans attacking natives, 146 were by the army, but Europeans consistently got light sentences: confinement to barracks or a fine, while an Indian who struck a European received imprisonment. Curzon's attempt to impose harsher sentences on soldiers was unpopular with Anglo-Indians, since prestige dictated that it would be impossible to have "an exactly equal law for Natives and Europeans." See E. M. Collingham, *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, c. 1800–1947* (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2001), 144. Anglo-Indians perhaps realized that the "dirty work" of empire had to be performed, and they therefore protected their own. Violence did not bother imperial society too much as long as it did not become too public.
169. Raymond K. Renford, *The Non-Official British in India to 1920* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), 296.
170. Ibid.
171. Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib,* 79.
172. Ibid.

173. Hillary Spurling, "Paul Scott: Novelist and Historian," in *Adventures with Britannia: Personalities, Politics and Culture in Britain,* ed., William Roger Louis (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 35–36.
174. Spurling, "Paul Scott," 37.
175. Victor Turner, "The Forest of Symbols," *Annual Review of Anthropology,* vol. 4 (1975), 145.
176. Thornton, *The Imperial Idea and its Enemies,* xxx.
177. Edward Ingram, "The Raj as Daydream," in *Studies in British Imperial History: Essays in Honor of A. P. Thornton,* ed. Gordon Martel (London: Macmillan, 1986), 88.

CHAPTER 2

1. This quotation fittingly appears in the introduction to Lea Homer, *The Day of the Saxon* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908).
2. John Stuart Mill, "On Liberty," *Three Essays* (reprint, London. Oxford University Press, 1966), 141.
3. Clark Worswick, "Photography in British India," in *The Last Empire: Photography in British India,* ed. Clark Worswick and Ainslee Embree (New York: Aperture, 1976), 1. The author also notes that thirty years after the Mutiny, Victoria could be found studying Hindustani, eating Indian curries, and proclaiming that she was finally in "real contact" with the people of India. She also had a fondness for being photographed with her Indian servants, which seemed to reflect the imperial splendor of her empire and the unique relationship between Britain and India.
4. Sir William Lee-Warner, *The Citizen of India* (London: Macmillan, 1907), 8–9.
5. Kenneth Ballhatchett, *Race Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and their Critics, 1793–1905* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980), 164.
6. Frank Henderson Stewart, *Honor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 46.
7. Arthur Schopenhauer, "The Wisdom of Life," in *Essays from the Parerga and Paralipomena,* trans. T. Bailey Saunders (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1951), 92.
8. Wordsworth, "The Wanderer," line 341, *The Excursion,* ed. Thomas Hutchinson (Oxford: Oxford Standard Authors, 1904), 926.
9. John Beames, *Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), 132.
10. Rosalind O'Hanlon, "Gender in the British Empire," in *OHBE: Vol. III: The Twentieth Century*, 392.
11. Charles Allen, ed., *Plain Tales from the Raj* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1975), 96–97.

12. Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks, *Contesting Colonial Hegemony* (London: British Academic Press, 1994), 6.
13. Roberta J. Park, "Biological Thought, Athletics, and the formation of a 'Man of Character,'" in *Manliness and Morality,* ed. J. A. Mangan and James Walvin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 7.
14. Parliamentary Papers 1876, lv (c. 1446), 417 (141). Quoted in J. M. Compton, "Open Competition and the Indian Civil Service, 1854–1876," *English Historical Review,* vol. 83, no. 327 (April 1968): 276.
15. Christopher, Bayly, "Returning the British to South Asian History," in *Origins of Nationality in South Asia: Patriotism and Ethical Government in the Making of Modern India,* ed. Christopher Bayly (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 289.
16. W. E. Mosse, *Liberal Europe: The Age of Bourgeois Realism: 1848–1875* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974), 12.
17. W. J. Reader, *At Duty's Call: Studies in Obsolete Patriotism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), l, 15.
18. John MacKenzie, "Empire and Metropolitan Cultures," in *OHBE: Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century,* 271.
19. Katherine Tidrick, *Empire and English Character* (London: IB Tauris, 1990), 4.
20. Ibid., 10.
21. J. W. Kaye, "The English in India," *Calcutta Review,* vol. 1, no. 1 (1844), 11. Quoted in Nihar Singh, *British Historiography on British Rule in India: The Life and Writings of Sir John William Kaye, 1814–1876.* (New Delhi: Janaki Prakashan, 1986), 25.
22. J. W. Kaye, "The English in India," *Calcutta Review,* vol. 1, no. 2 (1844), 292, 319. Quoted in Singh, *British Historiography,* 25.
23. John MacKenzie, *Orientalism*: *History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 22.
24. Robert A. Stafford, "Scientific Exploration and Empire," in *OHBE: Vol. III: Nineteenth Century,* 315. Although many Anglo-Indians sought careers in India to be able to "spread their wings," England was becoming more liberal in the nineteenth century, with the Reform Bill of 1832 and other reforms that enfranchised more Englishmen. Those who did not like this "vulgar" trend could also flee England and live in a land where status still reigned.
25. Francis Hutchins, *The Illusion of Permanence* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967), 128.
26. William Roger Louis, "Introduction," in *OHBE: Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century,* ix.
27. E. M. Collingham, *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, c. 1800–1947* (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2001), 118.
28. For the enduring appeal of the "Punjabi School," see Collingham, *Imperial Bodies,* 119, and Metcalf, *Aftermath of Revolt,* 250–252.

29. George Birdwood, "Competition and the Indian Civil Service." A Paper Read before the East India Association, Tuesday, May 21, 1872 (1872), 16. Quoted in Collingham, *Imperial Bodies,* 119.
30. Bradford Spangenberg, "The Problem of Recruitment for the Indian Civil Service during the Late Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Asian Studies,* vol. 30, no. 2 (February 1971): 351.
31. Robin Moore, "Imperial India, 1858–1914," in *OHBE: Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century,* 429–430.
32. Raymond K. Renford, *The Non-Official British in India to 1920* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), 25.
33. Ibid.
34. On the issue of "character" in England, see Stefan Collini, *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850–1930* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). Much like character in Britain, honor could be widely distributed to all classes, and even socialists in England spoke of the rampant individualism of England was destroying "character," 93.
35. J. Morley, *Life of Gladstone,* vol. 1, 649. Quoted in J. M. Compton, "Open Competition and the Indian Civil Service, 1854–1876," *English Historical Review,* vol. 83, no. 327 (April 1968): 266.
36. Denison to Sir Charles Wood, secretary of state for India, November 7, 1863, Wood Paper, 87/4 MSS. Eur. F. 78 India Office. Quoted in Compton, "Open Competition," 268.
37. Birdwood, Open Competition and the Indian Civil Service, 10. Quoted in Compton, "Open Competition," 269.
38. Ibid.
39. Compton, "Open Competition," 270.
40. John Cell, "Colonial Rule," in *OHBE: Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century*, 233.
41. Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 25.
42. Philip Mason, *English Gentleman,* 170. Quoted in David C. Potter, *India's Political Administrators* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 74.
43. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 72. Of course, not all members of the ICS attended public schools, but as Potter points out, even the grammar school, as much as possible, aped the traditions of the public school, even in Scotland or Ireland.
44. Simon Raven, *English Gentleman,* 58–59. Cited in Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 72–73.
45. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 77. As noted in Chapter 1, this gentlemanly code remained the dominant model of the ICS and other bureaucracies staffed by Anglo-Indians. Potter points out that Anglo-Indian members of the ICS often had a high regard for Indian members of the same service. Individual relations between the two, based on a mutual admiration of the masculine qualities of the other, were possible, although there is no doubt that "a majority

of ICS men held more or less strong feelings of racial superiority, vis-à-vis the rest of Indian society and culture." Indian members of the ICS did have to initially attend some sort of schooling in England, which was thought to bring about a certain unanimity of outlook and allowed Indians to absorb gentlemanly qualities from their original breeding grounds, English schools.

46. Reader, *At Duty's Call,* 134.
47. Sir John Strachey, *India, its Administration and Progress* (London: John Murray, 1888), 432.
48. Reader, *At Duty's Call,* 99.
49. Ute Frevert, "Honour and Middle-Class Culture," in *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe,* ed. Jurgen Kocka and Allen Mitchell (Oxford: Berg, 1993), 219.
50. H. John Field, *Toward a Programme of Imperial Life* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1982), 70.
51. Sir Richard Temple, *India in 1880,* 3rd ed. (London: John Murray, 1881), 44.
52. Temple, *India in 1880,* 44.
53. David Cannadine, *The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain* (New York: Columbia University Press), 108.
54. Susanne Rudolph and Lloyd Rudolph, ed., *Reversing the Gaze: Amar Singh's Diary, A Colonial Subject's Narrative of Imperial India*, ed. Susanne Rudolph and Lloyd Rudolph (USA: Westview Press, 2002), 8–10.
55. Susanne Rudolph and Lloyd Rudolph, *Reversing the Gaze,* 15.
56. Montesquieu, *Oeuvres,* vol. 2 (Paris, 1958), 354. Quoted in Peristiany, *Honour and Shame,* 73.
57. Cannadine, *Rise and Fall of Class in Britain,* 108.
58. Douglas M. Peers, "Britain and Empire," in *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain,* ed. Chris Williams (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 63.
59. Peers, "Britain and Empire," 63.
60. Ian Baucom, *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 79.
61. T. Smith, "Architectural Art in India," 281. Quoted in Baucom, *Out of Place,* 79–80.
62. Reader, *At Duty's Call,* 36.
63. R. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude: A Social History of the European Community in Calcutta* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1912), 214–215.
64. Bhupal Singh, *Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*, 2nd ed. (London: Curzon Press, 1975), 7.
65. As Dane Kennedy notes in *The Magic Mountains,* affairs among Anglo-Indians were sanctioned only in the hill stations, the area to which Anglo-Indian society escaped both the Indian climate and Indian humanity. Behavior that transgressed most imperial codes in the rest of India was accepted there which transgressed most imperial

codes in the rest of India, and the idyllic setting of the hill stations reminded Anglo-Indian society of England and allowed them to relax and drop their tough, imperial exterior, if only for a while.

66. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude,* 215.
67. A previous example in which aristocratic conceptions of honor slowly seeped into the lower strata is documented in studies of the ancient world. In ancient Greece, the growth of slavery reinforced the timocratic character of the ruling class, but also "stimulated its diffusion among all classes, for, by the classical period, these were societies in which even the destitute felt deprived if they could not afford a slave." See Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 87.
68. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude,* 214.
69. Though dueling in the middle-class Indian army was popular after it had lost its appeal in England, since imperial men had more power, and thus more of a reputation to defend when living in India, and dueling was a relatively easy route to the world of the genteel. Since much of the British Army and Navy were quartered abroad, their influence on English life may have been minimized there, so that dueling remained popular in India because of the preponderance of military officers there. See Antony Simpson, "Dandelion on the Field of Honour: Dueling, the Middle Classes, and the Law in Nineteenth Century England," *Criminal Justice History,* vol. 9 1988): 139.
70. "On Duelling," *Law Times,* March 16, 1844, 484–485. Quoted in Simpson, "Dandelion on the Field of Honour," 134.
71. Simpson, "Dandelion on the Field of Honour," 134.
72. Ibid., 140.
73. Anonymous, "Duelling in Our Indian Army," *Colburns' United Service Magazine* (1844): 240.
74. Ibid.
75. Peter Quennell, ed., *The Prodigal Rake: Memoirs of William Hickey* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1962), 112.
76. Ibid., 240.
77. Simpson, "Dandelion on the Field of Honour," 140.
78. Ibid., 141.
79. Brander Matthews, "Kipling's Deeper Note," (1926). Collected in *Rudyard Kipling,* 338.
80. Frevert, "Honour and Middle-Class Culture," 226.
81. Cannadine, *Rise and Fall of Class in Britain,* 158.
82. A. Claude Brown, The *Ordinary Man's India* (London: Cecil Palmer, 1927), 21.
83. Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 14.
84. David Gilmour, *The Ruling Caste: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), 253.

85. Yvonne Fitzroy, "Courts and Camps in India." Quoted in Singh, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 16.
86. Edward Wakefield, *Past Imperative: My Life in India, 1927–1947.* Quoted in Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries,* 30.
87. Savi, "The Unattainable." Quoted in Singh, *Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 19. Pseudonyms were regularly employed by Anglo-Indians, who needed some cover if their works proved contentious.
88. Ibid.
89. James Morris, *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire* (New York: Harvest/HBJ Book, 1968), 269.
90. Field, *Toward a Programme of Imperial Life,* 76.
91. Alice Perrin "East of Suez." Quoted in Singh, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 13.
92. Ibid., 14.
93. Thomas Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 45.
94. Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 3.
95. Ibid., 40.
96. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 77.
97. Ibid.
98. Cannadine, *Rise and Fall of Class in Britain,* 127.
99. S. Gopal, *The Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, 1880–*1884 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953), 84. Quoted in Brendan, *Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007), 235.
100. Nicholas Mansergh, "A. P. Thornton: Realism Tempered by Wit," in Martel, *Studies in British Imperial History,* 9.
101. Renford, *Non-Official British in India,* 261.
102. Brendan, *Decline and Fall,* 236.
103. Stephen to Lytton, November 24, 1876, Stephen Papers. Quoted in Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 108.
104. O. Douglas, "Olivia in India." Quoted in Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries,* 34.
105. Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 91.
106. Ibid., 107.
107. Allen, *Plain Tales from the Raj,* 35.
108. Bradford Spangenberg, "The Problem of Recruitment for the Indian Civil Service during the Late Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Asian Studies,* vol. 30, no. 2 (February 1971): 354.
109. *Oxford Magazine,* February 14, 1893. Quoted in Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 44.
110. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 64.
111. James Grant-Duff, "India: Political and Social & c," *Contemporary Review,* XXVI, 866. Quoted in Lawrence James, *The Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 303.
112. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 59.

113. Fergus Innes, interview by de Caro. 4700.0579/843.
114. Allen, *Plain Tales from the Raj,* 39.
115. R. Williams, *Culture and Society,* 1958. Quoted in Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 73.
116. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 60.
117. Philip Mason, "Introduction," in Allen, *Plain Tales from the Raj,* 18.
118. John W. Cell, *Hailey: A Study in British Imperialism, 1872–1969* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 13.
119. Fergus Innes, interview by de Caro. 4700.0579/843. Though this advice originally came from Henry Lawrence, who advised his political agents in the 1840s to "settle the country, make the people happy, and take care there are no rows." Inherently conservative, Anglo-Indians recognized good advice when they heard it. See James Morris, *Heaven's Command: An Imperial Progress* (New York: Harvest, 1973), 184.
120. John Masters, interview by de Caro. 4700.610/892.
121. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude,* 227.
122. Philip Mason, *Prospero's Magic: Some Thoughts on Class and Race* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 28.
123. Sir Charles Dalton, interview by de Caro. 4700.0597/875.
124. *The Anglo-Hindoostanee Handbook*: *Or, A Stranger's Self-Interpreter and Guide to Colloquial and General Intercourse with the Natives of India* (Calcutta: W. Thacker, 1850), 442–443.
125. The loss of the topi had potentially disastrous consequences as demonstrated in the original film, *The Four Feathers,* when a character loses his topi and has a sunstroke within minutes.
126. Reverend Leslie Newbigin, interview by de Caro. 4700.0604/884.
127. Philip Mason, interview by de Caro. 4700.0589/863.
128. Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 87.
129. Admiral Franklin Goodrich, "Letter from Bombay," in *Some American Opinions on the Indian Empire* by Theodore Roosevelt et al. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916).
130. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 11f.
131. Lieutenant Colonel Alexander George Stuart, *The Indian Empire: A Short Review and Some Hints for the Soldier Proceeding to India* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1927), 119.
132. Ibid.
133. Park, "Biological Thought, Athletics and the Formation of a 'Man of Character,'" 12–13.
134. Alex Charles Ewald, *Guide to the ICS*: C*ontaining Directions for Candidates, Standards of Qualification, Salaries, and Specimens of Examination Papers*, [n.d.], 15.
135. Mangan and Walvin, "Introduction," in *Manliness and Morality,* 3–4.
136. Chester Macnaghten, *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects* (Bombay: Education Society's Seam Press, 1892), 231.

137. James, *The Raj,* 312.
138. Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements* (USA: Perennial Classics, 2002), 136.
139. Hoffer, *True Believer,* 136.
140. Mosse, *Liberal Europe,* 46.
141. Edmund Candler, *Siri Ram.* Quoted in Singh, *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 203.
142. Ibid.
143. Steevens, *Egypt in 1898* (London: Dodd, Mead, 1899), 253.
144. Brown, *Ordinary Man's India,* 88–89.
145. Robert H. MacDonald, *The Language of Empire: Myths and Metaphors of Popular Imperialism 1880–1918* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994), 86.
146. Jeffrey Richards, "Passing the Love of Women: Manly Love and Victorian Society," in *Manliness and Morality,* 106.
147. Lee-Warner, *Citizen of India,* 132.
148. Leslie Stephen, *Life of Fitzjames Stephen* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1895), 244–245.
149. G. Dickinson, "Appearances," Quoted in Singh, *Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 27.
150. H. S. Cunningham, "The Coeruleans." Quoted in Singh, *Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction,* 27.
151. Edith Cuthell, *My Garden in the City of Gardens* (London, 1893), 163. Quoted in Mary Procida, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics, and Imperialism in India 1883–1947.* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 147.
152. MacDonald, *Language of Empire,* 13.
153. Elliot Evan Mills, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire: A Brief Account of Those Causes which Resulted in the Destruction of our Late Ally, Together with a Comparison between the British and Roman Empire* (Appointed for use in the National schools of Japan. Tokio [*sic*], 2005) (Oxford: Alden, 1905), 58.
154. Anonymous, *India in 1983,* 3rd ed. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1888), 52.
155. Ibid., 54.
156. Kipling, "The Education of Padgett, M. P." in *Departmental Ditties* (New York: 1913), 61.
157. William Arnold, in a series of articles in *Fraser's* magazine in the 1850s, decried the ignorance of most Britons about empire. According to Arnold, those who claimed to know about India were "Radicals" and "frothy declaimers," ignorant of India. Arnold wished that those same "Radicals" could be forced to live under the rule of an Indian prince, to teach the critics of empire a valuable lesson about empire and the benefits of British rule. See William Arnold, "What is the Indian Question?" *Fraser's Magazine,* vol. 48 (1853): 248.

158. Robert Buchanan, "The Voice of the Hooligan," in *Rudyard Kipling: The Critical Heritage,* ed. Roger Green (London: Routledge, 1971), 247.
159. James Mill, *History of British India,* vol. 1, 478. Quoted in Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 64.
160. Valentin Chirol, *Indian Unrest* (London: Macmillan, 1910), 301.
161. Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj,* 172.
162. Procida, *Married to the Empire,* 76.
163. Maud Diver, *The Englishwoman in India,* 190. Quoted in Allen, *Plain Tales from the Raj,* 106.
164. David Arnold, "European Orphans and Vagrants in India in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* vol. 7, no. 2 (1979): 104.
165. Anonymous, *A Handbook of Indian Law* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1894), 234. This guide, by an anonymous barrister, was meant for nonspecialists and students as a quick primer on the law in British India (outside of Muslim and Hindu law).
166. Charles Dilke, *Greater Britain* (London: Macmillan, 1869), 517. Quoted in Hutchins, *Illusion of Permanence,* 111.
167. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 101.
168. Paul Scott, *Staying On* (repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 96–97.Quoted in Cannadine, *Rise and Fall of Class in Britain,* 146.

CHAPTER 3

1. Al Carthill (pseud), *The Lost Dominion: The Story of England's Abdication in India* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925), 236.
2. David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional: The Imperial life of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002), 172.
3. Piers Brendan, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007), xv.
4. Ibid., xvi.
5. Phiroze Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," in Barbara Goff, ed., *Classics and Colonialism* (Liverpool: Duckworth, 2005), 49.
6. P. J. Marshall, "Introduction" in *OHBE: Vol. II: The Eighteenth Century,* 7.
7. George Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988), 16.
8. Catherine Edwards, "Shadows and Fragments," in *Roman Presences: Receptions of Rome in European Culture 1789–1945,* ed. Catharine Edwards (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 12.
9. Ibid.
10. P. J. Marshall, "Britain without America," in *OHBE: Vol. II: The Eighteenth Century,* 583.

11. Virgil, *The Aeneid*. Quoted in Donald Kagan, et al. *The Western Heritage*: Vol. 2 (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, 2004), 928. Or Anglo-Indians might prefer Virgil's dictum on power: "To them success was good, and the appearance of power gave power indeed." Quoted in Morris, *Farewell the Trumpets,* 235f.
12. Henry C. Boren, *Roman Society: A Social, Economic, and Cultural History,* 2nd ed. (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1992), xix.
13. Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," 38.
14. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 55, 57.
15. Arthur Jose, *The Growth of the Empire: Handbook to the History of Greater Britain* (London: John Murray, 1909), preface.
16. C. P. Lucas, *Greater Rome and Greater Britain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 178.
17. Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," 50.
18. David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003), 79.
19. Alex Charles Ewald, *Guide to the ICS*: C*ontaining Directions for Candidates, Standards of Qualification, Salaries, and Specimens of Examination Papers*, [n.d.], 15.
20. Ibid., 17.
21. Ibid., 21.
22. See Sara Suleri, *The Rhetoric of English India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 20.
23. Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," 43.
24. J. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome* (USA: Phoenix Press, 2002), 950.
25. Anthony Everitt, *Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician* (New York: Random House, 2003), 94.
26. Juvenal, *Satires* (London: Duckworth, 2002), 3.58.
27. Balsdon, *Life and Leisure,* 130.
28. Ibid., 139.
29. Everitt, *Cicero,* 51.
30. Potter, *India's Political Administrators,* 34.
31. Ibid., 75.
32. Anonymous, *The Anglo-Hindoostanee Hand-book*; *or Stranger's Self-Interpreter and Guide to Colloquial and General Intercourse with the Natives of India* (Calcutta: W. Thacker, 1850), 446.
33. Anon., *The Anglo-Hindoostanee Hand-book,* 446.
34. Ibid.
35. Robert Demaus, *English Literature and Composition: A Guide to the Candidates, in those Departments in the Indian Civil Service* (London: Longman Green, 1866), 153.
36. Alfred Tupp, *The Indian Civil Service and the Competitive System: A Discussion on the Examination and the Training in England, and an Account of the Examinations in India, the Duties of Civilians, and the Organisation of the Service* (London: RW Brydges, 1876), 16.

37. Tupp, *Indian Civil Service,* 27.
38. E. B. Sargant, "Educational Problems of the Empire," in *The Oxford Survey of the British Empire,* vol. 6, ed. A. J. Herbertson and O. J. R. Howarth (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), 265.
39. J. A. Mangan, "The Grist of our Forefathers," in *Imperialism and Popular Culture,* ed. John Mackenzie (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986), 116.
40. Sargant, "Educational Problems of the Empire," 265.
41. John Mackenzie, "Empire and Metropolitan Culture," in *OHBE: Vol III: The Nineteenth Century,* 285.
42. Richard Aldrich, "Imperialism in the Study and Teaching of History," in *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*, ed. J. A. Mangan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 24.
43. Lord Cromer (Evelyn Baring), *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* (London: John Murray, 1910), 15.
44. Kipling's *Puck of Pook's Hill* was closer in spirit to British India than Roman Britain, and many other works paid homage to Rome before tackling current problems besetting the British Empire.
45. Bryce, *The Ancient Roman Empire,* 1. Macaulay, on the other hand, in *Lays of Rome* moved quickly past the Roman conquest of Britain, since he apparently found it distasteful.
46. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 20.
47. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 7.
48. Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge,* 30.
49. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude,* 156.
50. H. P. Pelham, *Encyclopaedia Britannica,* 11th ed., s.v. "Augustus." Quoted in Vasunia, "Greater Rome and Greater Britain," 58.
51. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 127.
52. Peers, "Britain and Empire," 65.
53. Demaus, *English Literature and Composition,* ix.
54. Gilmour, *Long Recessional,* 11.
55. Lawrence James, *The Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 308.
56. Lucas, *Greater Rome and Greater Britain,* 4.
57. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 28. Bryce attributed the despotism of British rule to the "vast differences in the population of India" and noted that the Indian had no experience with self-government and "the people of India generally do not wish to govern themselves," 28, 31.
58. Ibid., 32.
59. The statement from Ennius is fittingly quoted in Bryce's, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 55.
60. Jose, *Growth of the Empire,* 12. Jose's work was meant to make its readers feel that they were "both a product and a part of the English historical narrative" and that "we are of the race of empire builders, and it is our business to understand their building in order rightly to maintain it," preface.

61. Lucas, *Greater Rome and Greater Britain,* 72.
62. Jonathan Sachs, Review of *Roman Presences: Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945* in *Modern Philology,* vol. 98, no. 4 (May 2001): 712.
63. Dio Chrysostom, Orations, 31, 17, 20. Quoted in Lendon, *Empire of Honour,* 35.
64. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 54–55.
65. Halford Mackinder, *The World War and After* (London: G. Philip & Son, 1924), 266. Quoted in Bernard Semmel, *Imperialism and Social Reform: English Social Imperial Thought 1895–1914* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 176.
66. The rise of German and American power threatened British supremacy, and the Boer War likewise affected English perceptions of national decline, leading Baden-Powell to found the Boy Scouts.
67. Donald Earl, in *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), describes the Roman view in which "all Romans saw political issues in personal and social terms, that is, in terms of morality . . . the Romans did not distinguish morality sharply from politics or economy . . . but looked at affairs from a point of view which may be termed social . . . reflecting the personal and social nature of political life itself," 17.
68. M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus* (New York: NYRB Classics, 2002), 13.
69. Chester Macnaghten, *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects* (Bombay: Education Society's Seam Press, 1892), 234.
70. J. Murdoch, *The Indian Student's Manual: Hints on Studies, Moral Conduct, Religious Duties, and Success in Life* (Madras: Christian Vernacular Education Society, 1879), 5.
71. Ibid., 6.
72. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* (London: John Murray, 1919), 106. This sentiment (and its reverse) is expressed in Kipling's "The Head of the District," when a Bengali babu deserts his post, since his MA is not enough to forestall violence.
73. Ibid., 114.
74. William Roger Louis, "Introduction," in *OHBE: Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century,* 5.
75. Jose, *Growth of the Empire,* 5–6.
76. Valentin Chirol, *Indian Unrest* (London: Macmillan, 1910), 308.
77. G. O. Trevelyan, *The Competition Wallah* (New York: AMS Press), 202.
78. T. Roosevelt, "From the African Jubilee Diamond Jubilee Mass Meeting in the Metropolitan Memorial Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C." in *Some American Opinions on the Indian Empire,* ed. T. Roosevelt, et al. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916), 1.
79. Ibid.
80. Jose, *Growth of the Empire,* 2.

81. G. W. Steevens, *In India* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1899), 54.
82. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 127.
83. Murdoch, *Indian Student's Manual,* iv.
84. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 57.
85. See Richard Allen and Harish Trivedi, *Literature and Nation: Britain and India, 1800–1990* (London: Routledge, 2000), 246.
86. R. Symonds, *Oxford and Empire,* 33. Quoted in Brendan, *Decline and Fall,* xvii.
87. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 24.
88. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 106.
89. Murdoch, *Indian Student's Manual,* preface. In this case, a classic example of projection.
90. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 95.
91. Lucas, *Greater Rome and Greater Britain,* 100.
92. Jose, *Growth of the Empire,* 4.
93. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 107. Cromer also find Indian writing to be "turgid and bombastic," 107.
94. Ibid., 105.
95. John Strachey, *India* (London: 1888), 358.
96. Bryce, *Ancient Roman Empire,* 11.
97. Ibid., 59.
98. Murdoch, *Indian Student's Manual,* 69.
99. Captain C. E. O. F. Atkinson, *Curry and Rice*: *Or, the Ingredient of Social Life at "Our" Station in India* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1911). (This book is unpaginated.)
100. Thomas Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 66–67.
101. Louis Tracy, *Meeting the Sun: Some Anglo-Indian Snapshots, with Occasional Verses* (Allahabad: Morning Post Press, 1898), 10.
102. Tracy, *Meeting the Sun,* 9.
103. Ibid.
104. Chirol, *Indian Unrest,* preface.
105. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 26.
106. Cromer, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism,* 124.
107. Gilmour, *Ruling Caste,* 27.
108. Lieutenant Colonel Alexander George Stuart, *The Indian Empire: A Short Review and Some Hints for the Soldier Proceeding to India* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1927), 17.
109. Ibid., 18.
110. H. H. Risley, *People of India* (reprint, New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1999), 53.
111. Macnaghten, *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects,* 114.
112. Ibid., 116.
113. Sir William Lee-Warner, *The Citizen of India* (London: Macmillan, 1907), 128.

114. Stuart, *Indian Empire*, 21.
115. Ainslee Embree, "The Rulers and the Ruled," in *The Last Empire: Photography in British India*, *1855–1911*, ed. Ainslee Embree and Clark Worswick (New York: Aperture, 1976), 143.
116. Lee-Warner, *Citizen of India*, 129.
117. Admiral Franklin Goodrich, "Letter from Bombay," in *Some American Opinions on the Indian Empire* by Theodore Roosevelt et al. (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916), 18.
118. Goodrich, "Letter from Bombay," 18.
119. Ibid.
120. Ibid., 19.
121. Cited in Allen and Trivedi, *Literature and Nation,* 245.
122. Lee-Warner, *Citizen of India*, 131.
123. Risley, *People of India,* 26.

CHAPTER 4

1. Winston Churchill, *My Early Life: 1874–1904* (repr., New York: Scribner, 1996), 107. Quoted in Francis Hutchins, *The Illusion of Permanence,* 102–103.
2. Ibid.
3. David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional: The Imperial life of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002), 88.
4. Many of these relationships have been explored, in an African context, by Karen Hansen. See Karen Tranberg Hansen, *Distant Companions: Servants and Employers in Zambia 1900–1985* (Ithaca: Cornell University. Press, 1989), 12. I am using many of her insights in this work, and though her field is the empire in Africa, many of the same strategies of rule were in place in India.
5. Colesworthey Grant, *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life: A Letter from an Artist in India to his Mother in England* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1862), 88.
6. Mary Procida, "Married to the Empire," (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1997), 97.
7. Mary Procida, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics and Imperialism in India, 1883–1947* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002). For this chapter, I use both Procida's dissertation and the book published from the dissertation.
8. Dane Kennedy, "The Imperial Kaleidoscope," *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 37, no. 4 (October 1998): 467.
9. Procida, *Married to the Empire,* 89.
10. Thomas R. Metcalf, "Imperial Towns and Cities," in *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*, ed. P. J. Marshall (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 236.
11. Jean and John Comaroff, "Christianity and Colonialism in South Africa," *American Ethnologist,* vol. 13, no. 1 (February 1986): 13.

This article, although centered on missionary activity in South Africa, is a seminal account of how Westerners have worked to inculcate Western values into colonial societies.

12. Grant, *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life,* 92.
13. R. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude: A Social History of the European Community in Calcutta* (Calcutta: Thacker Spink, 1912), 155. Though it is entirely possible that Pearson is exaggerating the numbers here for effect, to show the perceived decadence of the nabobs.
14. Ibid., 156.
15. Ibid.
16. Captain Thomas Williamson, *The East India Vade Mecum* (London: Black, Parry and Digsby, 1810), 167. Williamson also described the process of obtaining an Indian mistress, a person who became a "bosom friend" in a society (Bengal) that had 4000 British men and 250 British women. Williamson also spoke of the cheapness of mistresses, especially when compared to the "sums laid out upon some British damsels." Generally, Williamson said that, the British preferred "agreeable manners, polished language, highly cultivated minds, and pleasing attentions." 415.
17. Pearson, *Eastern Interlude,* 156.
18. Mrs. R. Temple-Wright, *Baker and Cook,* 3rd ed. (Calcutta: Thacker & Spink, 1912), Introduction. Thacker & Spink commonly placed reviews of their other works in many of their books.
19. George Dangerfield, *The Strange Death of Liberal England* (reprint, Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 88.
20. Edward H. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow* (London: Thacker, Spink, 1920), 2.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., 18.
23. Douglas M. Peers, "Britain and Empire," in *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain,* ed. Chris Williams (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 75.
24. George Orwell, *Burmese Days* (New York: Harcourt, 1962), 207.
25. See Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), for this argument.
26. John Shattock, interview by de Caro. 4700.0586/857. This is an often repeated tale, possibly apocryphal but ben trovato, nonetheless.
27. John Masters, interview by de Caro. 4700.0610/891.
28. Christopher York, interview by de Caro. 4700.0596/874.
29. R. G. Vermede, ed. *British Social Life in India: An Anthology of Humorous and Other Writing Perpetrated by the British in India, 1730–1950* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 104.
30. York, interview by de Caro. 4700.0596/874.

31. John Masters, *Bugles and a Tiger* (New York: Viking Press, 1956), 72–73.
32. The copy used for this paper is a twelfth edition from 1920. The book was first published in 1889 and went through three editions in its initial year. Later editions were published regularly with the 14th, and final, edition coming out in 1929, twenty years after the author's death. Guidebooks such as these continued to be read until the end of the Raj, though. Also note that this book went through more editions and was perhaps more popular at the time than Flora Annie Steel's now better known *Complete Indian Housekeeper*.
33. Edith Dixon, interview by de Caro. http://www.lib.lsu.edu/special/exhibits/india/intvw3.htm (accessed January 2, 2008). LSU has placed some of these interviews online.
34. Grant, *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life,* 91f.
35. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 2.
36. Anne Chisholm, *Rumer Godden: A Storyteller's Life* (New York: Greenwillow Books, 1998), 117.
37. C. Bayly, *The Raj* (London: National Portrait Gallery Publications, 1990), 234.
38. A. J. Stockwell, "Power, Authority, and Freedom," in *Cambridge Illustrated History,* 160.
39. Quoted in R. V. Vermede, *British Social Life in India: An Anthology of Humorous and Other Writing Perpetrated by the British in India, 1730–1950 with some Latitude for Works Completed after Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 103.
40. Captain C. E. O. F. Atkinson, *Curry and Rice*: *Or, the Ingredient of Social Life at "Our" Station in India* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1911).
41. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 3.
42. Pamela Horn, *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant* (Wolfeboro Falls, NH: Alan Sutton, 1991), 8.
43. Horn, *Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant,* 10.
44. Francis Bacon, "Of Honor and Reputation" in *Essays Civil and Moral,* vol. 30, (Harvard Classics), 136.
45. Quoted in Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 78.
46. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 12.
47. Ibid., 3.
48. Ibid., 13.
49. C. A. K. Innes-Wilson, interview by de Caro, http://www.lib.lsu.eduspecial/exhibits/india/intvw3.thm.
50. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 60.
51. Ibid. The American South likewise had the myth of the "happy" Sambo.
52. Quoted in Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death,* 78.

53. Procida, "Married to the Empire," 106.
54. V. G. Kiernan, *The Lords of Human Kind: Black Man, Yellow Man and White Man in an Age of Empire* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 45.
55. Hansen, *Distant Companions,* xi.
56. Ibid., 7.
57. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 141.
58. Ibid., 2.
59. Ibid., 12.
60. Ibid., 8.
61. Ibid., 18.
62. Ibid., 31.
63. Ibid., 32
64. James Fergusson, *History of Indian and Eastern* Architecture (London, 1876), 34–46. Quoted in Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj,* 87.
65. Williamson, *The General East India Guide and Vade Mecum,* 237.
66. Louis Tracy, *Meeting the Sun: Some Anglo-Indian Snapshots, with Occasional Verses* (Allahabad: Morning Post Press, 1898), 43.
67. Benita Parry, *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880–1930* (London: Penguin Press, 1972), 35.
68. Vermede, *British Social Life in India,* 68.
69. Maud Diver, *The Great Amulet,* 397. Quoted in Allen J. Greenberger, *The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism, 1880–1960.* (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 103.
70. Procida, *Married to the Empire,* 67.
71. Procida, "Married to the Empire," 49–50.
72. Ibid., 51–52.
73. Ibid., 60.
74. Quoted in Procida, "Married to the Empire," 49.
75. A. Claude Brown, *The Ordinary Man's India* (London: Cecil Palmer, 1927), 88.
76. Anthony King, *The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984), 23.
77. Peter Burroughs, "Institutions of Empire," in *OHBE: Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century,* 183.
78. George Aberigh-Mackay, *Twenty-One Days in India*, 8th ed. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1910), 91.
79. King, *The Bungalow,* 2.
80. Lt. J. E. Power, *Vade Mecum for Officers and Civilians Proceeding to India* (London: Forster, Groom, 1912), 83. This small book was a "take with you" manual for those "called to empire" but were "ignorant or in doubt as to what to take." A basic guide to India, it included topics on clothing, the voyage, arrival, disembarkations, servants, horses, dogs, languages, and sport. *Vade Mecum* appeared almost a hundred years after the publication of the original *Vade*

Mecum written by Captain Williamson, and the intent of both was the same.

81. Robin Adair, interview by de Caro. 4700.590/865.
82. W. A. Salmon, interview by de Caro. 4700.470/565.
83. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 10.
84. Power, *Vade Mecum,* 83.
85. Ibid.
86. Quoted in John Newsinger, *The Blood Never Dried: A People's History of the British Empire* (Bookmarks, 2006), 71.
87. Anon, *A Handbook of Indian Law* (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1894), 69.
88. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 2.
89. Frank Richards, *Old Soldier Sahib* (USA: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1936), 79.
90. Ibid.
91. Tracy, *Meeting the Sun,* 45.
92. Ibid.
93. Anon., *A Handbook of Indian Law,* 431.
94. Ibid., 430.
95. Ibid., 426–427.
96. Ibid., 425.
97. Ibid.
98. Ibid., 431.
99. Ibid.
100. Power, *Vade Mecum,* 70–71.
101. Ibid., 71.
102. Flora Annie Steel, "The Potter's Thumb," vol. 3, 143. Quoted in Greenberger, *The British Image of India,* 58.
103. Ibid.
104. See Judith Walkowitz's, *City of Dreadful Delight* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), in which she shows how attitudes toward prostitutes was a synecdochical "measure" of the Victorian mind; these attitudes representing, as they did, the intersections of science and morality which provided a prism through which to view Victorian society.
105. Aitken, *Behind the Bungalow,* 2.
106. Ibid., 138.
107. Ibid., 137–138.
108. Jonathan Barnes, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 226.
109. Aitken, B*ehind the Bungalow,* 139.
110. R. C. A. Edge, interview by de Caro. 4700.0586/859.
111. Rudyard Kipling, "In the House of Suddhoo," collected in the *Works of Rudyard Kipling* (Great Britain: Words Editions, 1994), 506.

112. Robert Nye, "Honor and Shame," in *Encyclopedia of European Social History: From 1350–2000,* vol. 5, ed. Peter Stearns, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2001), 103.

CONCLUSION

1. Sir William Lee-Warner, *The Citizen of India* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1907), 164.
2. Ibid., 164.
3. Ibid., 23–24.
4. Louis Tracy, *Meeting the Sun: Some Anglo-Indian Snapshots, with Occasional Verses* (Allahabad: Morning Press, 1898), 9.
5. Ibid., 9, 78.
6. Ibid., 67.
7. Herman Merivale, *Lecture on Colonization and Colonies* (London, 1861), 675. Quoted in Catherine Hall, "Of Gender and Empire: Reflections on the Nineteenth Century," in Philippa Levine, *Gender and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2004), 46.
8. Conklin, *European Imperialism*, 6.
9. Gallagher's anecdote is told by Christopher Bayly and Tim Harper, in *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941–1945* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2006), 30.
10. David Gilmour, *The Ruling Caste: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), 261.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aberigh-Mackay, George R. *Twenty-One Days in India: Or the Tour of Sir AliBaba KCB and the Teapot Series*. 8th ed. Calcutta/Simla: Thacker, Spink, 1910.

Aitken, Edward (as EHA). *Behind the Bungalow*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1920.

Anonymous. *The Anglo-Hindoostannee Hand-Book, or Stranger's Self-Interpreter and Guide to Colloquial and General Intercourse with the Natives of India*. Calcutta: W. Thacker, 1850.

Anonymous. "Duelling in Our Indian Army." *Colburn's United Service Magazine*, 1844.

Anonymous. *A Handbook of Indian Law*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1894.

Anonymous. *India in 1983*. 3rd ed. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1888.

Arnold, William. *Oakfield, or Fellowship in the East*. London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1854. Reprint. New York: Humanities Press, 1973.

———. "What is the Indian Question?" *Fraser's Magazine*, vol. 48 (1853).

Atkinson, Captain C. E. O. F. *Curry and Rice (On Forty Plates) or The Ingredients of Social Life at "Our" Station in India*. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink, 1911.

Baring, Evelyn (Lord Cromer). *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*. London: John Murray 1910.

Beames, John. *Memoirs of a Bengal Civilian*. London: Chatoo and Windus, 1961.

Blair, Hamish. *India: The Eleventh Hour*. London: Chawton, 1934.

Brown, A. Claude. *The Ordinary Man's India*. London: Cecil Palmer, 1927.

Bryce, James. *The Ancient Roman Empire and the British Empire in India / The Diffusion of Roman and English Law throughout the World: Two Historical Studies*. London: Oxford University Press, 1913.

Buchan, John. *A Lodge in the Wilderness*. London: 1906. Reprint. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1950.

Carthill, Al (pseudonym). *The Lost Dominion: The Story of England's Abdication in India*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1925.

Chesney, Sir General George. *Indian Polity: A View of the System of Administration in India*. 3rd ed., 1894.

Chirol, Valentin. *Indian Unrest*. London: Macmillan, 1910.

Coates, Tim, ed. *The Amritsar Massacre 1919: General Dyer in the Punjab*. Reprint. London: Stationery Office, 2000.

Demaus, Robert. *English Literature and Composition: A Guide to the Candidates in Those Departments in the Indian Civil Service*. London: Longman Green, 1866.

Digby, Everard, ed. *Indian Ink: Being Splashes from Various Pens in Aid of the Imperial Indian War Fund Education*. 2nd ed. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1914.

Ewald, Alexander Charles. *The Guide to the Indian Civil Service: Containing Directions for Candidates, Standards of Qualification, Salaries, and Specimens of Examination Papers*. N.d. (probably published during the 1870s).

Forster, E. M. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1951. Reprint. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1977.

Grant, Colesworthey. *Anglo-Indian Domestic Life: A Letter from an Artist in India to his Mother in England*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, 1862.

Hancock, W. K. *Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs: Problems of Nationality, Vol. 1: 1918–1936*. London: Oxford University Press, 1937.

Herbertson, A. J., and Howarth, O. J. R., eds. *The Oxford Survey of the British Empire: The British Isles and Mediterranean Possessions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

Homer, Lea. *The Day of the Saxon*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1908.

Horne, William. *Work and Sport in the Old ICS*. London: Blackwood & Sons, 1928.

Johnson, Samuel. *English Dictionary*. Philadelphia: Kimber and Sharpless, 1839.

Jose, Arthur. *The Growth of the Empire: A Handbook to the History of Greater Britain*. London: John Murray, 1910.

Kipling, Rudyard. "The Education of Padgett, M. P." *in Departmental Ditties*. New York: 1913.

Lee-Warner, Sir William. *The Citizen of India*. London: Macmillan, 1907.

Lucas, C. P. *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

Maconochie, Evan. *Life in the Indian Civil Service*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1926.

Macnaghten, Chester. *Common Thoughts on Serious Subjects*. Bombay: Education Society's Seam Press, 1892.

Masters, John. *Bugles and a Tiger*. New York: Viking Press, 1956.

Mill, John Stuart. "Considerations on Representative Government," in *Three Essays*. Reprint. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Mills, Elliot Evans (as Lung Kung). *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire: A Brief Account of those Causes which Resulted in the Destruction of Our Late Ally, Together with a Comparison between the British and Roman Empires* (appointed for use in the national schools of Japan, Tokyo, 2005). Oxford: Alden, 1905.

Murdoch, J. *The Indian Student's Manual: Hints on Studies, Moral Conduct, Religious Duties, and Success in Life*. Madras: Christian Vernacular Education Society, 1879.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. *The Discovery of India*. London: Meridian Books, 1951.

Orwell, George. *Burmese Days*. Reprint. New York: Harcourt, 1962.

Pearson, R. *Eastern Interlude: A Social History of the European Community in Calcutta*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink,, 1933.

Power, Lieutenant J. E. *Vade Mecum for Officers and Civilians Proceeding to India*. London: Forster Groom, 1912.

Risley, Sir Herbert. *The People of India*. 2nd ed. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink, 1915.

Richards, Frank. *Old Soldier Sahib*. USA: Harrison Smith and Robert Haas, 1936.

Roosevelt, T., William Taft, Jeffrey Franklin, Admiral Goodrich, James Hubbard, and John P. Jones, et al. *Some American Opinions on the Indian Empire*. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1916.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Essays from the Parerga and Paralipomena*. Translated by T. Bailey Saunders. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1951.

Steevens, G. W. *Egypt in 1898*. UK: Dodd, Mead, 1899.

_____. *In India*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1899.

Stephen, Leslie. *The Life of Sir James Fitzjames Stephen*. New York: Putnam's, 1895.

Strachey, John. *India, Its Administration and Progress*. London: Macmillan, 1888.

Stuart, Alexander George. *The Indian Empire: A Short Review and Some Hints for the Use of Soldiers Proceeding to India*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1927.

Temple, Sir Richard. *India in 1880*. 3rd ed. London: John Murray, 1881.

Temple-Wright, Mrs. R. *Baker and Cook: A Domestic Manual for India*. 3rd ed. Calcutta: Thacker, 1912.

Tracy, Louis. *Meeting the Sun: Some Anglo-Indian Snapshots, with Occasional Verses*. Allahabad: Morning Post Press, 1898.

Trevelyan, G. O. *The Competition Wallah*. Reprint. New York: AMS Press, 1977.

Tupp, Alfred Cotterell. *The Indian Civil Service and the Competitive System: A Discussion on the Examination and the Training in England, and an Account of the Examinations in India, the Duties of Civilians, and the Organisation of the Service*. London: R. W. Brydges, 1876.

Williamson, Thomas. *The General East India Guide and Vade Mecum: For the Public Functionary, Government Officer, Private Agent, Trader or Foreign Sojourner in British India*. London: Kingsbury, Parbury, and Allen, 1825.

Wordsworth, William. "The Wanderer." In *The Excursion*, edited by Thomas Hutchinson. Oxford: Oxford Standard Authors, 1904.

Wyllie, John Alfred. *India at the Parting of the Ways: Monarchy, Diarchy, or Anarchy?* London: Lincoln Williams, 1934.

Oral Histories

I have relied on a series of oral histories conducted by Frank de Caro in the 1970s with Anglo-Indians who experienced the end of the Raj. These interviews are collected at the T. Harry Williams Center for Oral History at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. I have made specific references to interviews in the endnotes, but in the interests of space, do no list all of them here.

Moon, Penderel. Interview. MSS Eur R181. Oriental and India Office Collections. British Library.

Willcocks, Frank. Interview. MSS Eur R185. Oriental and India Office Collections. British Library.

Secondary Sources

Allen, Charles. *Plain Tales from the Raj*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.

Allen, Richard, and Trivedi, Harish, ed. *Literature and Nation: Britain and India, 1800–1990*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Bacon, Francis. *Essays Civil and Moral*. New York: Peter Pauper Press, 1963.

Ballhatchet, Kenneth. *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Their Critics, 1793–1905*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1980.

Balsdon, J. *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*. USA: Phoenix Press, 2002.

Baucom, Ian. *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Bayly, C. A. *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. *Origins of Nationality in South Asia: Patriotism and Ethical Government in the Making of Modern India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

———. ed. *The Raj: India and the British 1600–1947*. London: National Portrait Gallery, 1990.

Bayly, C. A., and Harper, Tim. *Forgotten Armies: The Fall of British Asia, 1941–1945*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2006.

Boren, Henry. *Roman Society: A Social, Economic, and Cultural History*. 2nd ed. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1992.

Bose, Purnima. *Organizing Empire: Individualism, Collective Agency, and India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Bowman, James. *Honor: A History*. Encounter Books, 2006.

Brendan, Piers. *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2007.

Bristow, Edward J. *Vice and Vigilance: Purity Movement in Britain since 1700*. London: Gill and Macmillan, Rowman and Littlefield, 1977.

Brown, Judith M., and William Roger Louis, ed. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. IV: The Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Buettner, Elizabeth. *Empire Families: Britons and Later Imperial India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Burton, Antoinette, ed. *Gender, Sexuality and Colonial Modernities*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Cannadine, David. *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. *The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Chisholm, Anne. *Rumer Godden: A Storyteller's Life*: New York: Greenwillow Books, 1998.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Collingham, E. M. *Imperial Bodies The Physical Experience of the Raj, c. 1800–1947* Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2001.

Collini, Stefan. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850–1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Conklin, Alice, ed. *European Imperialism*. Boston: Houfton-Miflin, 1999.

Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler, ed. *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Cowasjee, Saro. *Studies in Anglo-Indian Fiction*. New York: Harper Collins, 1993.

Dangerfield, George. *Strange Death of Liberal England*. Reprint. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Earl, Donald. *The Moral and Political Traditions of Rome*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Edwards, Catherine, ed. *Roman Presences: Receptions of Rome in European Culture, 1789–1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Embree, Ainslee and Worswick, Clark, ed. *The Last Empire: Photography in British India, 1855–1911*. New York: Aperture, 1976.

Engels, Dagmar, and Marks, Shula, ed. *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: State and Society in Africa and India*. London: British Academic Press, 1994.

Everitt, Anthony. *Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician*. New York: Random House, 2003.

Field, H. John. *Toward a Programme of Imperial Life: The British Empire at the Turn of the Century*. Westport, CT; Greenwood Press, 1982.

Finley, M. I. *The World of Odysseus*. Reprint. New York: NYRB Classics, 2002.

Gilmour, David. *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2003.

———. *The Ruling Caste: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.

Goff, Barbara, ed. *Classics and Colonialism*. Liverpool: Duckworth, 2005.

Greenberger, Allen J. *The British Image of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism, 1880–1960*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Green, Roger, ed. *Rudyard Kipling: The Critical Heritage*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Guha, Ranajit, ed. *Subaltern Studies 6: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hall, Catherine, ed. *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, A Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Hansen, Karen. *Distant Companions: Servants and Employers in Zambia 1900–1985*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989.

Headrick, Daniel R. *The Tools of Empire: Technology and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Hoffer, Eric. *The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*. Reprint. USA: Perennial Classics, 2002.

Horn, Pamela. *The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Servant*. Wolfeboro Falls, NH: Alan Sutton, 1991.

Hutchins, Francis. *The Illusion of Permanence: British Imperialism in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Hyam, Ronald. *Empire and Sexuality*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990.

James, Lawrence. *The Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Kennedy, Dane. *The Magic Mountains: Hill Stations and the British Raj*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

———. *The Highly Civilized Man: Richard Burton and the Victorian World* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Kiernan, V. G. *The Lords of Human Kind: Black Man, Yellow Man, and White Man in an Age of Empire*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1969.

King, Anthony. *The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.

Kocka, Jurgen, and Mitchell, Allen, ed. *Bourgeois Society in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 1993.

Kramnick, Isaac. *The Rage of Edmund Burke*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lendon, J. E. *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Levine, Philippa, *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*. New York: Pearson/Longman, 2007.

———. ed. *Gender and Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Louis, William Roger, ed. *Adventure with Britannia: Personalities, Politics and Culture in Britain*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Louis, William Roger, and Brown, Judith, ed. *Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol IV: The Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

MacDonald, Robert H. *The Language of Empire: Myths and Metaphors of Popular Imperialism, 1880–1918*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994.

Mackenzie, John. *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986.

_____. *Orientalism, Theory, and the Arts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Majeed, Javed. *Ungoverned Imaginings: James Mill's the History of British India and Orientalism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Mangan, J. A., ed. *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Mangan, J. A., and Walvin, James, ed. *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America 1800 to 1940*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987.

Marshall, P. J., ed. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———, ed. *The Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol II: The Eighteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Martel, Gordon, ed. *Studies in British Imperialism: Essays in Honor of A. P. Thornton*. London: Macmillan, 1986.

Mason, Philip. *Prospero's Magic: Some Thoughts on Class and Race*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Mehta, Uday. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Metcalf, Thomas. *Aftermath of Revolt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964.

_____. *Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Morris, James. *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire*. New York: Harvest/HBJ Book, 1968.

_____. *Farewell the Trumpets: An Imperial Retreat*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1978.

Mosse, George. *The Culture of Western Europe: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988.

Mosse, W. E. *Liberal Europe*: *The Age of Bourgeois Realism, 1848–1875*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1974.

Newsinger, John. *The Blood Never Dried: A People's History of the British Empire*. London: Bookmarks, 2006.

Parry, Benita. *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination*. London: Penguin Press, 1972.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Paxton, Nancy. *Writing under the Raj: Gender, Race and Rape in the British Colonial Imagination, 1830–1947*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990.

Peristiany, J. G., ed. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Translated by Philip Sherrard. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Peristiany, J. G. and Pitt-Rivers, Julian, ed. *Honour and Grace in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Philips, C. H., ed. *Historians of India, Pakistan and Ceylon*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Porter, Andrew. *European Imperialism, 1860–1914*. London: Macmillan, 1994.

———, ed. *Oxford History of the British Empire: Vol. III: The Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Potter, David. *India's Political Administrators*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.

Procida, Mary. *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics and Imperialism in India*. New York: Manchester University Press, 2002.

_____. "Married to the Empire." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1997.

Raban, Jonathan. *Coasting*. London: Collins Harvill, 1986.

Reader, W. J. *At Duty's Call: Studies in Obsolete Patriotism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Renford, Raymond K. *The Non-Official British in India to 1920*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Ridley, Hugh. *Images of Imperial Rule*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.

Rudolph, Susanne and Rudolph, Lloyd, ed. *Reversing the Gaze: Amar Singh's Diary: A Colonial Subject's Narrative of Imperial India*. USA: Westview Press, 2002.

Sandison, *Wheel of Empire: A Study of the Imperial Ideal in Some Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Fiction*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1967.

Scott, Paul. *Day of the Scorpion*. New York: Avon Books, 1979.

Semmel, Bernard. *Imperialism and Social Reform: English Social Imperial Thought 1895–1914*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of the Woman in the Colonial Text*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Sills, David, ed. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Volume 6*. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Singh, Bhupal. *A Survey of Anglo-Indian Fiction*. 2nd ed. (first published 1934). London: Curzon Press, 1975.

Singh, Nihar. *British Historiography on British Rule in India: The Life and Writings of Sir John William Kaye, 1814–1876*. New Delhi: Janaki Prakashan, 1986.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The "Manly Englishman" and the "Effeminate Bengali" in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

Stewart, Frank. *Honor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

_____. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Thompson, Andrew. *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. New York: Pearson Longman, 2005.

Thornton, A. P. *The Imperial Idea and its Enemies.* 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Tidrick, Kathryn. *Empire and English Character.* London: IB Tauris, 1990.

Vermede, R. V. *British Social Life in India: An Anthology of Humorous and Other Writing Perpetrated by the British in India, 1730–1950 with some Latitude for Works Completed after Independence.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Von Tunzelmann, Alex. *Indian Summer: The Secret History of the End of an Empire.* New York: Henry Holt, 2007.

Williams, Chris, ed. *A Companion to Nineteenth-Century Britain.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.

Wilson, A. N. *After the Victorians: The Decline of Britain in the World.* New York: Picador, 2005.

Woollacott, Angela. *Gender and Empire.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

ARTICLES

Arnold, David. "European Orphans and Vagrant in India in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History,* vol. 7, no. 2 (1979).

Comaroff, Jean, and John Comaroff. "Christianity and Colonialism in South Africa." *American Ethnologist,* vol. 13, no. 1 (February 1986).

Compton, J. M. "Open Competition and the Indian Civil Service, 1854–1876." *English Historical Review,* vol. 83, no. 327 (April 1968).

Fields, Barbara J. "Slavery, Race and Ideology in the US of A." *New Left Review,* vol. 181 (May/June 1990).

Gascoigne, John. "The Expanding Historiography of British Imperialism." *Historical Journal,* vol. 49, no. 2 (2006).

Kennedy, Dane. "The Imperial Kaleidoscope." *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 37, no. 4 (October 1998).

Kriegel, Abraham. "Burke and the Quality of Honor." *Albion,* vol. 12, no. 4 (1980).

Patterson, Orlando. "The Code of Honor in the Old South." *Reviews in American History,* vol. 12, no. 1 (March 1984).

Peers, Douglas M. "The Habitual Nobility of Being: British Officers and the Social Construction of the Bengal Army in the Early Nineteenth Century." *Modern Asian Studies,* vol. 25, no. 3 (July 1991).

Sachs, Jonathan. Review of *Roman Presences* in *Modern Philology,* vol. 98, no. 4 (May 2001).

Sayer, Derek. "British Reaction to the Amritsar Massacre, 1919–1920." *Past and Present,* no. 131 (May 1991).

Simpson, Antony. "Dandelion on the Field of Honour: Dueling, the Middle Classes, and the Law in Nineteenth Century England." *Criminal Justice History,* vol. 9 (1988).

Sinha, Mrinalini. "British, Clubbability, and the Colonial Public Sphere: The Genealogy of an Imperial Institution in Colonial India." *Journal of British Studies,* vol. 40, no. 4, (October 2001).

Spangenberg, Bradford. "The Problem of Recruitment for the Indian Civil Service during the Late Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Asian Studies,* vol. 30, no. 2 (February 1971).

Tosh, John. "A Fresh Access of Dignity: Masculinity and Imperial Commitment in Britain, 1815–1914." Available from http//www.history.und.ac.za/sempaper/Tosh.PDF, (accessed February 2, 2003.)

Turner, Victor. "The Forest of Symbols." *Annual Review of Anthropology,* vol. 4 (1975).

Index