SUMMERHILL

IIAS REVIEW

CONTENTS

Articles

Book Reviews

Alexander Solzhenitsyn: Historian of Decline and Prophet of Resurrection

MADHAVAN K. PALAT

Introduction

In the well-established tradition of the Russian intelligentsia, Solzhenitsyn reflected on Russia's past, her relation with the West, and the crisis of modern civilization; but he departed from that tradition in significant ways. He did not propose a Russian leadership of the planet as sometimes done by the Slavophiles, the civilization theorists Danilevskii and the Eurasianists, certainly the Bolsheviks, and eventually the Soviet Union in mid-career until the optimistic reign of Khrushchev. Nor did he suggest joining hands with the West to assert leadership over the world as in the uninterrupted tradition of the Russian state as a colonial great power in the nineteenth century, as a centre of world communism during the caesura of the interwar years, as a superpower in the latter half of the twentieth century, or even as a "democratic" state of the perestroika years and early post-Soviet phase when many fantasized that a "liberal" and truly "Western" Russia had returned like the prodigal son to her home in the liberal West after shedding her Soviet and Asiatic dross. Russia, like post-War Europe, would become more self-contained, more civilized, and more liberal. Solzhenitsyn adumbrated the post-Soviet, post-Cold War, and presumably postmodern retreat of Russia into her shell, a shell in which she shall in seclusion but not isolation cultivate her priceless cultural and moral pearls and contain the baleful impact of modern (not necessarily Western) culture.

He traced the crisis of the modern world logically enough to the origins of the modern world; and he adhered to the venerable tradition by locating it in the European Renaissance, Reformation, and Enlightenment. Man replaced God as the centre of the universe and became the measure of all things; and his subsequent Faustian career has led to the degeneration of the species and of the planet.[1] Having liberated himself from restraint of any kind, he uses his liberty to pursue his wants, his material well-being, and equality with others. The more he seeks to satisfy his wants, the more they become insatiable; and he has been trapped in the vicious cycle of satisfying and escalating wants without limit. The entire world has been sucked into this process, Russia of course included. It is not only Russians as individuals, but also the Russian state as an individual agent in human history, that has been enticed into this trap; and Solzhenitsyn had given himself the task of proposing the means to extricate Russia and Russians at least, if not all of humanity, from this abyss.

This reads like a fundamental rejection of modernity itself, of human history turning in the wrong direction as it headed toward the modern. Consistently, he rejected most of the elements of revolutionary modernity for its corrosive implications: rationalism denies or denigrates lived experience, atheism is pretension, abstract constructions of society are artificial and unfeasible, individualism atomizes the social organism, egoism destroys community and undermines the commitment to duty, the profit motive privileges sheer greed, equality leads to indiscriminate leveling, mass democracy could amount to a deceptive empowering of the masses, the drive to unlimited growth is suicidal, and much else in that vein. The diagnosis was two centuries old, assembled from numerous elements of the conservative and romantic critiques of modernity, whether European or Russian; but it was couched in an apocalyptic strain and charged with a moral fervour as revolutionary as that of the revolutionaries whom he ceaselessly castigated. He sought to rescue humanity from itself in the manner of a Tolstoy or a Dostoevsky. His thinking was utterly historical, that is, the theory of human existence must be constructed from the record of human action in history

Madhavan K. Palat is National Fellow at the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla. This is the text of a lecture delivered by him at the IIAS on 14 July 2010.

and cannot be derived from nature; in this respect he was like any Christian or a Marxist; and in his redemptive doctrine as in theirs all the evil and contradictions of modernity had accumulated to the point of crisis and regeneration. Of this condition of humanity, he was the historian, artist, and prophet.

This morally surcharged diagnosis of the ills of modernity illuminated the condition of Russia in the twentieth century and prescribed a post-Soviet future for her. He set out his histories of Russia in the twentieth century, as fiction in *The Red Wheel*, as documentary record and memoir in *The Gulag Archipelago*, and through varied observations in numerous works of fiction, essays and interviews. They chronicled the idiocy of the Russian Empire plunging to its doom and the infamy of the Soviet regime that seized control thereafter, all accompanied by the endless malfeasances of the West that exploited the infirmities of the Empire and colluded in the villainy of the Soviet Union. The fascist (in fact Nazi) blight was so hideous and apparently so undisputed that it features in his works as a negative presence, a space left almost blank, akin to Tolkien's device of representing the absolute evil of Sauron through the single flash of the Eye across the plain in *The Lord of the Rings*.[2] These actions of imperial fools, Soviet scoundrels, fascist thugs, and Western knaves concentrated the evil in mankind with the density as it were of a Black Hole. But unlike the Black Hole, it prepared man for the redemptive exit into the light, as it did Dante after encountering Lucifer in the depths of Inferno, or as it did the Leninist Russian working class which condensed within itself all the contradictions of Russian capitalism to become the agent of revolutionary emancipation. Several centuries of Russian history culminated in the superlative evil and misery of the twentieth century; the overthrow of that evil shall inaugurate a new era of possible moral rejuvenation. Solzhenitsyn was the historian of a Russia that had the eagle tearing at its vitals for centuries; but that ordeal had readied her for the "moral blaze" of her own resurrection, of a revolutionary and Soviet Russia that girded herself for a post-Soviet Russia.

It required an unusual prophetic vision to cast himself in that role as he toiled in the Gulag for a decade and endured the usual forms of Soviet persecution during the height of Soviet greatness and worldwide power. But he entertained an exalted notion of genuine art as the truth, as Tolstoy and Dostoevsky had pronounced; and its revelatory power would be so immense that it would save the world, as Dostoevsky had once proclaimed. But more than that, artists were sometimes illumined by flashes of "revelation such as cannot be produced by rational thinking." If artists were indeed to be clairvoyant, they could not afford to be so pretentious as to imagine themselves creators as the conceit of revolutionary modernity would have it; for they were mere instruments, "apprentices under heaven", mediums through which the truth of the universe is communicated. When misfortune struck them, they did not lapse into despair and disorientation as happened to those who imagined themselves the creators; instead, they could absorb privation and see harmony,"in misfortune, and even at the depths of existence - in destitution, in prison, in sickness - his sense of stable harmony never deserts him." He thus explained how the artist in him maintained his equipoise by focusing on the truth in a world gone mad; he gazed into the depths and peered into the distance as he discerned a future of moral hope.[3]

His histories encompass at least four major themes: Self-Limitation by Russia; Nationalism; Democracy; and The Catastrophic Twentieth Century.

Self-Limitation

His doctrine of self-limitation was carried to extreme in his judgement on Russian history.[4] He complained that for nearly four centuries, the Russian state had imposed insupportable burdens on the country through adventures beyond its borders. The only worthwhile Russian conquests were, according to him, those for access to the seas to the north, the south, and the east, and for the recovery of Russian people trapped in servitude to foreign states, like those in Belorussia under the Polish crown. In short, Russia created an empire, engaged in great power politics, and eventually assumed the burden of a superpower, all to its detriment. Only from 1991, it would seem, had Russia acquired the discipline of self-limitation, concentration, and functioning at an optimal level.

Sweden perfectly illustrated his argument. She was decisively defeated by Russia at Poltava in 1709 and has ever since been confined to the northern extremity of Europe; but her capitalist prosperity has been enviable, her democracy is exemplary, and her welfare provisions a worldwide model, all while remaining neutral in great power conflicts during the twentieth century. Russia on the other hand compulsively extended her empire and dominion, plunged ceaselessly into wars, remained perpetually backward, never could evolve a democracy, and was subjected to the most unspeakable horrors through most of the twentieth century. He brushed aside all her European diplomacy and wars of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries as futile and wasteful. Nothing exasperated Solzhenitsyn so much as Russia's intrusion into Polish affairs, from Catherine II's

putting Stanislaus Poniatowski on the throne to the partitions of the country. He considered Poland a useless appendix, whether friendly or hostile, and he could not understand why the Russian state was repeatedly embroiled in Polish politics. He accused Catherine II of succumbing to a sort of Roman Empire illness with her plan to recreate Dacia in what is now Romania; and her dream project of investing Constantinople and resurrecting the Byzantine Empire was an absurd fantasy which provoked the hostility of all Europe to Russia until 1917. Even the high moment of the Napoleonic wars and of Alexander I entering Paris as the liberator of Europe seemed to him an indulgence that should have been avoided. The whole of the Transcaucasian and Central Asian conquest and the Balkan imbroglio were unnecessary. He was unimpressed by the argument that Russia had to go to the aid of the fellow Christian country of Georgia or the Orthodox brethren in the Balkans; and he purveyed the typically conservative grievance that the only contribution of colonies was financial loss to the metropolis. Alexander III (1881-1894) is the only one who earned full marks for self-limitation; but his reign was tragically short, and that of his son Nicholas II was an unmitigated disaster.

With the onset of war, revolution, and totalitarianism in the twentieth century, he assumed a more censorious tone against the West without toning down his attack on the Imperial Russian, now Soviet, leadership. Instead of avoiding World War I Russia rushed to the aid of her western allies and sacrificed herself in the revolutionary holocaust. In 1915, Russia passed up the opportunity to make a separate peace with Germany and continued to sacrifice herself for the West. (But in 1917-1918 the Bolsheviks did make such a separate peace with Germany!) During the Civil War, Western governments repudiated the White armies and allowed the Bolsheviks their victories. In 1941, Russian armies protested against Soviet rule by retreating headlong along a 2000 kilometre front before the German advance. But the West abandoned the beleaguered Russian anti-communists and sustained the Soviet regime against Hitler by using Russian lives and resources to save themselves when they could have fought off Hitler on their own. The war helped Stalin consolidate his grip on the country when the West could have loosened it. In 1945, the West made peace with the Soviet Union instead of overthrowing the regime along with that of the Nazis. The West always failed to confront communism when it was the duty of every moral person or entity to have done so, over Berlin in 1953, Budapest in 1956, Prague in 1968 and so on.[5] The Soviet Empire was ruinous for Russians and for everybody else except its nomenklatura; and he famously welcomed the

dissolution of the Union in 1991 for being an intolerable burden on Russia. With the non-Russian parts hived off, Russia could concentrate on herself and develop morally and otherwise, without external distractions and internal disruption. Russia, at long last, would be limited to herself.

Slavophilism and Nationalism

His second overarching theme is of a pure Russia for Russians. He imagined a state of purity when Russia was unpolluted by alien, that is, Western, influences in the seventeenth century; he catalogued the manner in which Russia was degraded over the past three centuries and a half; and he looked forward to a restoration of that pristine condition after 1991. It started with the tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's, virtually original sin of adopting western technology to defeat the Poles in mid-seventeenth century, after which everything western became "a sort of 'fashion'", down to altering the canon and inducing the permanent schism in the Church. But nothing could compare with the "wild whirlwind" of Peter the Great, who brutally transplanted western culture to Russia, pursued the "demented idea of splitting the capital," that is, of establishing St Petersburg as the new and "European" capital, and left a legacy of such loss and destruction. Anna's reign was "the darkest of all—for the complete domination of foreigners over Russia had summarily suppressed the Russian national spirit." Even if Elizabeth's reign was better in this respect, contempt for all things of the "Russian essence" remained ingrained in the ruling class throughout the eighteenth century. As for Peter III, not only did he "surround himself with men of Holstein and Prussia, but all of Russian policy was directed by the Prussian Ambassador Goltz." Strangely, he was not so damning about Catherine II's cultural impact and he concentrated on her foreign policy, which he found expectedly wasteful of Russian resources. Alexander I's western liberal training and western obsessions led him to neglect the internal development of Russia. His brother Nicholas I thought of himself as a Russian sovereign placing "Russian interests above the common interests of the European monarchs", but soon European temptations overtook him also. The imperial borderlands from Finland to Central Asia drained Russian resources, contributed proportionately less than Russians to defence and taxes, and distorted priorities in economic development and foreign policy.

If Russia until 1917 was in various ways permeated or dominated by foreign culture, foreign concerns, or otherwise enfeebled by the presence of foreigners, she

was from 1917 under a species of foreign occupation. This alien was Bolshevism and Communism, which slaughtered about 66 millions in an internal war in less than forty years between 1918 and 1956.[6] The Soviet system placed "the weightiest yoke" on the Slavic Republics, and the chief economic burden of the USSR was borne by the Russian Republic. Russian budgets contributed proportionately more to the Soviet budget, and the internal terms of trade were weighted against Russian producers. "To undermine specifically the Russian people and to exhaust precisely *its* strength was one of Lenin's undisguised objectives." During Brezhnev's tenure the centre of Russia was once again impoverished, just as it had been during the late Empire. Three million Russians fled the alien Soviet regime into German captivity during the summer of 1941 alone, with "entire caravans of people" following the Germans in their retreat. The true "voice of the Russian people" was the Russian Liberation Army organized by Vlasov with German support against the Soviet regime. The entire Soviet edifice was an alien monstrosity which rightly came apart in 1991 at long last.

He squarely faced the prickly problem of the cohabitation of Russians and non-Russian Slavs. Russians are a part of the Eastern Slavs, along with the Ukrainians and the Belorussians. He preferred to see them together in a single state and country, but he was consistently democratic in not objecting to their remaining outside a union if they so desired. But this came with an important irredentist qualification. He spoke of peoples and not states; hence the lands settled by Russians in these other states would revert to Russia. This is the special problem of Ukraine where the eastern segment along with the Crimea is said to be Russian, and of Kazakhstan where the northern provinces are again wholly Russian. Soviet borders would have had to be redrawn, new states fashioned, and a pure Russia for the Russians would at long last rise from the ashes. The opportunity has come with the end of the Soviet Union.

He presented Russian history of the past three centuries as a vast mistake; but they are the centuries of what is understood as modern Russia, and without which we would not recognize Russia. But that possible critique merely spurred him on to discern the essential substance of Russia over which flowed these three centuries of another history. Russia consisted of the people and their Orthodox faith, and she had been betrayed and tormented over three and a half centuries by an alien element, the ruling establishment. If this establishment were genuinely Russian, it could not have taken the wrong turning at every conceivable fork in the road as it seems to have done. Thereafter Bolshevism, communism, or Soviet

socialism, whichever the term used, was an infliction on Russian and non-Russian alike; it was not a Russian imposition on non-Russians; and the Revolution of October 1917 was not Russian but Bolshevik,[7] something that the Bolsheviks themselves had vociferously asserted. Russians suffered as much as non-Russians did under this international or supranational ruling aristocracy known as the nomenklatura. Russia in her Soviet captivity was ruled by ideologies that were entirely of European provenance and not native to Russia. If nothing else, Solzhenitsyn provided a sharp riposte to Europeans dismissing Soviet socialism as a uniquely, indeed chthonian, Russian phenomenon and nothing to do with Europe; to him, it was the exact reverse. But in this account Europe or the West emerged as the prime mover of Russian history, with Russian rulers as mere agents, a species of compradore if you will. It was a globalized vision of human history with Europe and the West as the centre, and Russia as a provincial appendage fated to endure the consequences of strategic decisions taken in the metropolis, the West, to emulate it as best it can, and fall short as is so often the destiny of imitators.[8]

He was ambivalent about whether he reposed his faith in the Russian tradition or in the ruling caste which had so violated that tradition since the seventeenth century. On the one hand he imagined the people and Orthodoxy, the bearers of tradition, as a sacred river Alph running through mysterious and measureless caverns to debouch spectacularly into the post-Soviet ocean of light. But in the almost uninterrupted lineage of the intelligentsia, be it of Belinskii or Chernyshevskii, Mikhailovskii or Lenin, his faith in the people amounted to no more than a conviction that they could attain the standards set by the intelligentsia. They were not privileged by virtue of their origins, an ideological position he deplored throughout his career, and he elaborated that detail through his character Spiridon, the janitor in *The First Circle*. The measure of virtue was the capacity to make individual moral choices and live with the consequences. On the other hand, as he repudiated the imperial ruling caste and the Soviet nomenklatura as aliens, he discerned creative possibilities in the imperial bureaucracy and nobility, and at times seemingly even in the nomenklatura.[9] In *The Red Wheel* he projected the imperial state as capable of survival if only it had found the wit to act with resolution and intelligence. He discovered that potential in Stolypin in *August 1914*, and throughout the work in Vorotynsky and others like him. They stood out from the benighted ruling establishment of the emperor and his court, and of the sundry imbeciles and charlatans who passed through the revolving doors of the ministries and general staff. This was a sustained polemic against

the determinism of a Tolstoy who held that individuals could not alter the course of history,[10] and of those Marxists-Leninists to whom it had been virtually preordained. He denounced the Petrine reforms as exempla of brutality and mindless westernization; yet he mythologized such a vigorous carrier of that legacy in Stolypin. As if aware of the inconsistency, he resorted to singularly bad history by asserting that Stolypin was restoring the medieval solidity of Autocracy and not Europeanizing Russia.[11] As he chronicled the descent into tragedy in the subsequent volumes of *The Red Wheel*, he yearned for a Stolypin to rescue Russia in the manner that Churchill and De Gaulle had rallied Britain and France during World War II.[12] But he was surprisingly realistic and accurate in his judgement on that history. His epic works showed how the imperial state tradition of dynamic reform and a vibrant popular culture of local democracy and creativity in the zemstvo had all been reduced to ashes in the holocaust of the Revolution and asphalted over by the gulag. *The Gulag Archipelago* gave voice to the millions broken and crushed under the Stalinist juggernaut, and *The Red Wheel* was an immense sigh of regret for possibilities forever lost. Everything would have to be created afresh in the post-Soviet resurrection.

His history is not as bizarre as it may seem on first reading, for it is largely a provocative and morally driven version of much conventional history. The central charge that modernizing Russia has been inspired by European models, ideologies, and even personnel, is well established. While everything in Russia appears different from Europe, that does not alter the main proposition. Even for the Soviet period, while Europeans have been quick to absolve themselves of responsibility for anything Soviet, Lenin inscribed his life's work in a pan European socialist movement that repudiated so many Russian traditions. Stalin and his successors saw themselves as Soviet and socialist, not Russian; and Solzhenitsyn agreed with them in this respect. On the issue of imperial overreach he was on shakier ground in that there have not been many sweeping denunciations of this sort. We have only more limited critiques of failures like the Crimean War, the Russo-Japanese War, and of course World War I. With respect to Lenin, he faithfully reproduced a certain brand of Cold War Anglo-American historiography, especially the twin legends of the "sealed train" in which Germany returned Lenin to Russia in 1917 to foment revolution, and of German money having lubricated the Leninist revolution. To this representation of Lenin, Boris Souvarine gave a sober and extremely well-informed reply.[13] But for the later Soviet period it was common to deplore the Soviet Union's *folie de*

grandeur as it competed with the USA for worldwide domination and eventually came a cropper. The thesis of the self-limitation of Russia to what Russia can reliably handle is a dissident, democratic, and liberal position of the perestroika and post-Soviet years. Solzhenitsyn has merely extended the argument backward in time to the eighteenth century to fit in with the rest of the general thesis that the rot had set in then, or shortly before, in the seventeenth century. It is a familiar polemical device to fortify an argument with the appearance of continuity and an appropriate pedigree.

His critique of the West as decadent and his expectation that Russia was possessed of the spiritual resources to dam that moral erosion may appear to be utterly Slavophile of the nineteenth century. But there is an important difference. Ivan Kireevskii for example claimed that the West was spiritually hollow but materially robust while Russia had reversed that combination by being spiritually superior and technologically retarded. Eventually, the conflation of Eastern spiritual radiance and Western material progress would spark an unexampled brilliance of moral and material creativity and potency that shall pulse through all of humanity.[14] In this utopian vision for the future, Kireevskii saw Russia harnessing the resources of the West for what amounted to a joint leadership claim over the human species. Russian technological backwardness did not hamper her onward march as the West would supply what was lacking; but the West, in its moral decay was incapable of establishing its sway. If Russia was the architect, the West was the engineer, and the two together would construct the brave new world.

Unlike his famous forbears, Solzhenitsyn entertained no such messianic illusions, and, utterly devoted as he was to Russia, he recoiled from assigning a leadership function to her. He did claim occasionally that the enormity of the Russian ordeal and her abiding religious faith had equipped her better than the crisis-ridden and irreligious West for the imminent moral revolution. Humanity stood on the brink of a tectonic shift akin to the transition from the medieval epoch to the Renaissance; as modern civilization was to be superceded by another, Russia was the "voice of the future" that would rescue a world in spiritual distress.[15] Russian technological inferiority should arouse no anxiety, for not only was her moral substance more than compensation, the pursuit of unrestrained technological development was ruinous. But he was keenly aware of the ambiguity of his position, for the spiritually enriched Russia needed the resources, both material and spiritual, of that same spiritually impoverished West for his moral crusade against the Soviet system and for the eventual eradication of that

evil.[16] In sum, he was pointing to the moral inadequacies of both the West and of Russia, the different ways in which they were deficient, and the sources of renewal, both Western and Russian, and their interdependence.

He rejected any notion of sin and virtue being specific to geography or culture; his career was devoted to arguing that these attributes were determined by ideology; but most of all, the individual was responsible for making the ideological and moral choice without the right to an alibi, whichever the nation or culture he was located in. He distilled his reflections on his experience and observation of both himself and others into an eloquent *profession de foi*: "Gradually it was disclosed to me that the line separating good and evil passes not through states, nor between classes, nor between political parties either—but right through every human heart—and through all human hearts. This line shifts. Inside us, it oscillates with the years. And even within hearts overwhelmed by evil, one small bridgehead of good is retained. And even in the best of all hearts, there remains . . . an unuprooted small corner of evil."[17] These articles of faith were not compatible with messianism; and as he retained his belief in the uniqueness of Russia and her capacity for spiritual regeneration, he evolved at best into a Slavophile in its minimalist variant, a Slavophile of political decline and retreat into the fortress, not one of exuberant expansion to disseminate the Word. But that did not make him a typical nationalist either.

His nationalism, like that of any nationalist, accorded primacy to Russians, their state, and to their culture in the territories inhabited by them; but he constructed his national state differently. The Russian state was imperial by constitution and its territory imperial or heterogeneous in composition until 1917; the Soviet state was multinational although from the 1980s it has been called imperial by some; and the post-Soviet Russian state was a reduced version of the Soviet one in that it was still polyglot and not purely Russian in composition. Russian nationalists pursued the usual European processes of nationalizing the Russian public through cultural homogenization, and attempted or dreamed of the extinction of other national cultures within the territory of the state, with ideologues like Mikhail Katkov being exemplars of such thinking in the late nineteenth century. But they have always faced the impossible task of creating a Russian national state in a territory that is so heterogeneous and can never therefore be national, unless of course all the non-Russians were to become Russian. For this reason, both the imperial and Soviet states were supranational states governed by the supranational principles of dynasticism and Soviet socialism respectively even as they intermittently exploited Russian nationalism without permitting it to dominate. Russian nationalism embraces the contradiction of supranationalism or the inclusion of non-Russians; by a purely nationalist logic this contradiction may be resolved only through Russification as in the late imperial period, or through ethnic cleansing and genocide, the preferred techniques of the twentieth century. Neither of these need happen, nor are they likely, but the tension is palpable and Russian nationalists must bear this particular cross inherited from their history.

Solzhenitsyn cut this Gordian knot by excising non-Russians and their territories from his ideal Russian construct. According to him, Russia should never have acquired non-Russian territories; he blamed the empire for being an empire and not a nation; and he sought to correct that error for post-Soviet times by redrawing the maps to exclude non-Russians and to include Russians trapped in other states like Kazakhstan and Ukraine. The accusation is anachronistic since nations and nationalism, with their attendant homogeneous cultural spaces coinciding with the political territory, began to appear at best only in the late eighteenth century and gathered momentum in the course of the nineteenth century in Europe. Dynastic empires like the Russian, Ottoman, or Habsburg, or for that matter any other, were never national even if a particular culture was dominant; rulers accumulated (and distributed) territories promiscuously and apparently irrationally as far as a nationalist was concerned, but utterly rationally in the eyes of a dynast. He missed or denied the principal logic of Russian imperial history of the past three centuries; but his purpose was to prescribe the timeless existence of a Russian nation, and in this he followed a well-established tradition of nationalist history writing the world over.[18] He thus departed from the traditions of both the Russian state of the past three centuries and from those of the nationalists of the past century and a half as he discarded a nationalism that harked back to imperial or Soviet domination. His was a post-Soviet nationalism for an exclusively Russian nation and state; it was a self-limiting nationalism without an imperialist or expansionist purpose; for that reason it was liberal in international relations however uncertainly liberal for its domestic politics.[19] As both Slavophile and nationalist he differed from the classical Slavophiles and from the typical nationalist.

His forms of self-limitation and nationalism were peculiarly attuned to the condition of Russia after 1991. He was often said to have lived in the world of ideas of the nineteenth century and to have been so marked by the Soviet experience that his significance ebbed with the Union. However, he turned out to be a prophet of post-

Soviet Russia rather than an incorrigible romantic or a despairing nationalist. He was not a mere pragmatic, regretting the defeat, disintegration, and reduction of the Soviet Union, and adjusting to the inevitable; he arrived at these conclusions from his understanding of Russian history over the past three centuries and its peculiar relation to the West. He was emphatic that in this post-Cold War globalized world Russia shall not be a leader since she had never been one in the first place; and if there was going to be a centre of power it must lie elsewhere. He presented the Russian rout in the Cold War and contraction thereafter as an opportunity for Russia to become truly herself again, which she had failed to be for three and a half centuries. He drew an astonishingly optimistic conclusion from a situation that most in Russia would have regarded as the gloomiest imaginable.

Like his fictional heroes immured in camps and hospitals and cultivating themselves spiritually to become freer than all their oppressors and their morally confused or inadequate fellow inmates, Russia shall nurture her self in the circumstances she found herself in. Kostoglotov, Nerzhin and Ivan Denisovich were not only models of conduct for individuals facing the severest trials of their lives, they were also metaphors for the new post-Soviet Russia. We may not agree with much of his history, but he has extracted from that history a thread which guides us into the post-Soviet world of Russia. Other, and I think, more convincing, explanations of Russian and European history are available; but none of them could secrete the promise of a more wholesome future for Russia. Instead of a defeated and further declining Russia, which is what my "better" explanations would lead me to, Solzhenitsyn painted the prospect of a Russia morally and culturally resurrected to a life in Orthodoxy and harmony. Much as he was product and victim of the Soviet century, he was the prophet to the post-Soviet age.

Democracy

The third major theme is the nature of democracy in Russia. He placed his faith in local democracy far more than on central or parliamentary democratic institutions. Both the Russian historical record and modern mass democratic politics seemed to justify that preference. Democracy appeared meaningful only on the foundation of vibrant local communities, and he discerned them as much in Russian history in the veche, the mir, Cossack self-government, and the zemstvo as in the cantonal and county politics that he experienced directly during his exile in Switzerland and America. Consistently enough, but imbued with a dreamy utopianism, he repeatedly

called for nurturing vigorous local democratic institutions after the collapse of the Soviet Union. His commitment to democracy as the foundation of a modern politics remained unequivocal.

But he was wary of party politics and mass democracy as a fertile source of evil and totalitarian menace. He dreaded, and with good reason, the tyranny of the majority over the minority and the individual as foreseen or seen by John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville in mid-nineteenth century. Universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage, had everything wrong about it. Universal and direct suffrage crushed the real inequality among individuals, "it represents the triumph of bare quantity over substance and quality", and it "assume[s] that the nation lacks all structure", that it is putty to be moulded at will. Secret voting favoured insincerity; and direct voting in national elections ensured that the candidates were unknown to their voters. Such mass democracy also entailed the domination of a minority over the majority, or elite rule; it engendered party politics, in which a party bureaucracy erased the individual, and whose mobilizing processes polarized society and split the nation; and it produced the professional politician, a "jurocracy" of lawyers who fattened themselves in the profession and were neither responsive nor responsible to their voters.[20] These familiar critiques of mass democracy, advanced at various times during the nineteenth century by liberals and conservatives, revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries, each after their own fashion, were revived and restated with vigour and passion by Solzhenitsyn in the late twentieth century; and it demonstrated, as with so many of his techniques and arguments, that what seemed *passé* in one part of the world could be very live in another.

With the searing experience of the twentieth century in mind, he placed his faith in a foundational local democracy and endorsed a limited authoritarianism for the post-Soviet transition. As he explained it, a secure democracy could not be established overnight after the totalitarian century, and any attempt at doing so would reproduce the evil it sought to eliminate. It must be built up from the base, brick by brick; and local democracy was the obvious foundation to this vast edifice. In the circumstances, even a limited authoritarianism at parliamentary levels could be contemplated, but not the reverse, of the absence of local democracy and an attempt at it at the apex. The reasoning was symmetrical with that for the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the transition to the communist utopia; but he bolstered his argument with a romantic reach into Russian history, that "Russia too has existed for many centuries under various forms of authoritarian rule, Russia too has preserved itself

and its health, did not experience episodes of self-destruction like those of the twentieth century. . ."[21] His concerns were utterly contemporary of the twentieth century; his thought processes belonged more to early Soviet Marxism than to any other ideological structure; but his legitimation arguments were romantically Slavophile.

Not surprisingly, his most detailed prescriptions concerned local democracy and its upward progression. It began with the basal zemstvo directly elected; these deputies would select the next level of deputies from among themselves; each level would continue to elect in this manner until it reached a national All Zemstvo assembly. All such deputies would be known and responsible to their electors unlike parliamentary deputies; and here he repudiated one of the central principles of parliamentary representation, first established in Britain and France in the late eighteenth century, by which a deputy is chosen by a territorial constituency but does not take further instruction from them on his conduct as a parliamentary deputy.[22] All of this bore an astonishing resemblance to the structure of revolutionary soviets before the Bolshevik dictatorship finally established itself over them.

He virtually replicated the arguments of the early Soviet jurists advocating the Soviet electoral structure over the parliamentary one; and not surprisingly, he warmly welcomed that most original, democratic, and revolutionary creation of the Russian revolutionary movement, the soviet. Like him, they denounced mass democratic parliamentary systems functioning through the so-called four tail suffrage of universal, equal, direct and secret voting. It generated professional politics run most often by lawyers, or an *advokatokratiia* akin to Solzhenitsyn's "jurocracy", and of course unknown to the mass of electors. Soviet publicists extolled the virtues of the lowest soviets of town and village as composed of deputies directly known to the people, and the hierarchy of soviets, with each level being elected by the one below, as satisfying this requirement of direct knowledge at each stage.[23] Ironically, Nadezhda Krupskaia, Lenin's wife, preferred exactly the same argument as Solzhenitsyn, that the deputies would be known to the voters and be in constant contact with them unlike other systems where everything ended with the election.[24] Like Solzhenitsyn, they deplored the atomization of the bourgeois individual; hence the voting process would represent the social organism, which in Solzhenitsyn's case was the community, and in the Soviet case, the productive unit or the working collective and the like.[25] By that same logic, both sought representation for professional groups and institutions, what Solzhenitsyn called *sosloviia* and the

Soviet theorists called unions or associations.[26]

He dismissed the soviets of late Soviet times as so emaciated that they would have to be replaced by the zemstvo, which had themselves been replaced by the soviets in 1917-1918.[27] But the analogy between the zemstvo and the soviet is obvious, and he admitted to considerable respect for the early soviets before the Bolsheviks imposed their monopoly after the Fifth Soviet Congress and inaugurated the new constitution on 18 June 1918. When Tvardovskii, the editor of the journal *Novyi Mir*, expostulated in 1967 that Solzhenitsyn was too unforgiving of the Soviet regime, he protested "that he was fully in favour of the Soviet regime in its original form—freely elected deputies to independent workers' soviets—."[28] A few years later, in 1974, he publicly reaffirmed that faith through his *Letter to the Soviet Leaders* as he called for a resurrection of the genuinely soviet system in lieu of the one that had degenerated into an extension of the Party: "May I remind you that the SOVIETS, which gave their name to our system and existed until 6 July 1918 were in no way dependent on ideology: ideology or no ideology, they always envisaged the widest possible *consultation* with all working people."[29] This declaration in favour of the soviets, which embodied the revolutionary tradition as little else could do, came after his conversion in 1969 to the non-monarchist conservatism of the *Vekhi* and *De Profundis* miscellanies, and of the group around Berdiaev, all of which were so critical of the radical traditions of the intelligentsia.[30] He echoed the words of one he professed to despise, Trotsky, who defended himself at his trial that the soviet of St Petersburg in 1905 had been a non-party body, that it was a purely democratic body without a necessary ideology, and hence akin to the Duma or the zemstvo.[31] The soviet was indeed competitively democratic until 1918, although it had already excluded the bourgeoisie and *tsenzovyeelementy*, which restriction Solzhenitsyn endorsed, unlike the socialist critics in Europe led by Karl Kautsky.[32] He revisited these arguments in 1994, but now to plead the case for the zemstvo in almost the same terms as for the soviet.

He found the party monopolies odious, but not the principle of the soviet structure. Martov, an important victim of the Bolshevik dictatorship, had endorsed the limited Soviet franchise as typical of bourgeois democracies also, but he specified political competition within the soviet structure as indispensable to democracy.[33] Since contested elections to the soviets had indeed been held in November 1918 – March 1919,[34] and February – May 1920,[35] he sustained his faith or hope until 1920. As the Bolshevik monopoly became irrevocable thereafter, he resigned himself to the darkness that was

descending on Russia. His faith now appears touching, but it is not so outlandish were we to transport ourselves to the vigorous electoral battles of the soviets before the Bolshevik dictatorship of 1918 and intermittently until mid-1920. Solzhenitsyn however imagined the curtain descending as early as July 1918. Had Martov survived into the thirties to experience the Nazi dictatorship rising out of universal suffrage and parliamentary democracy, he might have felt vindicated even as he would have despaired for humanity. Both saw that the soviet structure did not necessarily entail the Bolshevik dictatorship, that the Bolsheviks had perverted the democracy of the soviets, and that competitive electoral politics, otherwise known as democracy, was no guarantee of its own survival whether in soviet or parliamentary form. It is not so surprising that Solzhenitsyn's arguments seem to reproduce those of the early Soviet propagandists. But his argument on the genuinely democratic attributes of the revolutionary soviets establishes a discontinuity between the early Leninist revolution and the subsequent phases of both Lenin's regime and of course Stalinism; and this contradicts his passionately argued thesis of the continuity of Leninism and Stalinism.

The Catastrophic Twentieth Century

By far Solzhenitsyn's greatest obsession was the fate of Russia in the twentieth century, comparable in his mind only to the Holocaust and elaborated in his titanic works, *The Red Wheel* and *The Gulag Archipelago. The Red Wheel* was to tell the story of the War, the Revolution, and the Civil War until its denouement in the Soviet Union in 1922 in twenty volumes and five epilogues; but even a person of Solzhenitsyn's industry and stamina could manage only ten volumes of about 6000 pages of dense fiction and history up to April 1917.[36] *The Gulag Archipelago* takes the story up to 1956 as an account of how Russia became a prison camp, such that the "free" citizens outside the camps were as unfree as those inside. Often described as one of the most important books of the twentieth century, as the anti-epic that was a "surrogate" Nuremberg trial and the dossier for the Last Judgement on Soviet totalitarianism,[37] its metaphor of the Soviet Union as a prison camp can never be erased.

He presented the revolutionary myth through AgnessaLenartovich's words of Stolypin as the ultimate reactionary and of DmitriiBogrov, Stolypin's assassin, as a revolutionary saint. Through discussions by Agnessa and her circle, numerous saints of the revolutionary calendar flit across the pages, some famous historical figures like SofiiaPerovskaia, Kropotkin, or Zheliabov,

others fictional ones, all living like Christian saints solely for the cause to which they have devoted their lives and ready to be martyred for it. He then set the record right by reversing their mythological attributes. Stolypin was morphed into the saint and Bogrov into the demon. Stolypin emerged as the bearer of the exemplary virtues of courage, foresight, devotion, and patriotism with a heroic genealogy that included Suvorov and Lermontov. During his four days in the agonies of death in 1911, his fevered mind was focused wholly on the future of Russia and the reform process that would now be aborted. His assassination collapsed the millennium of Russian history: it occurred in Kiev, "the cradle of Russia, the city in which Russia had its earliest roots;" the bullets portended the tragedy of Russia and of the dynasty, for "they were the opening shots of the fusillade at Yekaterinburg" (where Nicholas II and his entire family were shot, in 1918); and his death befitted the bogatyrs, those larger-than-life heroes of Russian myth, as he "went to meet his death as an equal. He passed like a sovereign from one kind of life to another."[38] Bogrov was turned into a noxious object emerging from the dark folds of the earth to perpetrate his heinous crime, with a sinister predecessor in D'Anthès, Pushkin's killer.

Solzhenitsyn drew, not real historical figures, individuals acting in particular situations, but idealized and demonized mythological figures, timeless and extreme in their virtues and vices. His characters did not belong to a historical time and place but to a mythic eternity where they cannot be particularized. He drew on the canon of socialist realism in order to turn it against itself; instead he has reproduced it in inverted form. Like critical realism, socialist realism exposed reality; but it exposed all forms of reality except its own, the socialist one of the Soviet Union, and thus perverted its aesthetic purpose. It generated hagiography: it was intrusively didactic, outrageously optimistic, woodenly formulaic; and it assembled mechanical heroes ceaselessly performing feats of impossible valour, overcoming every conceivable obstacle, and delivering endlessly Stakhanovite results. Solzhenitsyn had imbibed the socialist realist maxims of the revolutionary epoch, and his anti-socialist message of Stolypinist heroism was purveyed through an undiluted if inverted socialist realism of his own provenance.[39]

But as his epic work progressed, it imperceptibly shifted from fiction to dramatized history, and the protagonist Colonel Vorotyntsev receded in favour of the historical personalities. Leaders repeatedly failed to discharge their duties, leaving the way open to revolutionary evil, and even Vorotyntsev dallied with his mistress instead of attending an important meeting

in St Petersburg in 1916. The gripping story of the chaos and frenzy takes us through the drama of the abdication, the Soviet of St Petersburg, the Provisional Government, and numerous other revolutionary events until Lenin took charge in April 1917. As Russia plunged into the abyss through *November 1916, March 1917,* and *April 1917,* her crust split open to reveal the flames of the revolutionary and Soviet inferno leaping up from the depths of the earth. The apocalypse of 1917 heralded its dreadful aftermath, the Soviet Union, which may be grasped only as a gulag, an archipelago of prison camps congruent with the limitless geography of Russia herself.

The Conservative

Solzhenitsyn professed to abhor revolution and anything akin to revolution after his ideological transformation and religious conversion in the camps in the late forties; subsequently he advocated a most controlled gradualism in the transition from authoritarianism to democracy in order to avoid the menace of revolution. He was well aware that the past could not be revived, and that any such attempt would have been as alienating as imposing Western culture, as Ivan Kireevskii had warned in his time. He projected himself as a conservative and Christian thinker, he licensed such an image of himself in both Russia and the West, and he welcomed his apotheosis as a prophet in the tradition of the Old Testament when Father Alexander Schmemann delivered his Easter Sermon in 1972: "And now this forgotten spirit of prophecy has suddenly awakened in the heart of Christianity. We hear the ringing voice of a lone man who has said in the hearing of all that everything that is going on—concessions, submission, the eternal world of the church compromising with the world and political power—all this is evil. And this man is Solzhenitsyn."[40]

His conservatism derived from his philosophic premise that man is imperfect, that the end of human existence was to overcome that inadequacy, that it could be achieved only through individual and inner self-examination and moral growth, that the manipulation of the external social environment cannot ensure these ends, but that external social institutions must reflect that striving.[41] He set himself off from the Left, and more generally from the tradition of the Enlightenment as he read it, which assumed the perfectibility of the human species and placed their utopian hopes on fashioning the ideal external environment in which humanity could blossom into perfection. Such utopian dreams of perfection is what he termed ideology; he was non-ideological in that sense; and conservatives claim that a conservative cannot in principle be ideological as they

do not engage in any form of utopianism. In his Christian view of life, imperfection was understood as the sin and evil inherent in human beings. As he developed his views on these matters he drew upon important strains of conservatism within Russia, especially Slavophilism. He sought out that realm in public affairs where individuals could freely reflect on the morality of political action, and he discerned it as that which was free of the direct exercise of political power. It led to his proposing to Soviet leaders the radical disjunction between political power and public opinion, or between the state on the one hand and the spiritual and ethical domain on the other. At times he seemed to favour the familiar liberal dichotomy between state and public opinion;[42] but at other times the distinction seemed to be heavily indebted to his Slavophile reading of Russian history and especially to Konstantin Aksakov's redaction of it, as Professor Confino has well analysed it. In Aksakov's extreme and utopian dream, the power of the Autocrat would be wholly distinct from the opinion of the people, yet they shall function in perfect communion. Solzhenitsyn's vision of a Rousseauvian (he preferred to call it Athenian) direct democracy at the base effortlessly melding with an authoritarian but self-limiting central power reproduces Aksakov's ideal of the symbiosis of autocratic power and popular opinion.[43] On that ground he even upbraided Sakharov for engaging in the direct political game instead of the moral and passive resistance which he considered superior and necessary. "When asked in 1974, 'How can your compatriots and youth show their support for you?' Solzhenitsyn answered: "Definitely not by any physical acts but by rejecting the lie, and by refusing to participate personally in the lie.... In breaking with the lie, we are performing a moral act, not a political one, and not one that can be punished by criminal law."[44] The disjunction between inner and external freedom and the stress on the former, if necessary at the expense of the latter, is a concept familiar to European conservatism but attaining its height or drawn to its extreme in Russia in the Slavophilism of Ivan Kireevskii and Konstantin Aksakov and in Leo Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance.

Certainly, the cultivation of inner freedom for moral self-perfection whatever the external circumstances is one of the grand themes of Solzhenitsyn's *oeuvre*. In the gulag, the relations of power were raw in the extreme, and he paraded all the moral choices available. It was always possible not to succumb to the Great Lie that was perpetrated daily and to think through the fundamental questions of life, however searing the answers they threw up. The *zek* (prisoner) who has lost everything and has nothing to lose, like the proletarian of the Marxian imaginary, is the freest person. Prisoners' minds could

range over fundamental issues freely without anxiety about losing their "liberties."[45] They could live more deeply, more fully, and engage with life in its many dimensions. As they do so, they endure their travails and privation with a growing moral fortitude that is so often unavailable to those who are "free." But they go beyond mere endurance. They do not struggle and revolt, nor do they fall into despair; they neither resist nor become passive. Like the martyred saints of Christianity, they grow in moral beauty, and having passed through the many circles of the nether world they approach the gates of Paradise. Such Christian ascetics gain knowledge of the self, of Creation, and of Christ through participation in the Passion; and prison and its suffering is the "martyrdom [that] facilitates one's eschatological quest for enlightenment."[46] Without degenerating into masochism or naïve optimism, Solzhenitsyn discerned the potential for moral regeneration in the prison experience which may have been denied the free person outside; he understood why Tolstoy dreamed of being in prison; and both Nerzhin and Solzhenitsyn "blessed" the experience for the enlightenment that it had bestowed upon them. Like Socrates being freer in prison than the despots who had thrown him in there, so Solzhenitsyn's protagonists nurtured their freedom in the gaols of their enslaved tyrants.[47]

These multiple processes of self-discovery have been brought together in his fictional masterpieces. As Dante was guided through the many circles of Inferno by Virgil, Gleb Nerzhin (Solzhenitsyn) accumulated spiritual capital through his engagement with Sologdin, the Virgil of *The First Circle*.[48] Innokenty Volodin, a diplomat who enjoyed the best of everything Soviet is more and more disturbed by the immorality of the system in which he worked. In his self-examination, he likened Stalinism to Epicureanism of all the unlikely philosophies, on the ground that the latter was materialist and hedonist, that its materialism caused it to deny the immortality of the soul, and that its hedonism allowed both accommodation to reality and the avoidance of public affairs. It was through such an unusual philosophical detour that Volodin decided to act morally. (Epicureanism was officially favoured in the Soviet Union and Marx had written his doctoral thesis on Epicurus, hence this unusual polemic). He telephoned the American Embassy to warn that their nuclear secrets were being transmitted to the Soviet Union.[49] The call was recorded of course and Stalin demanded a machine that could identify the caller. The research job was given to these highly educated prisoners; but Nerzhin retains his independence of mind, refuses to work on cryptography, and is bundled off in a Black Maria to a grim and dark fate. On the other

hand, the true believing communist, Rubin, amiable and kindly though he was, ceaselessly validifies the perversions of Stalinism on the ground that it served a higher cause; and he willingly invented the voice-recognizing machine that led to the arrest of Innokentii Volodin. *Cancer Ward*, perhaps his most accomplished work of fiction, ceaselessly revisits the theme of agonized reflection on what had always been taken for granted. Before his entry into the cancer ward, Oleg Kostoglotov had already revised his opinion of Stalin after the Finnish War of 1939. He objects to doctors deceiving him on the extent of his illness, yet he himself conceals the ominous detail from the Proska, justifying it by his own age and experience. He is certain that there is no life without reproductive capacity and objects to treatment that might lead to impotence; yet when he is spiritually attracted to Vega he reconsiders his belief that doctors must not take decisions for their patients. He permits her to administer the therapy that results in his loss of virility, and he prolongs his life in the knowledge that he can no longer reproduce it. He imagined a purely spiritual partnership with Vega and feels fulfilled thereby; but he realizes he cannot make her happy without sensuality, abandons the plan, and is once again fulfilled by the fresh awareness. As he hears of Elizaveta Anatol'evna's troubled life, his own anxieties over his sexual inadequacy subside in the presence of such untold suffering. He ponders the paradox that Chance is utterly arbitrary and irrational and can visit cancer and death randomly on anybody; but monstrous bureaucracies have raised their rational structures of repression that denies life everyday by rational choice. As he accepts that fatal disease does not make a rational choice of victims in the manner that tyrannical bureaucracies do, and that death is inevitable, he feels liberated from fear and from the compulsion to adjust to the rationality of a vicious bureaucracy. Thus the party hack's life of uninterrupted moral compromise seems to have caused Shulubin more misery than incarceration had to Kostoglotov. Shulubin had ceaselessly lied in order to protect his wife and family; but his wife was dead and his children were repulsive, and he was left with just himself and his body, a "sack full of shit." Kostoglotov gives thanks that he has been able to cherish whatever has been given to him in life without his having accommodated himself to injustice, while Shulubin participated passively in such Stalinist iniquity. Kostoglotov could not reproduce himself after his operation, yet he felt that something in him would live on forever thanks to the universal in him. After his prolonged imprisonment he emerges into the free world only to discover how alien he is to its philistine triviality.

Solzhenitsyn was concerned with the need for a

relentless re-examination of one's most cherished beliefs, not necessarily for altering them. Thus Kostoglotov's radiologist, Dr Dontsova, is deeply troubled by his questioning her absolute authority to treat him, and she reviews her firmly held conviction that doctors could decide. But when she herself falls victim to the cancer, she reaffirms her position and refuses to question her doctors' decisions on her own treatment. Hers was a conviction arrived at after deep cogitation; it was not a naïve or blind faith. Only Rusanov the apparatchik seemed incapable of such critical reflection; owing to his addiction to the narcotic of communist ideology, and he could think, if thought it was, only in clichés, slogans, and formulae, in what has been called "speaking Bolshevik."

With the psychological insight available to the conservative perhaps more than to others, Solzhenitsyn penetrated the depths of individual suffering and its consequences to a degree that is exceptional even in such literatures of suffering. Both Kostoglotov and Azovkin condense in themselves all possible forms of exile and liminality. Kostoglotov's political exile banished him from the world of the familiar to the margins; his illness exiles him from the world of the healthy to the closed world of the cancer ward; his impotence after his operation banishes him from his own body; when he is released into the outer world, he experiences it as alien and as yet another exile. Azovkin has been similarly exiled into the ward; his pain is so acute he cannot speak or communicate with fellow patients and he can only distort his body and grimace wordlessly as he doubles up in agony; he, like so many others in pain, cannot communicate the nature and intensity of his pain, which exiles him from medics who engage in the technology of treatment rather than those in healing; the intensity of his pain exiles him from his own body which he wishes to be rid of in order to assuage the suffering; his illness is incurable and his doctors are to release him to his own home, which is no longer a home but another exile, an exile from the ward where he was being treated. These multiple forms of exile coalesce in each person into a single overpowering experience of pain, suffering, exile, and liminality, a frequent condition of human beings and the real one of Soviet society. Only the ultimate revolutionary commitment could have led to Lenin's imagining all the contradictions of capitalism in Russia sedimenting in the proletariat and ordaining it for revolution; and it required a conservative's awareness of human imperfection to plumb the depths of exile in the human condition and to conflate it with the fate of Soviet society.[50]

The entire novel is shot through with ambiguity. Is it life-denying because Kostoglotov lost his potency as the cost of his cure; or is it life-affirming because his moral substance survived every ordeal? The doctors were omnipotent, yet they themselves were often exiles and unfree. Is the cancer ward a metaphor of Soviet society which had to be cured of sickness by its omniscient doctors, the Soviet state and Communist Party; or was the Soviet state and Party itself cancerous and undergoing treatment through de-Stalinization, the first signs of which were visible in 1955 when the novel was written? Was the cancer a species of bourgeois corruption or communist speak; which was the cancer ward, the Party or the prison; who were the doctors, the partocrats or independent citizens; and was exile and liminality the fate of the people or of the bureaucrats? Everything demanded re-evaluation and inner self-examination.[51]

However, the commitment to self-purification was not peculiar to the conservative; it was carried to extremes in the Russian revolutionary tradition; and Solzhenitsyn, despite himself, was drawing as much on the Russian revolutionary heritage as he was on Tolstoyan, Slavophile, conservative, or medieval Christian precepts. Russian revolutionaries have been famously admired and derided for being a community of apostles, ascetics and martyrs like Christian saints and missionaries. Such radicals laboured strenuously to perfect themselves spiritually and morally to undertake the daunting task of emancipating the Russian people. They demanded of themselves the purity of motivation and absolute integrity of medieval knights *sans peur et sans reproche*. They pursued the most exacting theoretical studies like hermits at their rigorous ascetic exercises; and both species gained access to superior knowledge which they might or might not have been able to share with the rest of their fellows. They endured endlessly hellish experiences in prison and exile, becoming more and more aware or "conscious", and eventually creating a heavenly community on earth through the camaraderie of the discussion group of like-minded persons (the *kruzhok*). Iconic radical fiction from Chernyshevskii, Gorkii, Gladkov and others provided just such models, especially Rakhmetov in Chernyshevskii's *What is to be Done?*[52] In real life, the Chaikovskii circle attained heights of self-perfection that became an inspiring myth to generations of revolutionary intelligentsia: they represented that perfection of inner development that Solzhenitsyn himself demanded from his characters. They sacrificed their biological families to nurture their revolutionary families, and persons like Sofiia and Perovskaia slept on bare boards if not on nails.[53] Indeed many of the heroes of the resistance in the Gulag were themselves revolutionaries who had undergone just such a spiritual

awakening in the revolutionary movement before 1917, including among them Trotskyites, whom he otherwise contemned.[54] As Solzhenitsyn-Nerzhin engaged in animated discussion and argument with Sologdin and Rubin in his sharashka and slowly converted from his youthful Marxism to his own version of religious faith and individual self-perfection, he seemed at times to be describing the Russian radical intelligentsia's self-education groups, the *kruzhki*, and at times the spiritual exercises of Christian martyrs in the catacombs or of monks in their cells. He conflated the two sources of inspiration, but the more proximate and palpable one is of Russian revolutionaries themselves.

The Revolutionary

Solzhenitsyn's instincts and temperament were revolutionary, and despite his professions and convictions, he endorsed extreme forms of action that included murder and terror. He accorded primacy to moral revolution; but his moral revolution was pervasive, it embraced all power structures, it was not segregated into an autonomous sphere of its own. Kostoglotov of *Cancer Ward* could come to the conclusion that "You are alive only when breaking rules." Quite únlike his non-resisting Tolstoyan fictional characters, Solzhenitsyn enthusiastically welcomed conventional revolutionary action when a reasonable opportunity seemed to present itself in the gulag. The *Gulag Archipelago* opens with the question why people did not fight off such iniquity, and after numerous reflections and narratives the work swells to the climacteric of the great rising at Kengir in 1954. It is a vast phenomenology of incarceration and an epic of endurance and revolt; but it is as much an optimistic affirmation of the capacity of human beings to resist injustice in mind and body should the choice be made to do so. Consistently enough, he regarded it as a moral choice of the individual to resist violently as long as it was arrived at freely. In the overture to his account of the rising at Kengir he reflected on violent resistance. His own words say it well:

Now as I write this chapter, rows of humane books frown down at me from the walls, the tarnished gilt on their well-worn spines glinting reproachfully like stars through the clouds. Nothing in the world should be sought through violence! By taking up the sword, the knife, the rifle, we quickly put ourselves on the level of our tormentors and persecutors. And there will be no end to it. . .

There will be no end. . . Here, at my desk, in a warm place, I agree completely.

If you ever get twenty-five years for nothing, if you find yourself wearing four number patches on your clothes, holding your hands permanently behind your back, submitting to searches morning and evening, working until you are utterly exhausted, dragged into the cooler whenever someone denounces you, trodden deeper and deeper into the ground—from the hole you're in, the fine words of the great humanists will sound like the chatter of the well-fed and free.[55]

He recalled how murders of traitors became utterly normal, how prisoners would ask each other every morning whether anybody had been killed, how "In this cruel sport the prisoners heard the subterranean gong of justice,"[56] and how these terrorist acts were profoundly liberating:

Out of five thousand men about a dozen were killed, but with every stroke of the knife more and more of the clinging, twining tentacles fell away. A remarkable fresh breeze was blowing! On the surface, we were prisoners living in a camp just as before, but in reality we had become free—free because for the very first time in our lives, we had started saying openly and aloud all that we had thought! No one who has not experienced this transition can imagine what it is like![57]

As he warmed to the theme he uttered this paean to the glory of violent resistance and how the land of the free had been created within the confines of the labour camps:

A time such as we had never experienced or thought possible on this earth: when a man with an unclean conscience could not go quietly to bed! Retribution was at hand—not in the next world, not before the court of history, but retribution live and palpable, raising a knife over you in the light of dawn. It was like a fairy tale: the ground is soft and warm under the feet of honest men, but under the feet of traitors it prickles and burns. If only our Great Outside were as lucky, the Land of the Free, which never has seen and perhaps never will see such a time.[58]

These were akin to the revolutionary soviet governments during the revolution of 1905 setting at naught the writ of the tsarist state within the "liberated" territories; and like those revolutionary soviets, the Kengir rebels set up an entire bureaucracy and governmental structure to run their own liberated space.[59] The Camp Administration regarded this as "gangsterism", but he saw it as "political", like any revolutionary of tsarist times.[60] He went on to recount the heroic resistance at Kengir in which eventually 6000–7000 prisoners were killed.[61] And, in his enthusiasm, he uttered the forbidden word, that this was indeed a "revolution", a high moment of which was on the anniversary of one of the most sacred days of the revolutionary calendar, on 9 (22) January, a Bloody Tuesday in 1952 instead of the Bloody Sunday of 1905.[62] His apostrophe to the Kengir heroes seems to be in flat contradiction with his preaching of inner concentration and non-violence.

But it is nowhere written that a person must be consistent; and we have often been cautioned against the myth of coherence in our effort to understand human action.[63] If heterogeneous elements go into constituting a discourse among a community of people, they do so in the body of thought of a single person also. Solzhentisyn detested revolution and violence, but he also felt that an atrocity like the Soviet Union could justify revolution; he favoured self-perfection above all else, but he could see that it ensured only the necessary but not the sufficient condition to the outcome of the power struggle he was engaged in and to which he summoned everybody with a conscience. By his own prescriptions, it would have been irresponsible and immoral on his part not to have saluted the martyrs of Kengir. Susan Richards has shown well how these ambiguities flowed from uncertainty, the refusal to judge, and from debate with himself, for the questing mind could not take an absolute position on many matters.[64] And Georges Nivat, one of the most acute and eloquent scholars of Solzhenitsyn, has presented it as a contradiction that need not be resolved: "This apostle of a certain non-violence is also a fighter of extraordinary combativeness. The hymn of Kengir remains one of the most beautiful hymns of revolt written in this century. But how is Kengir to be related to Matriona?"[65]

Solzhenitsyn realized how far he had gone, and for the American edition, he deplored terrorism while justifying it as the consequence of the forty-year terrorism of the state, that evil begets evil, that it may be necessary to resort to "evil ways even to escape it."[66] This is the most ancient excuse or argument, but, from within the traditions of Russian politics, it belonged unequivocally to the lineage of the radical intelligentsia, its revolution and terror. His account could have passed effortlessly into the pages of the *Revoliutsionnaia Rossiia*, or any other publication of the Socialist Revolutionary party before 1905, a party that carried its revolutionary action to the extremes of possibility, called upon its following never to let a single humiliation pass unanswered, gloried in terror and vengeful violence, and saw only cowardice and hypocrisy in the Bolsheviks. Bakunin and Chernov, Narodniks and the NarodnaiaVolia, the Socialist Revolutionary Party, its sundry offshoots, and even the Anarchists, all of them could have hailed him as a kindred spirit after reading the fifth part of *The Gulag Archipelago*. The Socialist Revolutionary Party asked how the people were to respond to the terrorism of the tsarist state, to beatings, lashings, shootings, and torture, the humiliation of women, or being ridden down by Cossacks, and the answer was that it should come "in burning letters etched into the consciousness of tsarist oprichniki."[67] The Social Democrats responded warmly to the faultlessly

revolutionary instincts of the terrorists while rejecting the action as wrong-headed, for which they earned the undying contempt of the Socialist Revolutionaries. Even Petr Struve, when launching his new liberal journal, *Osvobozhdenie*, in 1902, addressed primarily to a non-revolutionary public, employed the identical argument, that "Government terror begets revolutionary terror."[68] It routinely reported the dying declarations of heroic terrorists trudging to execution, and it happily noted that the Western press agreed that the "red terror is engendered by white terror."[69] The Socialist Revolutionaries were comfortable in their revolution; they assaulted the imperial state without equivocation or apology, and they fervently advocated every means of struggle, including individual terror.[70] Solzhenitsyn was just as absolute in his repudiation of the Soviet state; but given the origin, history, and legitimation processes of that state, he pursued alternatives to revolution through inner self-development and non-violence, while being drawn to revolution and even terror. Revolution and non-violence were tactics, not dogmas, and he pursued both equally. In the event, he proved himself an enthusiastic legatee of the most violent of Russian revolutionary traditions, which he also repudiated in his conservative *Vekhi* moment.

Unlike a conservative and like a good revolutionary, he sought to construct society anew, from its foundations, to undo error and to scrape off the carbuncles. He firmly rejected rationalist constructions of society as wholly artificial, and he stood with the Slavophiles and conservatives in general to demand that society must evolve from its own lived experience, that it cannot spring from the pages of a book. But he dismissed more than three centuries of Russian history, that is, the Petersburg or imperial period and the Soviet Union, as misbegotten deformities that had grown more grotesque by the decade; and he looked forward to wiping the slate clean and constructing a new Russia according his own theories of local democracy, Russian culture, and central political institutions. He claimed inspiration from the traditions of popular democratic Russian culture; but he was well aware and it was obvious to others that what he proposed lacked continuity with those political traditions which had atrophied in tsarist times and had been extinguished thereafter. He was prescribing innovation on a scale that was revolutionary for his epoch, the late Soviet one. He was, despite himself, constructing his new Russia from the pages of a book.

As soon as the Soviet Union collapsed he composed just such a book.[71] Here he lovingly outlined his vision of a new Russia, built upward from the local democracy of the zemstvo to the parliamentary institutions of the All

Zemstvo Assembly, drawing his inspiration and models from early Soviet democracy, the zemstvo reform of 1864, and Swiss and American local government which he had witnessed at first hand and come to admire. He argued or realized that after such a prolonged dictatorship it would be too severe a shock, indeed revolutionary, to institute the mass democracy that had spread over the West; and, like the early Soviet Marxist theorists prescribing a dictatorship of the proletariat until the utopian withering away of the state, he also propounded a benign authoritarianism for the transition to his perfect moral, just, and democratic political dispensation of the future. He redefined the contours of his new Russia, drew borders anew to lop off the non-Slavic parts, and left it open to the Ukrainians and Belorussians to choose to be in one state with Russia. He suggested that Kazakhstan be broken up and that the northern Russian districts be merged with Russia. It may require a species of black humour to compare Solzhenitsyn with Stalin, but identities are often found in the unlikeliest of places, as between Hitler's New Order for Europe and Schumann's plan for post-War co-operation between France and Germany, which culminated in the European Union.[72] Through some of the darkest chapters of *The First Circle*, the insomniac predator from the Caucasian ravines padded nightly through the halls of the Moscow Kremlin, tore into entire nations and peoples, and scattered their dismembered parts across the Eurasian landmass. Stalin was solving his political problems by inflicting punishment and destruction on a scale that may have defied the imagination until then; Solzhenitsyn was solving *his* problem of establishing justice and morality through the wholesale restructuring of nations and states across that same Eurasian plain, unaware of the enormous misery and dislocation of such vivisections and grafting. More than the specific proposals, the tone of his work betrayed the mind of the utopian dreamer exercising his option when history provided it, but to which he had also applied himself so intensely over the decades. Revolutionaries and Solzhenitsyn equally believed that the world could be remade, whatever its past history: that was the mood in which Lenin, who had endlessly dreamt of the Revolution and the socialist ideal, stepped up to the podium of the Second All Russian Congress of Soviets in the evening of 25 October 1917 to declare matter-of-factly, "Now we shall proceed to construct the socialist order."[73]

He resorted to one more revolutionary instrument against the Soviet Union and Marxism that may not have sat comfortably with his conservative ideal of moral self-perfection in a stable community and nation at peace with itself and with the world. After his forced emigration to the West in 1974 he repeatedly called for an end to the détente with the Soviet Union, accusing the West of being ensnared by Soviet intrigues in a pseudo-détente. He justified himself against charges of being a warmonger by claiming that he sought a genuine détente, not one that merely reinforced the Soviet tyranny. But his genuine détente, as he defined it, amounted to dismantling the Soviet system through curtailing the Soviet state's domestic powers of control, introducing parliamentary democracy, and putting an end to the international ideological contest; and all the changes were to be introduced by the Soviet Union alone, not by the USA.[74] He saw the Cold War for what it was, another world war and a continuation of the incomplete World War II; he berated the Western democracies for allying with and thereby reinforcing Stalin's totalitarianism to fight off Hitler's; and he demanded that they should have engaged in the serial destructions of totalitarianisms on their own, first the Nazi, then the Soviet Communist, and then on to the Chinese Communist.[75] He chased the dream of overthrowing the Soviet regime by international war as much as by domestic revolt and moral refusal to submit to the Great Lie. Like his revolutionary predecessor and antagonist Lenin, he refused to succumb to what appeared to him as putrid appeals to loyalty and patriotism, and he cannily exploited the Cold War as he headed westward with his one-way ticket in a "sealed aircraft."

He was converted to a conservative and religious view of life during his gulag days and he glorified Stolypin, but the most potent presence in his life, looming over him and shaping him psychologically and intellectually, was Lenin. Lenin was a major character in *The Red Wheel*, naturally enough, and Solzhenitsyn excerpted the Lenin portions of his opus to publish them as a separate book, *Lenin in Zürich*, long before the rest of the work was completed. The portrait of the monologic ideologue and a leader who shall not be crossed was sharply drawn and by no means laudatory, but it was not perverse and unsympathetic.[76] He seemed to enter so deeply into Lenin's mind and imagination, employing his usual technique of *erlebteRede* or "narrated monologue," of both third person narrative and direct speech,[77] that Vladimir Krasnov has proposed Lenin as a co-author.[78] His Lenin was "a fully realized, three-dimensional character with believable motives who bears moral responsibility for bringing much evil into the world."[79] As an iconoclast and prophet, so much did he "quiver with the intoxication of struggle" that his portrayal of Lenin was perhaps a means of releasing the immense violence dammed within. He was attracted to rebellion and dissent, as in the Old Believers, Stenka Razin and Pugachev, or the Populists

who sacrificed themselves in the nineteenth century, or for that matter Zwingli to whose statue in Zürich he bowed in homage; like Lenin he despised the liberals, as also Plekhanov, the "Marxist grand bourgeois" of Swiss villas.[80] He seemed to blame Lenin for the Revolution less than his evil genius Parvus, the Satan and the tempter, the Peter Verkhovenskii to Stavrogin. He wrote eleven chapters or 300 pages on Lenin against a mere five chapters on Stalin in *The First Circle*;[81] and his portrait of Lenin revealed respect and fascination for the founder of the Soviet state, not the hatred and contempt that he reserved for Stalin. He laboured hard to prove the continuity between Lenin and Stalin against those who claimed that Stalin had perverted Leninist ideals. He did so by assembling a vast array of the facts on the origins of terror during Lenin's reign. But as he did so, he diminished Stalin into an evil midget, a mere product of his times, incapable of being the demiurge of the epoch that was known by his name,[82] and Lenin emerged the incomparably greater man, the creator of the conditions that bred a Stalin. Michael Scammell summed it up well: "Solzhenitsyn's portrait of Lenin was highly personal, with autobiographical overtones. The picture of a lonely and unheeded prophet, self-centred, short-tempered, miserly with his time ('a single wasted hour made Lenin ill'), suspicious of others, virtually friendless, cut off from his homeland, and dreaming of leaving his wife for another woman seemed uncannily close to certain biographical details in the life of the author— breathtakingly so to those who knew him well—and there was much comment among Russian readers about Solzhenitsyn's psychological identification with his revolutionary predecessor and ideological opponent."[83] In 1976 he was asked by his BBC interviewer whether he admired Lenin; revealingly, he refused to answer. He also admitted to Nikita Struve: "Lenin is one of the central figures in my epic and a central figure in our history. I have been thinking of Lenin from the very moment I conceived the idea of my epic, for forty years already, and have collected every crumb and fragment that is known about him, absolutely everything. . ."[84] It was a compliment he did not pay to anybody else.

Conclusion

The three levels of personal integrity, domestic rebellion, and international war, albeit of the Cold War variety, belonged to a seamless strategy of inaugurating justice and morality in this world. Solzhenitsyn stressed personal development above all else owing to his personal experience of the gulag, but as much because the overwhelming might of the Soviet state made internal

self-perfection for long the only course of action open, not only to prisoners, but even to "free" Soviet citizens. Like his younger contemporary, Foucault, he ceaselessly reflected on the carceral condition of humanity, in prison and out of it, through the multiple levels of discourse, scientific discipline, and physical coercion; like him he investigated the manner in which this was peculiar to modernity, to the Soviet version of it in particular; and again like him he sensed that he was witness to the imminent end of this form of modernity and of the "modern episteme" that had invented man at the end of the eighteenth century.[85] Two wholly divergent experiences, the one of "saturation with freedom" in the West,[86] the other of being walled into the Gulag, yielded comparable reflections on servitude in modern times with intimations of the mortality of modernity, each according to his own experience of it.

The conservative preceptor's preaching of inner concentration was complemented by strategies of revolutionary politics and international warfare. His sustained anti-Soviet, anti-revolutionary, and anti-liberal Western rhetoric, has blinded us to the depth of his revolutionary message. Like a revolutionary of the eighteenth century, he sought to construct society from his own books of theory. In the tradition of the revolutionaries of Russia he gained "consciousness" in the *kruzhok* or study group of like minded seekers; he was inspired by the democracy of the early revolutionary soviets; he drew heavily on both critical realism and socialist realism to compose his two epic works; he endorsed revolutionary assault and terror as the only means of responding to the terror of the state; and he worked to overthrow the Soviet state initially through a new party organization when he was still a young army officer, and later, in his maturity, through the international Cold War.

Of the four ideologies on offer in the Russian nineteenth century, he discarded liberalism and Marxism and resurrected in different ways the two long submerged traditions of Slavophilism and Narodnichestvo without explicitly saying so. From the Slavophiles he drew on the dream of a pristine Russian culture and the democracy of robust local communities; and from the Narodniks he took the rising of the people against the state as a purely democratic commitment without the class analyses so beloved of liberals and Marxists. Those conservatively inclined would applaud his Slavophilism; those radically disposed and critical of the development excesses of industrialism and the omnipotence of the modern state would welcome his Narodnik leanings and fondly recall the eschatological inspiration of the people's final contest with the state. He projected himself as the prophet to a

post-Soviet and reduced Russia, when Russia shall not aspire to lead, where the centre of power in the world shall lie elsewhere, and Russia shall be delicately balanced between independence and subordination to that centre, in the manner of Europe. He presented it as an opportunity, not as a loss; as hope, not despair; as an aspiration, not reconciliation to a miserable fate, and the conflation of these multiple prescriptions may set the course for a Russia writhing to slough off her imperial and Soviet skin. He remained a revolutionary who detested the idea of revolution; he yearned to be a conservative in a Soviet world which he did not wish to conserve; he dreamt of his ideal Russia of the future which he must build from scratch like a revolutionary; and his iconoclasm could be accommodated, only in the plural world of liberal capitalism which he despised for its addiction to both excess and compromise. He repudiated the three great competitive ideological systems of the twentieth century, communist, fascist, and liberal capitalist as he prefigured the twenty-first century, the post-Soviet epoch, and perhaps postmodernism, with all their maddening uncertainties; and he wandered a lonely prophet and artist whose mixed bag of offerings attracted acolytes, provoked outrage, and exasperated ardent admirers.

NOTES

1. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Nobelevskaia Lektsiia*, 1972, section 1, available in English, "Nobel Lecture in Literature, 1970", (http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/1970/solzhenitsyn-lecture.html) accessed 8 November 2008. Only the text was presented to the Swedish Academy, it was not read out as Solzhenitsyn had not been permitted to leave the USSR; Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *Letter to Soviet Leaders*, translated by Hilary Sternberg, Index on Censorship, London, 1974, p. 12; Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *A World Split Apart*, Address at Harvard Class Day Afternoon Exercises, 8 June 1978; Michael Confino, "Solzhenitsyn, the West, and the New Russian Nationalism," *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 26, No. 3/4, The Impact of Western Nationalisms: Essays Dedicated to Walter Z. Laqueur on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday, (Sept., 1991), pp. 611-636, here pp. 612-614.

2. J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Lord of the Rings* (Great Britain: Harper Collins, 1994), book 6, chapter 3.

3. *Nobelevskaia Lektsiia*; Wayne Dowler, "Echoes of Pochvennichestvo in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 34, No. 1, (Mar., 1975), pp. 109-122, here pp. 119-121.

4. The following sections on self-limitation and Russia for Russians are summarized from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Russian Question at the End of the 20ᵗʰ Century*, translated from the Russian by Yermolai Solzhenitsyn (London: The Harvill Press, 1995).

5. Solzhenitsyn, *The Mortal Danger. How Misconceptions about Russia imperil America*, translated from the Russian by Michael

6. Daniel J. Mahoney, *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: The Ascent from Ideology* (London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), p. 3.

7. Solzhenitsyn, *The Mortal Danger*.

8. Confino, "Solzhenitsyn," p. 614, citing *Vestnik russkogo khristianskogo dvizheniia*, 111 (1974), 69.

9. As in his *Letter to Soviet Leaders*.

10. Vladislav Krasnov, "Wrestling with Lev Tolstoi: War, Peace, and Revolution in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's New Avgust Chetyrnadtsatogo", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Winter, 1986), pp. 707-719, here pp. 711-713, 719.

11. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Krasnoe koleso. Povestvovanie v otmerennykh srokakh*, uzel 1, *Avgust Chetyrnadtsatogo*, kniga 2, *Sobranie Sochinenii*, vol. 8 (Moskva: Vremia, 2006), p. 104.

12. Mahoney, *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 90-92.

13. Boris Souvarine, "Soljènitsyne et Lènine", *Est & Ouest*, 1-15 April 1976, 28e annèe, no. 570, pp. 1-16.

14. I. V. Kireevskii, "O neobkhodimosti i vozmozhnosti novykh nachal dlia filosofii" (1856), *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I. V. Kireevskago v dvukh tomakh*, ed. M. Gershenszon, vol. 1, pp. 222-264, here p. 242.

15. Interview to Janis Sapiets of the BBC Russian Service in 1974, letter to the *Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Devizheniia*, no. 116, 1975, and again in a BBC interview of 1976, cited in Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 899, 920-921, and 935 respectively.

16. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Nobel Lecture in Literature, 1970", November 2008, section 5.

17. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Arkhipelag Gulag 1918-1956. Opyt khudozhestvennaia issledovaniia* (Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo "U-Faktoriia", 2006), part IV, p. 500, translations from Alexander Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago 1918-1956. An Experiment in Literary Investigation*, [vol. 2], translated from the Russian by Thomas P. Whitney (London: Collins & Harvill Press, 1975), part IV, p. 615; Edward J. Ericson Jr; Alexis Klimoff, *The Soul and the Barbed Wire. An Introduction to Solzhenitsyn* (Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books, Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2008), pp. 186-187; Mahoney, pp. 50-51, 105-106.

18. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983), p. 31 and passim.

19. David G. Rowley, "Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and Russian Nationalism", *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (Jul., 1997), pp. 321-337.

20. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Rebuilding Russia. Reflections and Tentative Proposals*, translated and annotated by Alexis Klimoff (New York: Ferrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 1991) pp. 63-82, esp. p. 76.

21. Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "As Breathing and Consciousness Return," in Alexander Solzhenitsyn et al, *From Under the Rubble* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1975, pp. 3-25, here, p. 23; see also Solzhenitsyn, *Letter to Soviet Leaders*, p. 52.

22. B. N. Chicherin, *Obshchee gosudarstvennoe pravo* (Moskva: iz-vo "Zertsalo", 2006, orig. edn 1894), pp. 173-179.

23. S. M. Brodovich, *Sovetskoe izbiratel'noe pravo* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1925, p. 16.

24. N. Krupskaia, *Konstituttsiia rossiiskoi sotsialisticheskoi federativnoi sovetskoi respubliki* (Moscow: izdatel'stvo VTsIK, 1918), pp. 13-14.

25. M. Vladimirskii, *Organizatsiia sovetskoi vlasti na mestakh* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1921), pp. 32-36; Brodovich, pp. 61-71; Prof. G. S. Gurvich, *Osnovy sovetskoi konstitutsii*, 5ᵗʰ edn (Moskva-Leningrad, 1926), pp. 105-108; G. S. Mikhailov, *Mestnoe sovetskoe upravlenie. Konspekt i materialy. Uchebnoe posobie dlia komvuzov* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo kommunisticheskogo universiteta im. Ia. M. Sverdlova, 1927), pp. 64-65;

26. M. A. Reisner, *Osnovy sovetskoi konstitutsii* pp. 184-187; Gurvich's critique of Reisner's proposals in Prof. G. S. Gurvich, *Istoriia Sovetskoi konstitutsii* (Moskva: Izdanie Sotsialisticheskoi Akademii, 1923), pp. 28-32, separate pagination

27. Solzhenitsyn, *Rebuilding Russia*, p. 85.

28. Michael Scammell's words, see Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn*, p. 579.

29. Solzhenitsyn, *Letter*, 53.

30. Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 666-667.

31. Leon Trotsky, *1905* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), pp 382-83, 384; *Obvinitel'nyi Akt o chlenakh soobshchestva prisvoivshiiusia sebe naimenovanie: S.Peterburgskii obshche-gorodskoi 'Sovet rabochinkh deputatov', s predisloviem L. M.* (S. Peterburg, 1906).

32. Karl Kautskii [Kautsky], "*Diktatura proletariata*", in Karl Kautskii, *Diktatura Proletariata. Ot demokratii k gosudarstvennomu rabstvu. Bol'shevizm v tupike*, [orig. German edn 1918, Russian trans. 1919] (Moskva: AOZT, "Antidor", 2002), pp. 74-75; Bruno Naarden, *Socialist Europe and Revolutionary Russia: Perception and Prejudice, 1848-1923* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992).

33. Iu. O. Martov, *Mirovoi Bol'shevizm* (Berlin: "Iskra", 1923), pp. 43-4.

34. Vladimir N. Brovkin, *The Mensheviks after October. Socialist Opposition and the Rise of the Bolshevik Dictatorship*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell Univ. Press), 1987, chapter 5.

35. Vladimir N. Brovkin, *Behind the Front Lines of the Civil War. Political Parties and Social Movements in Russia, 1918 – 1922* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1994), chapter 7.

36. Ericson Jr; Alexis Klimoff, pp. 151-152.

37. Martin Malia, "A War on Two Fronts: Solzhenitsyn and the Gulag Archipelago", *Russian Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Jan., 1977), pp. 46-63, here p. 53.

38. Solzhenitsyn, *Avgust Chetyrnadtsatogo*, kniga 2, *Sobranie Sochinenii*, vol. 8 (Moskva: Vremia, 2006), chapter 65 especially on Stolypin's character and programme, quotes on pp. 272, 225, 274, translations from Solzhenitsyn, *The Red Wheel*, pp. 614, 573, and 616 respectively.

39. I have followed the analysis in Glenn Allen Davis, "Myth, History, and Solûenicyn's Krasnoe Koleso: Avgust ùetyrnadcatogo", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (Spring, 1992), pp. 84-100, and on socialist realism, Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981) and Luellen Lucid, "Solzhenitsyn's Rhetorical Revolution," *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 23, No. 4, (Dec., 1977), pp. 498-517.

40. Ericson Jr; Klimoff, pp. 202-203; Scammell, *Solzhenitsyn*, p. 769. Father Schmemann was Dean of the St Vladimir Orthodox Theological Seminary in New York State and a regular broadcaster on religious issues to the Soviet Union over Radio Liberty.

41. Edward E. Ericson Jr, "Solzhenitsyn, Russell Kirk, and the Moral Imagination," *Modern Age*, vol. 47, no. 1, Winter 2005, pp. 8-18, especially pp. 14-15.

42. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, parts V-VII, [or vol 3] pp. 79-81, 344.

43. K. S. Aksakov, "Ob osnovnykh nachalakh russkoi istorii" (1849), in K. S. Aksakov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Konstantina Sergeevicha Aksakova*, ed. I. S. Aksakov, vol. 1 (Moscow: Tipografiia P. Bakhmeteva, 1861), pp. 1-16 composed in two sections, with the second titled "O tom zhe"; Confino, "Solzhenitsyn," pp. 611-636, here p. 618.

44. Quoted in Confino, "Solzhenitsyn, the West, and the New Russian Nationalism," p. 619.

45. He experienced this personally in the Marfino sharashka through his uninhibited discussions with his friends Dmitrii Panin and Lev Kopelev, see Scammell, pp. 238, 497-498.

46. Svitlana Kobets, "The Subtext of Christian Asceticism in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 4, (Winter, 1998), pp. 661-676, here p. 666.

47. See chapter 1 of Part IV, "Voskhozhdenie" ["The Ascent"] in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *Arkhipelag Gulag 1918-1956. Opyt khudozhestvennaia issledovaniia* (Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo "U-Faktoriia", 2006); David M. Halperin, "Continuities in Solzhenitsyn's Ethical Thought", in John B. Dunlop et al, eds, *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials*, pp. 267-283; Georges Nivat, "Solzhenitsyn's Different *Circles*: An Interpretive Essay", in John B. Dunlop, Richard S. Haugh, Michael Nicholson, eds, *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn: Critical Essays and Documentary Materials* (Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1985), pp. 211-228; Gary Kern, "Solzhenitsyn's Portrait of Stalin", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1, (Mar., 1974), pp. 1-22; Susan Layton, "The Mind of the Tyrant: Tolstoj's Nicholas and Solûenicyn's Stalin", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 23, No. 4, (Winter, 1979), pp. 479-490, here pp. 483-485; Robert Boyers, *Atrocity and Amnesia: The Political Novel Since 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 104-105. Even soldiers of the victorious Red Army were prisoners to their fears and prejudices of the archetypical "Germany" they looted and raped in their race to Berlin in 1945, see Kenneth N. Brostrom, "Prussian Nights: A Poetic Parable for Our Time", in Dunlop et al. eds, *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 229-242, here p. 232.

48. Nivat, *Soljènitsyne*, pp. 50-51; Edward E. Ericson Jr, "Solzhenitsyn, Russell Kirk, and the Moral Imagination," *Modern Age*, vol. 47, no. 1, Winter 2005, pp. 8-18, here p. 15.

49. Helen Muchnic, "Solzhenitsyn's 'The First Circle'", *Russian Review*, Vol. 29, No. 2, (Apr., 1970), pp. 154-166; Daniel J. Mahoney, "The Moral Witness of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn," *First Things*, 2009 pp. 44-48; David M. Halperin, "Solzhenitsyn, Epicurus, and the Ethics of Stalinism", *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 7, No. 3, (Spring, 1981), pp. 475-497.

50. Daniel S. Goldberg, "Exilic Effects of Pain and Illness in Solzhenitsyn's *Cancer Ward*: How Sharpening the Moral Imagination Can Facilitate Repatriation," *Journal of Medical Humanities*, vol. 30 (2009), pp. 29-42.

51. David A. Sloane, "Cancer Ward Revisited: Analogical Models and the Theme of Reassessment", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 26, No. 4, (Winter, 1982), pp. 403-418; Diana Lewis Burgin, "The Fate of Modern Man. An Examination of Ideas of Fate, Justice and Happiness in Solzhenitsyn's Cancer

Ward," *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, (Apr., 1974), pp. 260-271; Jeffrey Meyers, "Cancer Ward and the Literature of Disease", *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 29, No. 1, (Spring, 1983), pp. 54-68, esp. pp. 64-66; see also Deming Brown, "Cancer Ward and the First Circle", *Slavic Review*, vol. 28, no. 2, June 1969, pp. 304-31.

52. Marcia A. Morris, *Saints and Revolutionaries: The Ascetic Hero in Russian Literature*, (Albany: State University of New York Press , 1993), ch. 6-7.

53. Glenn Allen Davis, "Myth, History, and Solûenicyn's Krasnoe Koleso: Avgust ûetyrnadcatogo", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 1, (Spring, 1992), pp. 84-100

54. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, parts V-VII, [or vol 3] part V, ch. 12; for the convergence of some of Trotsky's and Solzhenitsyn's views on Stalinism, see Marvin Mudrick, "Solzhenitsyn versus the Last Revolutionary", *The Hudson Review*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (Summer, 1981), pp. 195-217.

55. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago* parts V-VII, [or vol 3] pp. 234-235, and generally ch.10, the Kengir rising in part V, ch. 12.

56. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, p. 236.

57. Ibid., p. 238.

58. Ibid., p. 241.

59. Steven A. Barnes, " 'In a Manner Befitting Soviet Citizens' ": An Uprising in the Post-Stalin Gulag," *Slavic Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, (Winter, 2005), pp. 823-850, here p. 831.

60. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, pp. 242-243.

61. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, pp. 276-331; Anne Applebaum, *Gulag: A History* (New York: Random House, Anchor Books edn, 2004; orig. edn, Doubleday 2003), ch. 24, pp. 484-505, esp. 495-505, follows Solzhenitsyn closely, but suggests a figure of only 500 dead, p. 504.

62. Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, p. 248, at the end of part V, ch. 10; Liudmila Saraskina, *Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn* (Moskva: Molodaia Gvardiia, 2008) pp. 370-374.

63. Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas", in idem., *Visions of Politics*, vol. 1: *Regarding Method* (Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 57-89, here, pp. 67-72; James Tully, "The pen is a mighty sword: Quentin Skinner's analysis of politics," in Tully, James, ed, *Meaning and Context. Quentin Skinner and His Critics* (UK: Polity Press, 1988), pp. 7-25, here pp. 17-18, 21-24.

64. Susan Richards, "*The Gulag Archipelago* as 'Literary Documentary'", in Dunlop et al, eds, *Solzhenitsyn:* pp. 145-163, here pp. 156-158.

65. Georges Nivat, *SoljÈnitsyne*, pp. 36, 105.

66. Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn, "Preface to the English Translation," in Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, pp. xi-xii.

67. "Kak otvechat' na pravitel'stvenyia zverstva", in *Revoliutsionnaia Rossiia*, No. 12, Oct. 1902, pp. 1-3; for other articles in the same journal in this vein, see "Terroristicheskii

element v nashei programme", no. 7, June 1902, pp. 2-5, "Terror i massovoe dvizhenie", no. 24, 15 May 1903, "Eshche o kritikakh terroristicheskoi taktike", no. 26, 15 June 1903, and the numerous reports of conflicts with the police.

68. Petr Struve, "Ot redaktora", *Osvobozhdenie* No. 1, Stuttgart, 18 June (1 July) 1902, pp. 1-7, here p. 5.

69. *Osvobozhdenie* No. 3, Stuttagrt, 19 July (1 Aug) 1902, p. 46.

70. Manfred Hildermeier, *Die Sozialrevoliutionäre Partei Rulands. Agrarsozialismus und Modernisierung im Zarenreich (1900-1914)*, (Kïln, Wien: Bohlau Verlag, 1978), pp. 58-68, 358-394;

71. Solzhenitsyn, *Rebuilding Russia*.

72. Mark Mazower, *Dark Continent. Europe's Twentieth Century* (New York: Vintage Books edn, 2000, 487 pp.; orig edn UK, Allen Lane, Penguin Press, 1998), pp. 183-191.

73. Leon Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution* (London: Sphere Books, 1967) vol. 3, pp. 300-301.

74. Address to AFL-CIO, 30 June 1975, Washington D. C., in *Solzhenitsyn: The Voice of Freedom* (Washington D. C.: AFL-CIO, Publication No. 152, 1975), pp. 19-20; John B. Dunlop, "Solzhenitsyn's Reception in the United States", in Dunlop et al, eds, *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 24-55, here pp. 27-30, 46; Scammell, pp. 875, 912-915, 935.

75. Address to AFL-CIO, 30 June 1975, Washington D. C., pp. 10-11.

76. Nivat, *Soljénitsyne*, pp. 80-81.

77. Ericson Jr; Klimoff, pp. 84, 118.

78. Krasnov, "Wrestling with Lev Tolstoi,"p. 717; echoing this, Roger Boylan, the American novelist, has this to say, "Critical of Lenin as the architect of what became Stalinism, he nevertheless narrates the novel largely from Lenin's point of view, an 'I' for an 'I', and not entirely unsympathetically," Roger Boylan, "Fateful Gates. The Lives of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn," *Boston Review*, vol. 34, no. 2, March-April 2009, pp. 34-38.

79. Ericson Jr; Klimoff, p. 119.

80. Nivat, *SoljÈnitsyne*, pp. 105, 157, 168-169.

81. Four chapters in the 87 chapter edition.

82. Susan Richards, "*The Gulag Archipelago* as 'Literary Documentary'", in Dunlop et al, eds, *Solzhenitsyn* pp. 145-163, here p. 145.

83. Scammell, p. 943.

84. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "An Interview on Literary Themes with Nikita Struve, March 1976", in Dunlop et al, eds, *Solzhenitsyn*, pp. 298-328, here p. 309.

85. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things. Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1973, Translation of the French *Les Mots et les Choses*, Editions Gallimard, 1966), pp. 386-387.

86. His words were "saturated with boundless freedom", in reference to Western terrorists of the 1970s. See Solzhenitsyn, "Preface to the English Translation," in Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, vol. 3, pp. xi-xii.

Imperial Player: Richard Burton in Sindh

INDIRA GHOSE

The Victorian traveller Sir Richard Burton (1821-90) became famous for his sensational narrative of a journey to Mecca in disguise in 1853, published in 1855-6. Less well-known is Burton's account of his travels in Sindh, in present-day Pakistan, from 1844 to 1849.[1] Before embarking on his career as one of the leading explorers and adventurers in the nineteenth century, Burton was stationed in Gujarat as an officer in the Indian Army. It was here that his voracious appetite for Oriental languages and Oriental knowledge was whetted.[2] Burton was transferred from Gujarat to the Indian Survey in Sindh, where he came to the attention of Sir Charles Napier (1809-54), who had conquered the province of Sindh in 1843. Napier required surveillance reports about the morale among the population. It was during the five years he spent in Sindh that Burton first tried his hand at impersonating natives, working as an undercover agent in disguise.[3]

Burton's book *Scinde; or, The Unhappy Valley* was published in two volumes by Richard Bentley in 1851. As was customary in nineteenth-century travel writing, it appeared simultaneously with a more ethnographic account, *Sindh and The Races that Inhabit the Valley of the Indus; with Notices of the Topography and History of the Province*, published by William H. Allen & Co. What makes Burton's travel narrative both more interesting and more tantalizing than *A Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah* (published in 1855-6) is the fact that nowhere did Burton refer to his secret missions. Whereas he openly advertised his pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina as the first instance of a European to penetrate the sacred cities of Islam incognito, his travel account of Sindh is silent about his undercover activities in the guise of a native. It was only in the Postscript appended to his next book, *Falconry in the Valley of the Indus* (1852), that Burton described his forays into native life in the persona of a half-Arab, half-Persian trader. 'The

European official in India seldom, if ever, sees anything in its real light, so dense is the veil which the fearfulness, the duplicity, the prejudice and the superstitions of the natives hang before his eyes,' he remarked, referring obliquely to his official mission to gain intelligence (65). Only years later, in the Terminal Essay of his ten-volume translation of the *Arabian Nights*, which was circulated to private subscribers in 1885, did he explicitly mention his intelligence work (Brodie 1967, p. 66). It was Lady Isabel Burton (1831-96), his wife, who revealed his double life as a spy in the biography about her husband that she published after his death.[4]

The most striking feature of *Scinde; or, the Unhappy Valley* is the boisterous sense of humour that suffuses the text. The whole book is an extended joke at the expense of the addressee, one John Bull–clearly a parody of the average armchair reader Burton has in mind. John Bull is presented as a 'fat, old, testy, but very unbloodthirsty *papa de famille*,' grabbing the opportunity to travel as long as Mrs. Bull permits it and 'when there is no squabble. . . in your happy home, – no murders in the neighbourhood to engross your attention' (vol. 1, pp. 4; 2). Large swathes of the narrative are written in the form of direct address to John Bull, serving to characterize him as a grouchy philistine, mainly concerned with securing his animal comforts while travelling. Bull's breath-taking ignorance about the world outside his home is wickedly sent up, as in the following excerpt from his diary, when he notes, 'All to be seen was a troop of beggars, calling themselves "Fukyers," who looked very surly before I gave them a few coppers'(vol. 1, pp. 179-80).

Burton is not above taking a joke himself, however. The narrator is presented as a tourist guide fond of striking a pompous attitude:

I elevated myself, if you recollect, upon my stirrups, extended my right arm, and with the impressive expression of countenance with which an effective cicerone standing at the

Indira Ghose is Professor of English at the University of Fribourg, Switzerland

Camaldoli pronounces the apophthegm, "Vedi Napoli e poi muori," I looked at you and exclaimed –

"There, Mr. Bull, lies the far-famed, the classic Indus!" (vol. 1, p. 185)

This Romantic pose is immediately deflated by John Bull, who complains that the river 'wasn't broader than the Thames at Black'all', apart from which it was 'still as a mill-pond, foul as a London sewer, shallow, flat-banked, full of sand islets, – briefly, an ugly sight' (vol. 1, p. 186). The narrator is portrayed as tiresomely over-officious, much to the disgust of the easy-going John Bull, who notes in his diary, 'I am sick of them, but that fellow B. will insist upon my visiting all the sights' (vol. 1, p. 179). After indulging in a long diatribe against the stinginess of the government towards army subalterns, the narrator cannot resist a wry joke at his own expense: 'Were he that chatteth with you Lt.-Gen. Sir R. Burton, G.C.B., instead of being a small lieutenant, then might he have some hope of an occasional cheer from you, to enliven his squabble with a brother veteran' (vol. 1, pp. 93-4). The narrator expends copious advice on how to ride a camel, only to relate the hilarious tale of his own first ride:

After considerable difficulty in getting on the roaring, yelling beast, it became palpably necessary to draw my sword and prick his nose each time it crept round disagreeably near my boot. Finding his efforts to bite me unavailing, he changed tactics, and made a point of dashing under every low thorn tree, as close to the trunk as possible, in the hope of rubbing his rider off.... At last he settled upon the plan of running away; arched his long neck till his head was almost in contact with mine, and in this position indulged in a canter, which felt exactly like the pace of a horse taking a five-barred gate every second stride....

I did not mount that animal again. (vol. 1, p. 95-6)

The book brims over with tomfoolery and youthful exuberance. The strain of facetiousness spills into the scholarly apparatus of the text. In one footnote Burton gives the original Sindhi term for 'stranger' noting tongue-in-cheek that it was 'a word with a plurality of signification, or, rather, none at all in particular' (vol. 1, p. 167). In another, he refers to the five products of the cow deemed sacred by Hindus, adding, 'if you want to know what they are, consult a Hindostanee dictionary' (vol. 2, p. 288). He even throws in a sly in-joke about his spy status. While recounting an ancient legend, he describes how a caliph had sent a confidential agent, a Hakim, into Sindh, to report on the state of affairs. The spy returned, 'saying that the water was black, the fruit sour and poisonous, the ground stony, and the earth saline.' In a footnote Burton remarks, 'That Hakim must have been a most discerning traveller; his brief account of Scinde and Scindians is a perfect specimen of pregnant truth' (vol. 1, p. 125). Even a reader ignorant of the background of his travels would not have failed to catch the ironically self-congratulatory reference to Burton's own travel narrative.

On the other hand, Burton cannot resist showing off his expertise in things Oriental whenever he can. The narrator lavishes attention on points of Oriental etiquette, coaching John Bull to follow certain immutable rules:

Whenever anything is said to you, you will be pleased gravely to stroke your beard, with the right hand for goodness' sake! frown a little, roll your head much with a heavy ferocious roll, and ejaculate syllable by syllable, Alhamdu I'illah, "Praise to the Lord," – *àpropos de rien*. When a man shows you any thing admirable, such as his horse or his son, you will perform the same pantomime, and change your words to Mashallah, or "What the Lord pleases,". . . Whatever action you undertake, such as rising from your seat or sitting down, calling for your pipe or dismissing its bearer, beginning or ending dinner, in fact, on all active occasions, you must not forget to pronounce Bismillah, "In the name of the Lord," with as much pomposity as you can infuse into your utterance. By this means you will be considered a grave and reverend personage. . . (vol. 2, pp. 10-11)

The text offers a wealth of information on the myths, manners and mores of the people of Sindh–backed up by an even more impressive display of erudition in the purely ethnographic companion volume to the book. Passages of boisterous playfulness are interspersed with lengthy disquisitions on the history and geographic features of the region, bristling with footnotes that demonstrate Burton's learning and formidable linguistic skills. Despite the undercurrent of self-mockery, the narrator is clearly anxious to convey the impression of a scholar who has accumulated a hoard of Oriental wisdom. He is fond of correcting other travellers in the region, such as his predecessor in the Great Game, Alexander Burnes.[5] He flaunts his insight into typical aspects of Sindhian life, ranging from the use of bhang or hashish – 'I have often taken the drug' (vol. 1, p. 262) – to intimate details of the toilette of Sindhian women. The climax of the narrative is an account of a visit to a Baluchi chief, Amir Ibrahim Khan. He was a ruler who had collaborated with the British and thus retained a measure of political power. Here Burton displays his skill in political manoeuvring, triumphantly demonstrating British superiority in the game of one-upmanship he plays with the wily native chief: 'Ibrahim Khan has quietly but decidedly assumed the very, very great man. He expects that we should, according to custom, await

his signal for ending the visit. Therefore we will do nothing of the kind, and he will respect us much the more' (vol. 2, p. 154-5).

For all his enthusiasm about amassing information on Oriental life, it is clear that Burton does not like Sindh. The first glimpse the traveller gets of the landscape is unprepossessing: 'a mere line of low coast, sandy as a Scotchman's whiskers – a glaring waste, with visible as well as palpable heat playing over its dirty yellow surface!' (vol. 1, p. 21). The main impression of the country one is left with by the book is of heat and sand. The port of Karachi launches an assault on all one's senses: 'The perpetual tomtoming and squeaking of native music, mingle with the roaring, bawling voices of the inhabitants, the barkings and bayings of the stranger-hating curs,. . . . The dark narrow alleys through which nothing bulkier than a jackass can pass with ease, boast no common sewer. . .' (vol. 1, p. 29). The text conflates native inhabitants and animal scavengers to offer a cocktail of cacophany, nauseous smells and murky sights. While admitting that the Sindhians have been subjected to wave after wave of political conquest, Burton nevertheless regards them as a degenerate race of slaves, whose natural vices are 'inertness and cowardice, lying and gasconading' [boasting] (vol. 1, vol. 267). Their main activities consist in getting drunk and consuming hashish. At this point in his career, Burton is yet to find the chivalrous Oriental race that he so admires and with whom he identifies – the Bedouin in the deserts of Arabia.

Sindh was, of course, a newly conquered province. The British were faced with hostility and the threat of insurgency wherever they went. 'Everything in this place seems to hate us', Burton remarks (vol. 2, p. 221). He expatiates at length upon his political views for managing the unruly population, strongly advocating military rule as the only form of governance suitable to Orientals. The lenient approach taken by the British will only lead to contempt for the new rulers, he argues. A case in point are the punishments meted out to criminals. The Asians are accustomed to barbaric punishments. By contrast, the indulgent British legal system can only serve to inspire disrespect. As he points out scathingly: 'The Affghan is detected stealing; he expects to have his right hand chopped off: we lodge him for a few months, in what he considers a luxurious retreat, where he can eat, drink, doze, smoke his pipe, and abuse the Frank [European] in plenary animal satisfaction' (vol. 2, p. 69).

Prior to 1857, in pre-'Mutiny' Britain, where the belief in the benevolence of British rule was still strong, it was Burton's ideas on Indian policy that provoked a reprimand in the press. The reviewer of the *Athenaeum* rapped him over the knuckles for harbouring 'very

extreme opinions' and warned him not to disregard 'those well-established rules of moderation which no one can transgress with impunity' (1851, p. 1111). In response Burton, who loved nothing more than a good mud-slinging match, set out enthusiastically to expose the *ignorance crasse* which besets the mind of the home-reader and his oracle the critic.' His main argument was that the Eastern mind itself was 'always in extremes' and incapable of moderation. (1852, pp. 59; 70). To bolster his authority on the Orient he revealed how he had acquired his wisdom–through impersonating natives. In the Postscript to his next book, a volume on the art of falconry, which also drew on his experiences at Sindh, he described the double life he had led:

With hair falling upon his shoulders, a long beard, face and hands, arms and feet, stained with a thin coat of henna, Mirza Abdullah of Bushire [in Persia] – your humble servant, gentle reader – set out upon many and many a trip. He was a Bazzaz, a vender of fine linen, calicoes and muslin; – such chapmen are sometimes admitted to display their wares even in the sacred harem by "fast" and fashionable dames; – and he had a little pack of *bijouterie* and *virtù* reserved for emergencies. . . . Thus he could walk into most mens̄ houses quite without ceremony; even if the master dreamed of kicking him out, the mistress was sure to oppose such measure with might and main. He secured numberless invitations, was proposed to by several papas, and won, or had to think he won, a few hearts; . . . (1852, p. 66)

Burton certainly succeeds in his aim of proving that he penetrated Sindhian culture to an extent no one had done before him. Strangely, however, the main insight he delivers is not that of the Eastern mind, marked by immoderation. Instead, his writing reveals the extraordinary pleasure he gained from slipping into native culture in disguise. This ploy even enabled him to insinuate himself into a harem, a feat that had been rarely, if ever, achieved by male travellers and accordingly had acquired the status of a hoary Western fantasy. His self-revelation served as an authorising strategy for the ethnographic information he had so painstakingly accumulated. But it does more – it reveals Burton's fascination with play-acting.

The next review in the *Athenaeum* was far nastier in tone. The reviewer sneers:

That a good many adventures may be met with, and a good deal of knowledge of a certain kind obtained by an European official in India, who thinks it worth while to assume an equivocal disguise, imitate native feats of sharp practice, and spend months in succession in the houses of female busy bodys, we can also easily understand. But we *cannot* understand how it should happen that the cultivation of habits so wholly irregular should be the best possible discipline for keeping the judgment and the taste in perfect order. . . (1852, p. 766)

What the reviewer implies is not that Burton has gone native and actually crossed the boundary to adopt another culture – it is Burton's penchant for native slumming, as it were, that finds his disapproval. Burton has overstepped class lines to delve into a low-life world of native wheeling and dealing and cloying domestic intimacy. In indulging his pleasure in cultural masquerade, he displays above all a lack of self-control. And the reviewer goes on to hint darkly, 'Tell me who you live with, and I will tell you what you are' (ibid.). What this comment is infused with is a strain of antitheatrical thought that goes back to Plato – the belief that performing a role spills over and contaminates the player. In other words: you become what you act.

This was not the first time that Burton would find himself accused of cultivating the wrong friends. As a young subaltern he was often called "White Nigger" for spending so much time in the company of his *munshis*, native scholars who taught him the languages and the social rules which he sought to acquire (Isabel Burton 1893, p. 144). More dramatic was the episode that put paid to his career in India. Apparently one of the missions assigned to him by Napier was to investigate the boy brothels in Sindh. The confidential report he filed for the General contained explicit details on pederastic practices which would have been deeply shocking to strait-laced Victorian sensibilities. In the Terminal Essay of his *Arabian Nights* Burton claimed that when the report fell into the wrong hands, it was used by his enemies against him with the insinuation that it clearly took one to know one. Despite the dogged persistence of Burtonophiles, the report has never been discovered (Brodie 1967, pp. 69; 347). Nevertheless, it it is apparent that despite his intelligence and brilliant linguistic skills, Burtons official career never got off the ground. All his life he was an embarrassment for his diverse employers. He never rose to a high rank, either as a soldier or as a consul. Even the Royal Geographic Society, which financed his expedition to the sources of the Nile and awarded him a gold medal, never entrusted him with another scheme of exploration.[6] In a review of Burton's life in the *Edinburgh Review*, the author attributes Burton's blighted career to his unrestrained license' and his want of control, rooted in adolescent high spirits.[7]

Burton's fondness for dressing up as a native is manifestly not a sign of 'going native', of excessive empathy with other cultures. On the contrary, what his skill in impersonating natives demonstrates is the cultural superiority of the British. Native identity can be appropriated at will for the purposes of ferreting out the secrets of the colonized. In the case of Burton, cultural masquerade is a strategy to bolster colonial power (Roy 1998). What is remarkable, however, is the sheer excess of theatricality that Burton reveals. Perhaps the most striking thing about Burton is his delight in histrionics. Take, for instance, the following passage, where Burton describes how he presents himself as an Englishman during the day and an Oriental at night:

> The timid villagers collected in crowds to see a kind of Frank in a sort of Oriental dress, riding spear in hand, and pistols in holsters, towards the little encampment pitched near their settlements. But regularly every evening on the line of march the Mirza issued from his tent and wandered amongst them, collecting much information and dealing out more concerning an ideal master, – the Feringhee [foreigner] supposed to be sitting in state amongst the Moonshees, the Scribes, the servants, the wheels, the chains, the telescopes and the other magical implements in which the camp abounded. When travelling, the Mirza became this mysterious person's factotum. . . (1852, p. 67)

What is the most noteworthy aspect about this passage is the exorbitant pleasure in performance it displays. One is left with the suspicion that Burton delights in theatricality for its own sake. As Mirza, Burton does collect information, but clearly gains more pleasure from play-acting. In a dizzying theatrical flourish, we are presented with Burton acting at least two roles – that of the sahib as well as that of the native. Burton presents the sahib as performer, acting a role in much the same way as the native character Burton impersonates. The authentic Englishman is as much as a spectacle as the fraudulent native, even if here he is mainly created in the imagination of the awe-struck audience.

Significantly, Burton does not aim for discretion in his roles as a native. Instead, he opts for flamboyantly conspicuous disguises, which cannot fail to attract attention. He is just enjoying himself too much to rein in his theatrical abilities in the interest of personal safety. Indeed, it is his exhibitionistic pleasure in make-believe rather than the fact that he adopts native disguise that marks him out as an outsider in the society he lived in. In many ways Burton is a throwback to an earlier age, the Romantic period with its affinity for the Orient and its pleasure in striking theatrical poses – as exemplified by the iconic figure of Byron. In colonial India the generation of East India Company officials at the turn of the eighteenth century were marked by an avid interest in Oriental lore. Administrator-scholars such as Sir William Jones spent hours every day poring over Persian or Sanskrit writings in the company of their *munshis*. The eighteenth-century British in India were often depicted in Indian clothes, smoking a hookah, or were known to have Indian wives or mistresses, like Sir Charles Metcalfe or Sir David Ochterlony, Resident at Delhi. Ochterlony

was famous for his daily constitutional on elephant back in the company of his thirteen wives (Moorhouse 1983, p. 185). But there was no question of these colonial officials endangering the prestige of British rule by their incursions into Indian culture. Indeed, their cultural appropriation only served to shore up the omniscience of the rulers. During the 1840s – the decade that Burton spent in India – colonial society was undergoing a profound change. In the autobiographical fragment that Burton wrote for his biographer, Francis Hitchman, he describes a world where most officers still kept a native mistress or *Búbú*, termed a 'walking dictionary' for teaching the Englishman Hindustani (Isabel Burton 1893, p. 135). But the 1840s saw an influx of English wives into India, and an increasing social segregation between the British and Indians. In point of fact, the policy of social distance had been in place since the turn of the eighteenth century, when Governor-General Cornwallis instigated the Anglicisation of government service, allegedly to bring native corruption and nepotism to a halt. The triumph of what was termed the Anglicist school in the government of India in the 1820s further exacerbated official disdain and contempt for native tradition. Officially, India was to be remade into a model of benevolent autocracy, and slowly inducted into the higher wisdom of democratic governance (Hutchins 1967; Metcalf 1994).

Mid-Victorian society saw the appearance of a militant form of evangelicalism, tied to the spread of the public school modelled on the system introduced by Thomas Arnold at Rugby. Public schools were increasingly seen as training grounds for the empire, and a large number of boys left school to take up imperial careers. The new mid-Victorian ideal of imperial masculinity was closely linked to the emergence of muscular Christianity in England, which set a high premium on earnestness and self-discipline. It is this ethos that marked the emergent paradigm of manhood in the colonial context in the 1840s and 50s – the so-called Punjab school, consisting of a band of brothers who made their mark in the administration of the North-Western part of the empire under the tutelage of the Lawrence siblings, Henry and John. The happy few belonging to this set – men like John Nicholson and Herbert Edwardes – later secured a place in imperial hagiography, earning immortal status through their role during the Mutiny (Tidrick 1992; Wurgraft 1983). Even when evangelical zeal began to ebb, the ethic of duty to the empire remained firmly in place. The British were in India to do a job. India was seen as a testing-ground for one's character. What counted was setting a good example to the natives. To this end, Oriental study was now denounced as the pursuit of arcane knowledge

(Hutchins 1967, p. 25). As the historian Francis Hutchins points out, 'India came to be valued not for its pleasures, or promise, but precisely because it was possible to be desperately unhappy there' (29). Nothing was more destructive to the ethos of work than the solipsistic pursuit of pleasure. Burton's flagrant pleasure in performance was bound to clash with the belief in the value of self-discipline. What he implied was that imperialism was bound up with pleasure – a notion that was emphatically denied in the self-image of the British in India.

Not that the British in India repudiated the importance of performance. Indeed, they were continually engaged in staging a performance of ideal Englishness – white men wearing white masks, as one historian has it (Hyam 1967, p. 156-62). Much of the mystique of the British in India rested on the power of make-believe. Years later, one colonial official would put it in the following words:

Our life in India, our very work more or less, rests on illusion. I had the illusion, wherever I was, that I was infallible and invulnerable in my dealings with Indians. How else could I have dealt with angry mobs, with cholera-striken masses, and with processions of religious fanatics? ... They expressed something of the idea when they called us the 'Heaven Born', and the idea is really make believe – mutual make believe. They, the millions, made us believe we had a divine mission. We made them believe they were right.[8]

What distinguished this model of performance from Burton was his distance from the role he was playing. Playing consists in entering a play frame, a mood of 'as if' that involves an awareness that one was only playing (Bateson 1972). By contrast, the British in India tended to (or pretended to) believe their own performance. They succumbed to the illusion they themselves had created – they believed what they acted. This gave their role-playing the stamp of authenticity. As the passage quoted above demonstrates, it was this belief that inspired the idealism many Indian Civil Service officers actually displayed. Hannah Arendt once remarked that the empire was an arena for men who clung to petrified boyhood ideals (Arendt 1951, p. 211). Despite the racial ambivalence with which Burton liked to shock his peers, Burton was far more interested in parading his mastery over a range of identity roles than in actually adopting them. However, in a colonial society that deeply distrusted ostentatious theatricality, Burton's ease in slipping in and out of identities as if they were merely roles he was playing marked him down as an imposter. He was rightly suspected of ambivalence towards his own Englishness (Kennedy 2005).

Burton's own self-image was clearly modelled on a Byronic ideal of an aristocratic rebel against middle-class

hypocrisy and moralism (Brantlinger 1988, pp. 158-71). Occasionally in his book he lapses into a melancholy, romantic mood, as in his rendering of a Baluch love ballad that he has translated into English. The lyric abounds with unabashedly poetic lines, such as the following: 'As the tree joys at the prospect of the blossom, / So expanded my heart with delight, / The torments of months left my heart.' Burton frames his translation with ironic disclaimers: 'the hero carries off the heroine by main force, knocking, at the same time, every one he can on the head', but cannot resist the temptation to reproduce romantic poems and legends at length (vol. 2, pp. 203-4). In his later work, particularly in *A Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah*, (1855-6) he constructed himself as a solitary gentleman-traveller who identified with the chivalric nomads of the desert. The empire seemed to present him with the opportunity of freedom and escape from the crass and vulgar civilisation of Europe. Nothing aroused his scorn more than bourgeois hypocrisy. He was fond of exposing the cant that sugar-coated imperialism, as in the following passage:

> Whenever Madam Britannia is about to break the eighth commandment, she simultaneously displays a lot of piety, much rhapsodising about the bright dawn of civilisation, and the infinite benefit conferred upon barbarians by her permitting them to become her subjects, and pay their rents to her. (vol. 1, p. 182)

For Burton, the empire was founded on nothing but naked power – the discourse of the civilising mission of the British was merely a veneer to cover up the unpalatable truth. Burton's sense of superiority is not restricted to natives. He displays a deep arrogance toward middle class British society. Although his books (especially the account of his pilgrimage to Mecca) were well received by the general public, he addressed his work to fellow Orientalists and scholars, as his often pedantic style makes clear. In a gesture of defiance directed at bourgeois sensibilities he insists on treating the empire as a game. And this is precisely what might lie at the core of the mistrust he inspired among both his superiors and his peers.

At first sight this idea might appear paradoxical – Victorian culture was suffused with the spirit of play. Victorian society experienced a games revolution which took hold at all levels of society. Public school culture saw a shift from the code of moral earnestness to a cult of athleticism (Mangan 1975; Vance 1975). The games ethos was explicitly linked to the empire – it was intended to hone the character of future generations of imperial administrators or officers by instilling into them qualities such as leadership and team spirit. The playing fields of the public schools were regarded as preparation for the battlefields of empire. The Reverend J. E. C. Welldom, headmaster of Harrow School, declared, 'In the history of the British Empire it is written that England has owed her sovereignty to her sports.'[9] The imperial games cult was cultivated in the service of a higher purpose. Play was a serious affair with moral implications. Games, it might appear, evolved into a cornerstone of imperial policy.

However, the problem lies in the fact that there is nothing intrinsic in the nature of play that lends itself to a higher moral purpose. Play, as play theorist Johan Huizinga points out, has no moral function. 'Play ... lies outside morals. In itself it is neither good nor bad.' (213) Roger Caillois speaks of play as essentially meaningless: 'Play is an occasion of pure waste: waste of time, energy, ingenuity, skill, and often of money' (5-6). Victorian culture attempted to harness play to inculcate notions of patriotism and duty in the service of the empire. With his celebration of play for the sake of play, what Burton insinuated was that the game of empire might serve no ulterior function. His rebellion against middle-class notions of moral earnestness and the cant of the civilising mission of the empire inspired the suspicion that in the final analysis, the British in India had no serious purpose at all.[10] His view of empire comes disturbingly close to Arendt's definition of imperialism as expansion for expansion's sake (1951). The moral justification of empire, the mission to uplift the unenlightened races, appeared in this light as nothing so much as sheer humbug.

To be sure, Burton did have a clear view of the purpose of his own writing. Few travellers are as explicit as he is about how knowledge is bound up with power. In the preface of *Sindh and The Races that Inhabit the Valley of the Indus; with Notices of the Topography and History of the Province* he points out that 'Knowledge is power,' citing as proof Oriental contempt for rulers ignorant of their mores (p. v). In the account of his pilgrimage to Mecca, he presented himself as an adventurer exercised by the urge to remove 'that huge white blot which in our maps still notes the Eastern and the Central regions of Arabia' (1855-6, vol. 1, p. 1). For all his respect for Islam, he clearly saw his role as that of a vanguard laying the groundwork for later conquest: 'It requires not the ken of a prophet to foresee a day when political necessity. . . will compel us to occupy in force the fountain-head of Al-Islam' (1855-6, vol. 2, p. 231). He regarded himself as an indispensable agent of British imperialism. Perhaps Burton himself realised that his foregrounding of playful theatricality had detrimental implications for the prestige of the empire. In a noteworthy passage in his *Personal Narrative*

of a Pilgrimage to El-Madinah and Meccah he reflects ruefully upon his stay in India:

I am convinced that the natives of India cannot respect a European who mixes with them familiarly, or especially who imitates their customs, manners, and dress. The tight pantaloons, the authoritative voice, the pococurante manner, and the broken Hindustani imposes upon them – have a weight which learning and honesty, which wit and courage, have not. This is to them the master's attitude: they bend to it like those Scythian slaves that faced the sword but fled from the horsewhip. (vol. 1, p. 40)

Once again, the contemptuous tone is directed at both his peers, the philistines of colonial society, and at the slavish mentality of the Indians. Nonetheless, in the revised edition of his book on Sindh, *Sindh Revisited: with Notices of the Anglo-Indian Army; Railroads; Past, Present, and Future, etc.* (1877), published after a second trip to Sindh thirty years after his first, all references to wearing native clothes are carefully deleted. In the original volumes the first-person narrator, an old colonial hand, introduces John Bull to Indian clothes to ease the hardship of travel in the heat. In the later version references to native garments are changed into European articles of clothing, and accounts of native habits adopted by the experienced colonial are rigorously cut. A case in point is a reference to the Oriental custom of applying kohl around the eyes: 'Now draw a little surmeh [kohl] along the inside of your eyelids: fwill make you look quite an Eastern. . .' which appears in the first version of the book (vol. 2, p. 40). It disappears without a trace in the revised edition. In post-Mutiny colonial society, imperial prestige was closely bound up with drawing ever more rigid boundaries between the rulers and the ruled. If Burton had evoked distrust with his eccentric behaviour in the 1840s, now his behaviour would have been considered outrageous. His flirting with an Oriental identity would have been seen as a deliberate infringement of the imperial policy of segregation between ruler and ruled: it would have placed him beyond the pale of imperial society.

There is no doubt that Burton's pleasure in disguise was rooted in his fascination with secrecy. All his life he was attracted to secret brotherhoods which promised access to esoteric knowledge. Indeed, he claimed to have been made a master Sufi (Isabel Burton 1893, p. 150). The idea of belonging to a secret club fuelled his sense of elitism. The pleasure of spying, too, consists in the thrill of observing without being observed. Occasionally, however, a note of self-doubt creeps into his writing about how effective the entire notion of surveillance in native disguise was. At one stage he engages with his forerunners in the Great Game, spies like Alexander Burnes and Arthur Connolly[11], who had attained mythical status:

Thus you see how it is that many of our eminent politicals – men great at Sanskrit and Arabic, who spoke Persian like Shirazis, and had the circle of Oriental science at their fingers' ends; clever at ceremony at Hindoos, dignified in discourse as Turks, whose "Reports" were admirable in point of diction, and whose "Travels" threatened to become standard works, turned out to be diplomatic little children in the end, which tries all things. They had read too much; they had written too much; they were a trifle too clever, and much too confident. Their vanity tempted them to shift their nationality; from Briton to become Greek, in order to meet Greek on the roguery field; and lamentably they always failed. (vol. 2, p. 7)

Indeed, many of the most celebrated colonial spies had come to a disastrous end – Connolly was executed as a spy by the Amir of Bokhara in 1842 , Alexander Burnes was murdered in 1841 by an Afghan mob in the Afghan uprising that followed in the wake of the First Afghan War (1838-40). It marked the culmination of one of the greatest catastrophes in colonial foreign policy. Burton reflects ironically that whatever their other shortcomings, it is impossible to outwit the natives in duplicity. He remarks, 'I would rarely attempt feinting at them; and finally, I would never try to penetrate into their secret motives, well knowing that there I should be overmatched' (vol. 2, p. 8).

Of course, this is precisely what Burton attempts throughout his career, and this is the pretext for his colonial masquerade. It might be that in this passage Burton reveals his suspicion about whether he, too, was being observed and manipulated for the purposes of his native interlocutors. As he mentions casually in his autobiographical fragment, many of his travels were undertaken in the company of his *munshi*, Mirza Mohammed Hosayn of Shiraz, who acted as both chaperone and guard against gross blunders on Burton's part. Hosayn was a member of the Persian Agha Khan clan in exile in Sindh, who were applying pressure on the British to support an armed rebellion against the ruling government in Persia. Burton spent much time in the Agha Khan̄s household, ostensibly to perfect his Persian and to be trained in Muslim practices, but in reality to inform his superiors about the doings of their ally (Lovell 1998, p. 61; Rice 1990, pp. 89-100). His words suggest that in the contest of gamesmanship with duplicitous natives, Burton might well have found himself outwitted and outplayed.

At one point in his narrative, Burton describes how a native fakir sees through his native dress to perceive his identity as a Frank. The fakir proceeds to pour a stream of invective on the travellers, cursing them as 'crows

dressed in parrot's feathers!'s (vol. 2, p. 219). While he is merely in Moslem garments, not in disguise, the incident nevertheless leaves a discordant note. It introduces a hint of insecurity in the text about the extent to which Burton is in control of his image.

Burton's legacy lived on in *fin de siècle* imperial culture. A string of fictive Englishmen in native disguise – such as Kipling's Strickland or Flora Annie Steel's Jim Douglas[12] appeared on the scene, travelling back and forth between different cultures as they pleased. In the meantime, the boundaries between the British and the colonised became increasingly impermeable. But while these imaginary figures – possibly modelled on Burton, as Lady Burton asserted (Isabel Burton 1893, p. 159) – lived out fantasy versions of walnut-juice stained Englishmen slipping in and out of native cultures with dazzling ease, it was Burton's real-life exploits that carried the disturbing suggestion that the empire might be nothing but a game played for its own sake.

Burton has rightly been regarded as one of the founding fathers of anthropology. In his travel writing he accumulated a vast wealth of information about other cultures – information that catered to the obsession of the colonial state with amassing knowledge about the people they ruled. His penchant for travelling in native disguise served to underline his sense of racial superiority towards natives and his arrogance toward his hidebound peers. Nevertheless, his writing is riven with ironies. The excessive theatricality flaunted in his texts drew attention to the pleasures bound up with the empire – as one vast playing field for natives from a cold, constricted island. He ironically exposed the justificatory myth of empire as so much cant. What his solipsistic games laid bare was the unpleasant truth that empire might not, after all, serve a higher moral purpose.

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this piece appeared in *Travel Writing in the Nineteenth Century: Filling the Blank Spaces*, ed. Tim Youngs (London: Anthem, 2006), pp. 71-86.
2. He allegedly spoke twenty-five languages and innumerable dialects. (Brodie 1967, p. 333).
3. I draw on the biographies by Brodie 1967, Farwell 1963, Lovell 1998, McLynn 1990 and Rice 1990.
4. Isabel Burton 1893, pp. 160-1. She includes two versions of his Indian experiences, drawing on autobiographical fragments written by Burton and the reminiscences he dictated to her.
5. Sir Alexander Burnes (1805-41) became famous for his travels in Central Asia on a covert mission to explore the options for a British invasion of Afghanistan. His *Travels into Bokhara* was an immediate bestseller when it appeared in 1834.
6. His quest for the sources of the Nile was undertaken jointly with fellow-explorer John Hanning Speke (1827-64) and culminated in an acrimonious controversy and Speke's suicide.
7. *The Edinburgh Review* 1893, p. 441. It is manifest that the piece was written by Henry Reeve, editor of the journal and an old enemy of Burton's. In an aside the author refers to his own previous review of the *Arabian Nights* (p. 467). Reeve had attacked it as one of the most indecent books in the English language (see Brodie 1967, p. 18).
8. Walter Lawrence, *The India We Served*, 1929, qtd. in Eldridge 1996, p. 126.
9. Qtd. in Mangan 1985, p. 36.
10. See Bivona 1990, pp. 42-50. I am indebted to Bivona for the notion of the empire as a game.
11. Alexander Connolly (1807-42) was a British officer who travelled in Central Asia (partly in Muslim disguise) as an agent to collect information on Russian territorial designs in the region. His *Journey to the North of India* appeared in 1834. He coined the phrase the Great Game for the rivalry between Britain and Russia.
12. Flora Annie Steel, *On the Face of the Waters* (1896).

WORKS CITED

Arendt, Hannah, 1951, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.

The Athenaeum, 25 Oct. 1851, pp. 1111-12.

The Athenaeum, 17 July 1852, pp. 765-66.

Assad, Thomas J., 1964, *Three Victorian Travellers: Burton, Blunt, Doughty*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bateson, Gregory, 1972, 'A Theory of Play and Fantasy', *Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*, London: Intertext.

Bishop, Jonathan, 1957, "The Identities of Sir Richard Burton: The Explorer as Actor", *Victorian Studies 1*, pp. 119-35.

Bivona, Daniel, 1990, *Desire and contradiction: Imperial vision and domestic debates in Victorian literature*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Brantlinger, Patrick, 1988, *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Brodie, Fawn, 1967, *The Devil Drives: A Life of Sir Richard Burton*, London: Eland.

Burton, Isabel, 1893, *The Life of Captain Sir Richard F. Burton*, 2 vols., London: Chapman & Hall.

Burton, Richard F., 1852; 1997, *Falconry in the Valley of the Indus*, Karachi: Oxford University Press.

———, 1855-6, *A Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah*, 3 vols.

———, 1851a; 1998, *Scinde; or, The Unhappy Valley*, 2 vols., New Delhi: Asian Education Services.

———, 1851b; 1998, *Sindh and The Races that Inhabit the Valley of the Indus; with Notices of the Topography*

and History of the Province, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

————, 1877; 1997, *Sindh Revisited: with Notices of the Anglo-Indian Army; Railroads; Past, Present, and Future, etc.*, 2 vols., New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Caillois, Roger, 1958; 1961, *Man, Play, and Games*, trans. Meyer Barash, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

The Edinburgh Review, Oct. 1893, Vol. 178, pp. 439-68.

Eldridge, C. C., 1996, *The Imperial Experience: From Carlyle to Forster*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Farwell, Byron, 1963; 1988, *Burton: A Biography of Sir Richard Francis Burton*, New York: Viking.

Huizinga, Johan, 1955, *Homo Ludens*, Boston: Beacon Press.

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

Hyam, Ronald, 1976, *Britain's Imperial Century 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*, London: Batsford.

Kennedy, Dane, 2005, *The Highly Civilized Man: Richard Burton and the Victorian World*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lovell, Mary S., 1998, *A Rage to Live: A Biography of Richard and Isabel Burton*, London: Little, Brown and Company.

Mangan, J. A., 1975, 'Athleticism: A Case Study of the Evolution of an Educational Ideology,' *The Victorian Public School: Studies in the Development of an Educational Insitution*, ed. Ian Bradley and Brian Simon, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, pp. 147-67.

Mangan, J. A., 1985, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal*, Harmondsworth: Viking.

McLynn, Frank, 1990, *Burton: Snow upon the Desert*, London: John Murray.

Metcalf, Thomas. R., 1994, *Ideologies of the Raj*, The New Cambridge History of India 3.4, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moorhouse, Geoffrey, 1983, *India Britannica*, London: Harvill Press.

Ondaatje, Christopher, 1996, *Sindh Revisited: A Journey in the Footsteps of Captain Sir Richard Francis Burton*, Toronto: HarperCollins.

Rice, Edward, 1990, *Captain Sir Richard Francis Burton: The Secret Agent Who Made the Pilgrimage to Mecca, Discovered the* Kama Sutra, *and Brought the* Arabian Nights *to the West*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Roy, Parama, 1998, 'Oriental Exhibits: The Englisman as Native,' *Indian Traffic: Identities in Question in Colonial and Postcolonial India*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 17-40.

Tidrick, Kathryn, 1992, *Empire and the English Character*, London: I. B. Tauris.

Vance, Norman, 1975, 'The Ideal of Manliness,' *The Victorian Public School: Studies in the Development of an Educational Insitution*, ed. Ian Bradley and Brian Simon, Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, pp. 115-28.

Wurgaft, Lewis D., 1983, *The Imperial Imagination: Magic and Myth in Kipling's India*, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press.

Sceptre, Cross and the Healing Hand:
Practice of Medicine in Colonial India

SANDEEP SINHA

Primitive men did not know that disease was a natural or biological occurrence. They believed that some evil spirit or paranormal force was responsible for all their physical ailments and that a human being could cast a spell upon another to cause illness. Death was regarded as a punishment.

This was, in fact, the attitude of most of the people in large areas of the world in the pre-scientific age. In Europe, a more rational explanation of disease came to be accepted by the end of the 18th century. The realization, however, was gradual as scientific research was slow and sporadic. With the spread of general education in modern times these natural explanations of biological phenomena have become common knowledge.

In India, however, the science of medicine was remarkably well developed since the ancient period. The ancient Indian physicians had scalpels, scissors, hooks, forceps, catheters and syringes to help them. In all, they had over a hundred different surgical instruments and which were used for complex operations.[1] In fact, today's plastic surgeons use a technique for operating on the nose which was first developed by those surgeons in India 4000 years ago.[2]

The Indian understanding of disease and infection contributed to the success of their treatments. Operating theatres in India 4000 years ago were kept scrupulously clean, and surgeons had to keep their hands clean, their nails short, and wear clean white clothing when operating. Sheets were steamed clean, instruments boiled and operating rooms, though well-lit and ventilated, were protected from dust and smells with the use of fragrant smokes and perfumes. The surgeons who used anaesthetics and antiseptics some thousands of years before they were introduced into European hospitals, were forbidden to speak during operations in case their breath contaminated the wounds.[3] When convalescing from surgery, patients were encouraged to rest, eat well and enjoy plenty of sunshine and fresh air. To prevent further infections, impure water supplies could be purified by boiling, heating in the sun or filtering through sand, coarse gravel and charcoal.[4]

In addition to their surgical skills, the Ayurvedists had acquired other sophisticated medical skills too. Before arriving at the diagnosis, the physician would examine a patient and listen to his heart and lungs, and there are suggestions that Indians knew how to protect themselves against smallpox with inoculation and malaria by using mosquito nets. These observations are all the more remarkable considering the fact that it was not until the 19th century that the association between malaria and mosquito was first recognised officially by Western researchers. The Indians used a wide variety of drugs and one Ayurveda book alone describes the qualities of seven hundred plants and chemical mixtures which, in the light of the modern scientific research are proved to have genuine effects.[5]

The Atharva Veda mentioned many symptoms and signs of diseases – fever, diarrhoea, jaundice, dropsy, cough, consumption, facial and other paralyses, mental disorders – and more recognisable complications like eye diseases, sores, leprosy, tumour, abscess, snake poisoning, worms, etc. One system of behaviour which arose out of Indian philosophy and which still has a marked bearing on health is Yoga[6]. In fact before the coming of colonial rule, Ayurveda, Unani and Siddha – the three systems of indigenous medicine were very much in place to protect the people of the country. Even in the early years of British rule, the Western system was far less domineering in its approach to native society. The local physicians had to look after the health matters of the society. The early Europeans had to rely on the native physicians, partly from a strong persuasion that they were

Sandeep Sinha is Associate Professor of History at Serampore College, University of Calcutta

likely to have a better knowledge of the diseases of the place and partly to avoid the import of expensive Western medicine. The East India Company authorities in the early years persuaded its servants to make use of local physicians.[7]

By the second quarter of the 19th century the changing social set-up was creating problems more or less similar to those of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain. The newer health problems could hardly be tackled with the indigenous systems which prevailed in the countryside and the common people were drawn toward esoteric methods of treatment.[8] Lord William Bentinck had once appointed William Adam to study the indigenous systems of education in Bengal who wrote in 1836 that the general practitioners had not the least semblance of medical knowledge and they, in general, preceded or followed their practice by the pronouncing of an incantation and by striking or blowing upon the body.[9] There were many methods used by them, like the esoteric, Ayurvedic, Totka, Hakimi and Siddha. However, there is hardly any contemporary evidence to suggest that these worked effectively.

During the same period a growing conviction of the rationality, scientific understanding, universalistic character and superior efficacy of Western medicine prompted the British to stop medical pluralism in the colony which stood in abrupt contrast with the practice of less than a century earlier when European medicine was thought competent to deal with only a limited range of afflictions. Now it challenged the customs and beliefs of the people associated with the systems as irrational, obscure and superstitious and began to treat indigenous medicine as an obstacle to be removed immediately.[10]

Life in the tropics was considered to be full of danger and a sojourn in the disease-ridden tropics was considered tantamount to a sentence of death for the Europeans[11]. The Colonial Secretary, Joseph C. Chamberlain was quoted in *The Times* of 11th May, 1899 as hailing the work of Western doctors in lessening the unhealthiness of Asia and Africa and endeavouring to make the tropics livable for white men. Robert Koch, echoed the sentiments in 1898, 'we will not be happy in our colonial possession until we succeed in becoming master of malaria.'[12] These factors, too, gave rise to the development of Western medicine. From 1890 onwards tropical medicine began to receive serious attention. There was a debate in England on whether the white people could successfully rule in the tropical environment of India. The foundation of the London School of Tropical Medicine in 1899 was a direct outcome of this debate. The germ theory of disease received importance since its discovery by Louis Pasteur in the mid 19th century which

brushed aside the old miasmatic theory[13]. This germ theory gave new hope to the British colonists when Patrick Manson, father of tropical medicine in England, gave the assurance that germs were the main factors for all diseases, a control of which would surely increase the possibility of strengthening the British domain in India.[14]

This growing understanding of aetiology of disease further stood in the way of the indigenous systems to develop. The Europeans now had a far better and scientific comprehension of diseases. They now could cope with a disease with more confidence than they ever had. This confidence led to the development of the Western medical education in India and gradually led to medical research. It was confidently assumed that there could be self-contained technical solutions to what were in reality, complex social and environmental problems. As Britain began to free itself from its own epidemiological past, disease became part of the wider condemnation of Indian backwardness, just as medicine became a hallmark of British racial pride. Quite naturally, policies of the British Government reflected that feeling. The Bengal Medical Acts were enacted only to give right of practice of medicine to those who were registered under the Medical Acts. It is an axiom to say that the physicians who received medical education from Medical College or from other medical schools of Western medicine established by the Government had the sole legal authority to practice medicine as registered medical practitioners. The practitioners of indigenous systems had no such legal authority given by the Government. All the earlier Medical Acts enacted right from the mid-19th century culminated in the Bengal Act of 1914. Only those registered persons were qualified for appointment as medical officers in hospitals, asylums, infirmaries, dispensaries, or lying-in-hospitals which were supported partially or entirely by the public from local funds. Heavy penalties were instituted for non-registered physicians using the authority of a registered one. These medical acts and finally the Medical Act of 1914 ruined the future of the indigenous physicians and paved the way for Western medicine to spread.[15]

There were certain reasons behind the increasing penetration of the Western system of medicine in India. Nineteenth century was a period of consolidation of British power in India and this process depended entirely on the strength of a disciplined and able-bodied army. But evidently, it became a growing problem for the British to protect the increasing battalions of army in the tropical environment of India. Previously some steps were taken for their protection. But the growing realisation that the health of the soldiers, a large number of whom were Europeans, could not be secured through measures

directed at their health alone, gained recognition during the course of the 19th century.[16] It followed, therefore, that the protection of European health could only be attained by measures that took Western medicine into the native towns and slums. With military casualties often heavier from disease than from battles and given the military's importance to the maintenance of imperial control, the health of soldiers, specially the white soldiers, was a high priority of the colonial state. Naturally, the first and foremost duty of the colonial Government was to look after the health of their men in uniform in India. In a report of the Company published in 1857 it is found that only 6% of the British soldiers died in warfare and the rest died of tropical diseases. Of those most severe were fever or malaria, dysentery, small pox and cholera.[17]

The enactment of the Military Cantonment Act XXII of 1864 aimed at the protection of the British soldiers on land. Thus the *Cantonment Manual of 1904* declared that the cantonments were formed to save the army, therefore, they were to receive air-tight protection. Large amounts were paid for smooth functioning of health measures in the cantonments.[18] J.A. Sinton in his book *What Malaria Costs India* (1951) once mentioned that the cost of British military hospitals in 1926-27 was about 11.4 million sterling and only malaria had cost Ü3.4 million sterling annually upon the army budget on account of sickness among British troops alone. This amount did not include the cost of medical aid to the even larger force of Indian troops in the army.[19]

The tropical diseases had probably killed more human beings than the wars that had devastated the earth by several natural disasters. Malaria alone was responsible for more than one million deaths each year. In 1863 a team of native zamindars, talukdars(both belonged to the feudal gentry), traders and the inhabitants of the districts of Burdwan and Hooghly gave a joint memorandum to the Lt. Governor of Bengal expressing their fear of the ravages made by the epidemic fever during the last 10 years. They claimed that in many villages the increased epidemicity of the disease accounted for the death for almost half or one third of the population.[20] But the British in India, throughout the period under review were much more anxious to keep the commercial zones apart from the military cantonments free from tropical diseases, for beyond dispute, the diseases were the greatest obstacles to the economic development of the natural resources of large tracts of the country. It was a source of constant anxiety for the British Government. The loss incurred by the European employers, shippers and industrialists was often heavy in disease prone areas, labour was often difficult to recruit and expensive, its efficiency was low and its output was often meagre at most important

periods of the work[21]. The Government made desperate efforts to keep commercial zones free from epidemics.

Strict measures were taken to prevent any damage done to the European dealers and their interests. Tension and anxiety regarding chances of outbreak of epidemics in large congregation of native population such as fairs and bazaars found frequent mention in several reports and records of the government departments.[22] Captain S.P. James, I.M.S. pointed out how the European bungalows were susceptible to contagion due to living in close proximity of the native servants.[23] Sir Ronald Ross also maintained such a notion when he said that anti-malarial measures should be confined to areas which were profitable to the Empire.[24] This was the attitude of the colonial Government too and the native society was pathetically ignored. Such gross contrasts between the native and European population were the highlights of the period. The firmer native bodies became weaker and weaker due to repeated outbreaks of epidemics, for which the authorities had no concern, but they were given treatment when it came to the requirement of physical labour for more production in industries, and plantations. This invidious attitude of the government resulted in increased sufferings of the Indian population.[25]

The missionaries on the other hand, made a real contribution in the field of health care. Welfare activities remained as one of the most important agenda of the Christian missions throughout the twentieth century India. Government efforts though they were increased, were still not sufficient, considering the urgent need for the health care. During the years of the Second World War and after independence missionary activities had declined. The number of the foreign missionaries had in fact registered a sudden drop and financial help from the missions abroad also decreased considerably. Notwithstanding these the mission schools, colleges and other institutions, driven by the urge to disseminate education and hiegene, are still functioning. According to the Christian faith the terms health and healing are used in a comprehensive sense and are not confined to only one aspect of man's being. The reason for using the term healing in a comprehensive way are stated simply as the need for an all embracing term which includes all the forms of restoration to normality which are found in the New Testament which describes the restoration of wholeness or well being in every sphere of man's being whether it be body, mind, spirit or community.[26] Christian faith has never been a stranger to problems of health. The basic reason for this lies at the heart of its message, the proclamation of a 'Saviour' Jesus. Jesus manifested salvation not only by His words but also by His body through His acts of healing and exorcism to the point of

the total gift of His person.[27] As far back as we can trace the history of the Church, it oscillates between the two poles of 'anointing the sick' with the goal of physical healing or at least the improvement of health and 'extreme unction' which would mean a spiritual healing, namely the forgiveness of sins and preparation for the encounter with god in death.[28] And the Church had a specific task throughout of synthesizing these two objectives through the Healing Ministries or the medical missions.

The church in India made a great contribution in the field of health care. Treatment of ordinary people became one of the main concerns of most of the missions throughout the period under review. They felt it to be more urgent as the large sections of the tribal and poor people had absolutely no opportunity to receive the services of physicians of the Indian Medical Service. As a result they had recourse only to tribal and ancient ritualistic practices, incantations and black magic.[29] However, as in other mission fields, nearly all missionaries had at some time or other been in a position to use whatever measure of medical skill they possessed in the healing of disease and many of them had been able to accomplish much good by means of this modest service even though they might not have enjoyed the advantages of special medical training. These attempts of a non-professional kind had long been made by missionaries to sickness. Gabriel Boughton in 1636 and Hamilton in 1713 had cured the Mughal rulers of painful maladies and in return received royal favours. The Tranqueber Mission had sent an occasional doctor to India and Carey's companion Dr. John Thomas was a known physician and in a colloquial sense he may be termed as the first medical missionary to India.[30] But organized medical missions are a phenomenon of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which coincided with the fast development of the Western medical science. But there was as yet no clear perception of the methods of working to be followed nor of the particular tasks devolving upon medical labour as special branch of missionary organization.

The first mission to adopt a regular policy of sending medical missionaries to India was the American Board.[31] The early ones were two men both ordained to the ministry and fully qualified as doctors. The first and perhaps most distinguished of these early practitioners was Dr. John Scudder who arrived at Madurai in 1836. Till 1854 he toiled with undaunted enthusiasm in and around Madurai and Arcot districts, preaching and healing. One of his sons Dr. Henry Scudder was also a medical evangelist and moved out to Arcot in 1851 to start the mission of which his father was a pioneer.

Meanwhile from 1837 other medical evangelists were at work in Madurai and the adjacent areas though the American Board was far ahead of all other societies working in India in the sending out of thoroughly trained medical men; some of the notables were Dr. Steele, Dr. Charles Sheldon and Dr. Lord who worked from the 30s through the 60s of the 19th century.[32] The London Missionary Society had started medical work at Neyyoor in its South Travancore Mission in 1838 with Dr. Ramsay. He however, could not work beyond 1842 and the development of this mission with a central hospital and more branches came much later. From 1840 the American Baptists had two medical evangelists, Dr. Otis Bachelor and Dr. Williamson working in southern Bengal. The first doctor came to Ludhiana in the Punjab in 1842. Before Mutiny this was the extent of medical missions, a year after there were only seven fully qualified medical missionaries in the whole of India.

However, by the end of this year the missions had given intense attention to medical work and the period between 1858 and 1882 had witnessed the real foundation of mission activities in this field, though in numerical terms it was not very significant with only twenty eight medical missionaries working in the field. In 1860 the United Presbyterian Mission of Scotland began its work in Rajasthan through two qualified doctors Shoolbred and Colin Valentine. This led to the establishment of clinics and hospitals and nearly all mission stations became centres of medical work. Between 1862 and 1885 five hospitals at Beawar, Ajmer, Nazirabad, Udaipur and Jodhpur were set up. In the same way the Free Church of Scotland Mission between 1857 and 1903 founded many hospitals in several prominent localities. Through their united efforts general recognition particularly in Scotch missionary circles, was won for the watchword of the Edinburgh Society 'Preach and Heal' and the medical missions justifying themselves by the example of Christ's miracles of healing that went along with evangelistic and educational missions.[33] These missions tried to create a confidence among the people on more scientific Western medicine which in turn had weakened the position of the indigenous physicians particularly those of the hakims. The L.M.S. with equal zeal made Neyyoor the central hospital of fifteen dispensaries and sub-hospitals. They were in close relation with the Medical Missionary Society of Edinburgh. The conviction of the medical missions had already created a position for themselves among the Indians and as a result of which demand for more such clinics and physicians was on the rise.

However, the fast growth of medical missions dates from the time when two new and important branches of this particular work were developed on a large scale in

about 1882. Visiting women in the homes of the natives had brought to light the special need of women for medical work. Medical aid was difficult for men to obtain and it was practically non-existent for the women section. This was due to the 'Purdah'[34] system of the Indian women which had prevented the male doctors to touch and treat them. This situation had prompted the missions to send trained lady doctors to India. Soon the women section acquired a special position in the medical missions.

The first woman medical missionary was Dr. Clara Swain of the American Episcopal Methodists who had started her work in 1870 at Bereilly in Uttar Pradesh. In 1874 she had opened a women's hospital at the same place on a land donated by the Nawab of Rampur. Dr. Sara Seward of the American Presbyterian Mission arrived at Allahabad in 1871 with a host of other doctors. In 1880s two great 'zenana' societies were formed to work in a big way. The undenominational Zenana and Bible Medical Mission and the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society built hospitals for women and children in various parts of India from Amritsar in Pubjab to Krishnagar in Bengal and from Varanasi in the U.P. to Bangalore in Karnataka.[35] The C.E.Z.M.S. by 1890s alone had twelve lady doctors in the service. The British Methodists took up medical work in Mysore in Karnataka and Hassan in Tamil Nadu in 1906 and had served thousands of women and children in the process[36]. By the work of these women medical missions other missions were inspired and they too soon opened similar sections to serve the women patients and thus a healthy competition was generated among them. The distress and suffering of the women in cases of sickness was so appalling that the wife of Lord Dufferin, the Viceroy was prompted to make an effort towards applying some measures of relief. In 1886 she founded the 'National Association for Supplying Medical Aid to the Women of India. She was very happy to see that the main objective of the women medical missionaries in India was to help and treat the sick women of the country and not proselytisation.[37]

By the first decade of the twentieth century this Association had not only paid the regular salary of 74 women doctors and 52 assistants but also supported 257 women medical students. The purpose was purely humanitarian – to fight against the unutterable misery of the women of this country.[38]

The progress of Western medical science and the increased attention paid to matters of hygiene and sanitation prompted the missions to be more aware of the need for medical services in India and since these required trained physicians, nurses and paramedical staff

the medical missions in India were obliged to make some arrangement for the training of Indian assistants. At the beginning this was the responsibility of individual missionaries though now a need was felt for a systematic training of doctors at a time when government medical schools were in existence and the government began to insist on certain academic standards for medical practitioners. Consequently mission medical schools were established in some places where medical missions irrespective of denominations had started sending students. In 1881 the Agra Medical Mission Training Institute was founded, which was their first effort. In 1894, the North India School of Medicine for Christian Women, a more ambitious project set up by Dr. Edith Brown and Miss Greenfield, came into existence at Ludhiana in Punjab. This Institute was affiliated to the Punjab University. The Christian Medical School at Miraj in Maharashtra under Dr. William Wanless remained the best medical college for men for at least fifty years. Dr. Ida Scudder of the well-known Scudder family that belonged to the American Arcot Mission had founded a medical school for women at Vellore in Tamil Nadu which soon became a union institution for medical sciences. Under the untiring advocacy of Dr. Ida Scudder, the Christian Medical College, Vellore became a world renowned medical college and hospital in 1945. Within two decades another medical college and hospital in the same name was established in Ludhiana. Apart from physicians, however, in the training of nurses and in the department of nursing the medical missions have made one of their most distinctive contributions to India. As late as the beginning of the Second World War it was estimated that about 90% of all the nurses in the country, male or female, were the product of nursing schools and hospitals of the medical missions.[39]

Special areas of work which medical missions developed were surgery and the treatment of eye-diseases. Neyyoor, Vellore, Miraj, Ludhiana and many other hospitals became well-known for their surgery, while Bamdah in Jharkhand, Jalalpur-Jattan and Mungeli in Madhya Pradesh for eye-treatments. But perhaps the most conspicuous medical fields in which medical missions had been foremost are tuberculosis and leprosy. The immeasurable misery of the unhappy lepers and awakened a large and enduring amount of sympathy of the medical missionaries. The pioneer in this field was William Carey who founded the first refuge for lepers in Calcutta.[40] He was succeeded by Dr. Ribbentrop of the Gossner's Missions, who not only founded an asylum but also personally, and in the most self sacrificing way, took his share in tending the lepers, binding up their wounds and burying their dead. During 1840s Dr. J. Ramsay

founded the leper hospital at Almora in Uttar Pradesh (now in Uttarakhand) and in 1850 Budden of the L.M.S. became its director. The American Presbyterians and the Church of Scotland had established two leper hospitals at Sabathu and Ambala during the mid nineteenth century. The great enterprise by means of which missions to lepers were to justify their existence and their right to become an independent branch of missionary work was definitely the impact of Wellesley Bailey an Irish missionary. His conviction and sympathy towards the lepers were examples which many medical missionaries tried to follow. His small pamphlet 'Lepers in India' called public attention to the matter and the result of which was the foundation of the Mission to Lepers in India. By 1970s it had 26 institutions of its own and assisted 34 other homes and clinics. The settlements in Purulia district of West Bengal and Dichpalli in Andhra Pradesh are the biggest. The Mission to Lepers has been regularly carrying on anti-leprosy campaign. Like leprosy, tuberculosis also received great attention of the medical missions to fight against diseases. The premier tuberculosis sanatorium in India is 'Arogyavaram' in Andhra Pradesh, a venture of 14 missions founded in 1915. Besides these there are now 11 other sanatoria in different parts of India. All these are founded and ran by the different medical missions.

After the Second World War, the medical missions had initiated psychiatric treatment, a need for which had long been felt. Mental clinics at Lucknow, Miraj and Vellore had made the beginning.[41]

In 1905, the medical missions in India formed an association which finally led to the formation of the Christian Medical Association of India in 1926. In its early years the Association carried out a valuable survey of the medical missions and offered counsel. This advocates that the Ministry of Healing is not a mere adjunct of mission work, but itself an essential part of the Christian Church. Just as the earthly ministry of the Jesus included the healing of sick people, so the care of the sick is the part of the ministry he committed to the Church.[42] The Association, believes this to be a way by which the Christian 'dharma' could be performed.

During the post colonial period government medical services have been developing. The Five Year Plans of the Government of India include a large expenditure on public health. Yet the mission hospitals have maintained their popularly and distinctive character. People have recognised that the care of the sick involves more than buildings and equipments and technical knowledge, for it is also a matter of personal relations and personal service. Here these Christian medical institutions have to offer which many institutions are not likely to do . In

fact the vision that inspired the medical missionaries was conceived as a response to an overwhelming physical need, very much in the spirit of the Second Commandment, 'Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself.' They pioneered in bringing to needy peoples the obvious benefits of scientific medicine, they introduced medical education for men and women, and initiated nursing services. The medical missionaries could establish standards of excellence, and showed that it was possible to do first class medical work with second class equipments and facilities in third class buildings. These missionaries had introduced the ideals of compassionate caring for the unwanted and the outcast and created a climate of acceptance, both of Western medicine and of responsibility.

The issue of missionary activities and their ultimate aim is often raised again and again. Several historians and social thinkers are of the view that the main agenda of the missionaries was proselytisation and they kept it hidden under the cover of so called social work and philanthropy. This, however, is not wholly true, though some of the missionaries did believe that the main purpose of the missions in India was to increase the number of the Christians.[43] Some were also very skeptical of the British Government's attitude in India and termed that as an anti-Christian one. They claimed that the Government should take very stern actions against the Hindus and their religious practices and help the missionaries in spreading Christianity all over India. To instigate the government some of them used very harsh words and made scathing remarks against the Hindus. Claudius Buchanan of the B.M.S. had termed all Hindus as most superstitious and their religious activities as impure, indecent, sensuous and lascivious. According to him it was a community of vice.[44] Buchanan had accused the government of showing lukewarm interest in helping the missionaries to promote Christianity in India.[45] But definitely this was not the voice of all the missionaries, rather most of them had a different opinion. Bradbury of the L.M.S. who had stayed in Calcutta and in different parts of Bengal for more than 34 years tried to present a very balanced view on the Hindu religion. He had shown a definite respect towards the overall character of the Hindus and had never given any biased opinion on the socio-religious institutions of the Hindus and was of very high regards for their women.[46] Bowen of the C.M.S. had never believed conversion or evangelism in India to be the main purpose of the missionaries. According to him that when the mountains of Caucasus and the plains of Hindusthan were explored for converts, their own population were wallowing in unparalleled pollution and committing the most frightful excess.[47] John P. Jones in

his book *Krishna or Christ* called for honesty and asked his fellow men to show proper respect for other religions.[48] In fact fundamentalism was a part of these missionaries who had come to India with the agenda of conversion. This attitude of theirs never bore fruit and only provoked those Indians who had looked at them with suspicion. But at the same time, there were also missionaries like James Long, C.F. Andrews, William Carey, Ida Scudder or Mother Teresa who believed in the service of the needy and helpless which brought them closer to God as they understood the Christian ethics much better than their fundamentalist brothers. Naturally non-Christians had never a problem in interacting with them nor had they any confusion in recognising them as great benefactors of the society. The fundamentalist missionaries had in fact made a greater blunder through their proselytizing activities by preparing a ground for the fundamentalist Hindu socio-political parties to grow and claim themselves as the protector of the Hindu religion. They are doing the same by generating hatred toward other religions as had been done by those fundamentalist missionaries. Most of the educated Indians now believe that religion should only get the space of a man's personal world and that it should not be given a place in the nation's reconstruction.

An attempt has been made here to highlight some of the activities of the missions and missionaries in India to show how despite their religious background they worked in the service of the people of India. Their idea of God was that of a God of love who never wants to destroy any of His creatures, no matter whether he is rich or poor, educated or illiterate, European or a native Indian. Religion had definitely played a role in the activities of the missionaries in India, though religion was not the sole objective or instrument.

Independent India from 1947 tried to improve its medical infrastructure and established government aided hospitals and clinics all over the country. However, the Christian hospitals including those of the Baptists remained as popular as they were during the British rule notwithstanding the fact that they had to change with the times and conditions keeping the spirit of service intact. In a leaflet of the B.M.S. called 'One Another's Burdens', it is said, 'rather than bearing one another's burdens we are enjoined to help carry one another's burdens, not taking away the responsibility, but giving help so that the other may ultimately be able to cope with the situation himself.'[49] This would point to their eagerness to cooperate with other bodies including those of the government in terms of the medical work in India. In the same leaflet they had made it clear that though they are considered now as a private sector of health care,

they could not, considering the economic background of the patients, raise the fees as others in the private sectors were doing.[50] It is seen that the doctors and all the other medical staff of the mission hospitals and clinics in free India were paid much lower comparing to their counterparts in either the government sectors or other private societies, but that never came in the way of maintaining the standards of treatment or in the devotion they had shown[51]. In 1956, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Union Minister of Health, Government of India, had praised highly the attempts of the medical missionaries in free India, more so in the rural belt of the country[52]. In the rural areas the entire Christian church was deeply involved in the life of the community and at times of natural calamities the missions had more work to perform. In the post-colonial India the mission hospitals have taken upon themselves the responsibility of providing holistic treatment to the patients, which means providing not only medical care but at the same time providing them with food, clothes and shelter.[53]

If we review the emergence of the medical missions and their activities from the beginning to the end of the British rule in India, we find that it all started against a background when the common people, especially those in the rural areas, feared disease as evil and monstrous spirits to be exorcised through divine intervention. These potentially hostile and vindictive evil spirits. Those were evidenced particularly in times of widespread epidemics and sudden illness. Those affected often resorted to the visits of or to the self declared medicine men with all their rituals of incantations and sorcery and pilgrimages to the temples and shrines of disease healing gods and goddesses like the Olabibi or Sitala. When the missions opened their dispensaries, they met with considerable suspicion. But hard work, perseverance and sincerity won them the ground they were looking for. Those who still believed in the primitive exorcism tried to come to terms with a sort of coexistence of oriental beliefs and scientific medicine of the Christian missions. This culminated in a viable medical establishment by the second quarter of the 18th century and the auxiliaries were finally amalgamated with their respective missions. The following years witnessed a steady growth of the wings and in fifty years the missionaries founded many hospitals, cooperated with other denominations, and a huge number of village dispensaries and clinics that came up, served thousands of patients each year. Evangelism was definitely an objective but it was not the overriding concern. It was the Christian philanthropic spirit which guided the Christian medical missions to perform in the name of Christ to follow religiously Christ the Healer. There are some examples where some natives embraced

the religion of the medical missions but a majority of them were either the social outcasts, distant tribes with no formal religion or those ostracized by the society as they suffered from some dreaded diseases like leprosy or tuberculosis. Despite this the missions neither lost the energy and vigour to serve nor did they give up Christ and fortunately the combination of these made them a force that fought effectively the scourge of dreaded tropical diseases that otherwise, given the limited health care services provided by the government, would have wiped out millions of Indian lives during the period under review. Even after sixty three years of independence the Christian hospitals and clinics are rendering the best medical service in to the country.

NOTES

1. Kaviraja Kunjalal Bhisagaratna, ed., *The Susruta Samhita, Uttara Tantra*, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 1981, pp. Xviii-xx.
2. Surgery was, in fact, one of the major areas of the Ayurvedic medical practice in India, though it is not conclusively known when the first plastic surgeries were performed. However, Sushruta is considered to be the most outstanding surgeon and teacher of surgery. His medical elucidation called Sushruta Samhita was an anthology of all his medico-surgical procedures followed by him and his disciples. The collection contains copious and comprehensive references to diseases and their surgical procedures. Non-invasive methods were also used for cosmetic purposes. Otoplasty or plastic surgery of the ear and rhinoplasty or plastic surgery of the nose were quite usual operations of the time. Though the Egyptians performed these types of surgeries during 3400 B.C., Ayurveda recorded those as in 5000 B.C.
3. Vernon Coleman, *The Story of Medicine*, London: Robert Hale, 1985, p. 15.
4. Ibid.
5. P.V. Sharma, *Ayurveda Ka Vaijnanika Itihasa* (in Hindi), Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 1975, pp. 37-44.
6. H. E. Sigerist, 'Early Greek, Hindu and Persian Medicine' in *A History of Medicine*, Vol. II, Oxford University Press, New York, 1961, pp. 168-169.
   The word Yoga denotes union which in other words can be referred to as a synthesis of the body and the mind. The foundation of yoga as was mentioned in the Atharva Veda is called Hathayoga. Ayurveda and Yoga were used as complementary to each other aiming at a comprehensive therapy of the patient while sharing many resemblances in terms of hygiene and sanitation, diet and prohibitions and the philosophy of holistic healing.
7. D.G. Crawford, *A History of the Indian Medical Service, 1600 – 1913*, London: I, W. Thacker and Co., 1914, pp. 21-33.
8. William Adam, *Reports on the State of Education in Bengal, 1835 and 1838*, Calcutta University Edition (1941), Edited by Anath Nath Basu, pp. 198-199.
9. Ibid, p.197.
10. G. Maclean, 'Medical Administration in the Tropics,' *British Medical Journal*, 1, 1951, p. 759.
11. Douglas Guthrie, *A History of Medicine*, Proceedings of The Royal Society of Medcine, Vol. 53, No. 12, 1960, p. 35, and E. M. Chamberlain, *The Scramble for Africa*, London: Longman, 1974, Passim.
12. Gordon Harrison, *Mosquitoes, Malaria and Man, A History of Hostilities Since 1880*, London: John Murray, 1978, p. 4.
13. George Bankoff, *Milestones in Medicine*, London: Museum Press, 1961, p.71.
   Though a great progress in medical science was made during the late 18th century Europe, it was during the 19th century that the fight between nature and man started in earnest. Previously man had always been the victim and loser. As the centuries passed by, the voice of one scientist or another was occasionally heard asserting that diseases were due to some invisible organisms, which were later proved to be germs. But those had been rather prophetic guesses than scientific statements. Most people used to believe that all living beings could develop from nothing, in putrefying matter, though some scientists like the Italian Lazzaro Spallanzani denied it firmly in the late 18th century. However, Louis Pasteur 'of France was the first man to finally settle the question in the 19th century and his main contribution to microbiology was to minimize the chances of spreading diseases by bringing in changes in medical practices. Pasteur together with Claude Bernard for the first time introduced a method through which microbial growth in food was slowed down. The process was named after him and called Pasteurization.
14. Patrick Manson, with colleague Ronald Ross studied the mosquito-malaria theory. Through the India Office, Manson helped Ross in many ways to investigate this theory in India. Ross and Manson had regular correspondences among themselves during this research. Ross, in August, 1897, sent some specimens to Manson, who confirmed the findings. Manson publicised the findings which in due course helped in controlling malaria. He was involved in various aspects of tropical medicine and helped to set up world's first school of tropical medicine in Liverpool and was also a founding member of the London School of Tropical Medicine in 1899. He was also instrumental in the foundation of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine in 1907.
15. *The Bengal Code*, Vol. III, Calcutta, pp. 536, 544.
16. J.W.Cell, 'Anglo-Indian Medical Theory and the Origins of Segregation in West Africa', *American Historical Review*, 91, 1986, p. 321; Sir G. Covell, *Lectures on Malaria*, 4th. edn. Delhi: Ministry of Publications, 1949, pp. 2-4 ; David Arnold, (ed.), *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1989, p. 14.
17. David Arnold, 'Cholera and Colonialism in British India,' *Past and Present*, November, 1986, p. 127-128 ; Dipesh Chakraborti, 'Oupanibshik Bharatey Mahamari O Janasanskriti' (in Bengali), *Anustup*, XXIII, 1, 1988, p. 175 ; *Report on the Statistics of the British Army in India and the Native Army and Jails of Bengal, to the End of 1876*, Calcutta: GOB Press, 1877, p. 81 and p.84.
18. *Anti-Malarial Measures in Military Stations in India*, New Delhi: Army Medical Directorate, 1942, p. 16 and p.24.
19. J.A.Sinton, *What Malaria Costs India*, Health Bureau Bulletin, No.12, Delhi, 1951, pp. 74-75.
20. Progs. No. 12. Political Department, Sanitation Branch, May 1869, W.B.S.A.
21. Sinton, op cit, p. 40.

22. C.A. Bentley, *Fairs and Festivals in Bengal,* Calcutta: GOB Press, 1921, pp. 1-3.

23. S.P. James, *Scientific Memories by Officers of the Medical and Sanitary Departments of the Government of India.* No. 2, Calcutta: GOB Press, 1902, p. 20.

24. Sir R. Ross quoted in R. Nathan, H. B. Thornhill and L. Rogers, *Report on the Measures Taken Against Malaria in the Lahore.* (Main Mir) Cantonment, Calcutta: GOB Press, 1910, pp. 6-7.

25. Sandeep Sinha, *Public Health and Indian Public : Bengal, A Case Study,* Calcutta: Vision Publications, 1998, passim. The author shows in this book the specific reasons behind the penetration of colonial medicine in India and its impact on the native society.

26. John Wilkinson, *Health and Healing, Studies in New Testament, Principles and Practice,* Edinburgh: Handsel Press, 1980, p. vii.

27. Marie Chauvet Louis and Miklo's Tomka (ed.s), *Illness and Healing,* Utrecht: Nijmegen, Peace Research Centre, 1998, p. vii.

28. Gisbert, *The Anointing of the Sick : The Oscillation of the Church Between Physical and Spiritual Healing,* in Chauvet and Tomka, op cit., p.79.

29. Kuppozhackel Eliza, *New Church Practices in Healing, Their Importance in Asian High Cultures : India,* in Chauvet and Tomka, op. cit., pp. 107-108.

30. R. F. Moorshead, *Heal the Sick,* London: The Carey Press, London, n. d., p.15.

31. Cyril Bruce Firth, *An Introduction to Indian Church History,* Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1976, p.205.

32. Julius Richter, *A History of Missions in India,* trans. Sydney H. Moore, Edinburgh: Oliphant Anderson Ferrier, Edinburgh, 1908, p.347.

33. Julius Richter, op cit., p.348. (ref.35)

34. In most of the regions of South Asia including the Indian subcontinent, the actual translation of the word Purdah is a curtain or veil or screen which makes an obvious separation between the world of man and that of a woman and between the public and the private. Purdah was a custom observed by both Muslims and Hindus. The limits imposed by this practice differed according to different regions and class levels. Generally, those women in the upper and middle class were more likely to practice all aspects of purdah though among the poorer classes the system also existed.

35. Julius Richter, op cit., pp. 350-351.

36. C. B. Firth, op cit., pp. 205-206.

37. Julius Richter, ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. C.B. Firth, op.cit., p.208.

40. E. Daniel Potts, *British Baptist Missionaries in India, 1793-1837, The History of Serampore and its Missions,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, pp. 68-69.

41. C.B. Firth, op cit.

42. Ibid.

43. J.F. Edwards, *India's Challenges to Christian Missions : An Answer to the Appraisal Commission Report,* Madras: Madras Publishing House, Madras, 1933.

44. Claudius Buchanan, *An Apology for Promoting Christianity in India,* Strand: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1813, pp. xix-xxi ; p.33 ; pp. 43-44, 46, 52.

45. Op. cit.

46. James Bradbury, *India, Its Condition, Religion and Missions,* London: J. Snow and Co., p.53 ; pp. 102-122 ; pp. 143-169.

47. John Bowen, *Missionary Incitement and Hindoo Demoralization,* London: Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly, 1821, p.6.

48. John P. Jones, *Krishna or Christ,* New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1903, Passim.

49. 'One Another's Burdens,' Leaflet, B.M.S., London, 1974.

50. Ibid.

51. 'Take Care of Him,' Leaflet, B.M.S., London, 1968.

52. 'Contrasts,' Leaflet, B.M.S., London, n. d.

53. 'To Comfort Others', Leaflet, B.M.S., London, 1975.

Locating the Artist in Early Indian Art History

R. N. MISRA

Indian art studies till recently have conspicuously evaded issues pertaining to ancient Indian artist, taking Indian art as anonymous[1]. The notions about anonymity have perpetually thrived, aided, on one hand, by western scholarship till early twentieth century that judged Indian art in the light of 'Orientalism' or Classical Archaeology; and by brahmanical texts, on the other, that consistently devalued crafts to a lowly status and relegated craftsmen to the rank of śudra. Even Coomaraswamy, whose contribution to Indian art studies is substantial, held that traditional artist was not given to self-expression[2]. In a marked contrast to such notions, recent researches have afforded useful information both on artist and social realities governing their status and function.[3] The relevant information, so brought forth, has helped in eroding assertions about anonymity of ancient Indian art tradition adding at the same time significant epigraphic data on artists and their specific work. Information, thus accumulated, comes from different parts of India, including Karnataka[4], Madhya Pradesh[5], Himachal Pradesh[6] and Rajasthan. A document from Orissa besides some field data from Khajuraho and northern Madhya Pradesh in the form of graffiti and masons' marks afford valuable hard evidence on artists and their work. These materials also help in exemplifying their organizational and institutional network and add significantly to whatever little had been written on the subject by Kramarisch (1958)[7] and Sivaramamurti (1934).[8] This paper briefly highlights the relevant material about artists covering the period from Vedic times down to the middle ages. The details follow.

There is little in the Vedic texts to distinguish an artist from craftsmen though works of art besides techniques and skill are often mentioned and have significance in their original context as well as in the perspectives of literature that developed subsequently.[9] Vedic texts mention little about figural representations but rūpa in reference to 'form' constituting something tangible is a favourite subject of speculation in them. Rūpa in the Rgveda is a 'universal principle'; its primal source and secondary manifestations stand in tandem as for instance, in the Rgveda (VI.47.18) where 'form' and its "counter form" seem to stand ever in co-relation (rūpam rūpam pratirūpo babhūva tadasya rūpam praticaksanūya). Rūpa is 'fashioned' in a variety of ways and artifice is often implicit in such descriptions. A work of art and beauty is defined by the term śilpa.[10] In Vedic references artificer, whether a divine being or a craftsman, is exalted for his act of creating beauty. Thus Tvastr 'carves' (pimśatu) the 'forms' (Tvastā rūpāni pimśatu, Rgveda 10.184.1) or the beauty of Usas is described as suśilpa (Rgveda 9.5.6; 10.70.6) or, the works of art and craft like an elephant, a goblet, a garment, an object of gold or a mule chariot are made in 'imitation' (anukrti) of 'divine crafts' (deva śilpa). In the Aitareya Brāhmana (6.27), 'harmony' (chandas) characterizes such works, which, in performance, are supposed to 'culture the self' (ātmānam samskurute). The Vedic roots like piś-, han-, kris-, tvaks- and mi-, convey the technique and artifice involved and the consummate product of such acts is supposed to manifest itself in citra, rūpa and śilpa[11]. Rbhus, who were mortals turned into divine beings, possessed 'good hands' (Rbhuvah suhastah, Rgveda, 1.35.3) and they are supposed to have carved the limbs with pointed implements. The action here, in terms of 'fashioning' an object by manual exercise, is conveyed by the root piś-.[12] Similarly, a carpenter (taksan) embellishes his woodwork with pleasing carvings.[13] Or, a 'form' is "measured" to beings.[14] The process of cutting and shaping is explained by the root takṣ- which also implies chiselling and polishing in the Rgveda (5.2.11: ratham na dhīram svapā ataksam) or in the Rgveda (3.38.1: adhitasteva dïdhayā manīsān), implying 'brightening up a

R. N. Misra is former Professor of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archeology, Jiwaji University, Gwalior, and a former Fellow of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla

song in the manner a carpenter makes a piece of wood shine.' Viśvakarmā, the divine artificer, creates things out of *dhātu* and the act is known as *sanghamana*.[15] Creation is not necessarily a manual activity in the *Rgveda*. It is often achieved by sheer mental excellence or by mysterious power out of nothing tangible, as it were, for we have in the *Rgveda* (1.51.10) Usanas who fashions (*taksad*) 'power with power'.[16] Or, we have Saraswatī in the *Taittirīya Brāhmana* who creates internal beauty.[17] Skill, in these references, is essentially an attribute that defines someone as an artist and the terms *damśana, śacī, kratu, māyā* and *dhīra* imply such skills or propensities in producing or fabricating forms, whether material or non-material.[18] Of these different terms, *dhīra*[19] is especially relevant to artisans' skill.

Brief though the details reproduced here are, they yet seem to clarify the early perceptions about skills of early artists and craftsmen, divine or human, and their relevance in concretizing either 'forms' or a phenomenon. The act required mental or manual dexterity or both and elevated the doer in that creative act of doing. The relevant enunciations contain explicit hints of idealizing the skilled artifice in Vedic society and underscore the exalted status of those possessed of it for they were supposed to be endowed with mysterious power.[20] Thus, a 'dear' *vipra* to warriors—a *kāru*—accompanies them to battlefield;[21] or invokes gods' help for peaceful possession of property.[22] In a society that was graduating into sedentary patterns of living, growing with different kinds of human settlements,[23] artisans apparently enjoyed respect of the community. Social relationships then seem to have been based on interdependence within the community and craftsmen fulfilled an important role in producing utility goods for the community even as a *kāru*, a *vardhakī* or a *taksan* occasionally produced a work of art in wood. In any case, the passages quoted above help in explaining the role and status of artists and craftsmen in the early Vedic society. These ideas occur more explicitly in the literature of subsequent times and formally explain aesthetic foundations of Indian art.[24] But even in early texts *śilpa*—the instrument of artists' action—has been idealized as an extraordinary potential that was held as a sanctifying principle or a supportive, sustaining and strengthening force. It was supposed to be a propensity either 'divine' (*daivī*) or anthropocentric (*mānusa*) in character. In being emulated it tuned the performer into its harmony (*chandas*). As an ingenuous generative principle *śilpa* was supposed to be amorphous, existing merely in the idea or notion of it, simply by itself. When resorted to, it turned into a boundless energy which filled the universe with *antariksa* (atmosphere), extended the earth, strengthened the sun and differentiated 'all

forms'.[25] Such conceptualizations about *śilpa* presuppose an exalted status of its practitioners: the artists and craftsmen.

Eventually, artists seem to have lost their preeminent status as a result of growing occupational divisions in society. As the class of warriors and priests rose up the powers and privileges of the community declined.[26] This seems to have adversely affected the status of artists and craftsmen and their occupational pursuits. The priestly bias against *śilpins* is indicated by the disabilities, which texts imposed on *śilpīs*. From the middle of the first millennium B.C. the texts contain hints of tension between different sections of society and they tend to indicate that the practice of crafts was no longer in tune with priestly temper.[27]

The *Maitrī Upanisad* (VII.8), for instance, regards those living on *śilpa* as unworthy of heaven. Apastamba and Gotama ordain that the food offered by those living on *śilpa* must not be accepted. Gautama allows a brūhmana to accept food from a trader who is not an artisan but prohibits him from doing that from those, including a carpenter, who practiced *śilpa* (crafts).[28] Imposition of disabilities on those practicing art and crafts might reflect notions of purity and pollution that applied to different crafts and to the people who practiced them. But that is only one side of the story for the Buddhist texts, on the contrary, indicate a phenomenal rise of *śilpas*.[29]

From the sixth century BC. onwards, the rise of towns in the wake of second urbanization produced mobility in the ranks of artisans. The *vardhakin* and *taksan* among them seem to have taken advantage of the emerging situation when stone came into use in raising structural or the rock-cut works.[30] They started working on stone and swelled the ranks of artists who were exclusively engaged in artwork. The coming into being of guild (*srenī*) of craftsmen from the Mauryan times onwards and proliferation of Buddhist monuments besides those given to the Ājīvikas must have contributed to this development.[31] Isolation of artisans working within village communities seems to have ended as the process of urbanization got strengthened. Between the fifth century BC. and the second century AD. Works of art found a market and artists found patronage, as demand for their work increased. Panini in a *sūtra* (*ive pratikritau*) makes a distinction between the images made for earning livelihood and those made for (sale in) market.[32] A *Jātaka* refers to a goldsmith who was invited by a prince to make a female figure out of a quantity of gold.[33] The carpenters collecting wood from a forest and constructing dwellings to the satisfaction of their clients figure in the *Alinacitta Jātaka*.[34] The *Milinda Panho* mentions an architect who lays out and raises a city, and when "the city was fully

developed he might go away to another district".[35] A *Jātaka* (IV.207) refers to a brāhmana who plied the trade of a carpenter (*vardhakī*). This indicates that the *śāstric* rules about practice of crafts by śūdras alone were not always adhered to. *Śilpīs* often grew up to have an enhanced economic status and that could have made their profession attractive. The *Anguttara Nikāya* (III.363) refers to practice of crafts (*sippāditthāna*), which had earned prosperity to their practitioners, turning them into *gahapatis*.[36]

In these circumstances, composition of the class of artists seems to have become a-symmetrical. We have different kinds of artisans coming up by the Mauryan times, with the affluent and resourceful ones running their own manufactories, offering employment to others while still others functioned independently on their own resources. Of these two kinds—which find mention in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya—the *kāruśāsitr* (master-craftsman) employed a large number of artisans, while the *savittakāru* had his own capital and workshop[37] through which he plied his trade. Other kinds of artists also surfaced, and some among them operated under the direction and control of institutionalized religions like the Buddhism and Bhagavatism. Some artists, under Buddhist *samghas*, seem to have assumed different roles within the *samgha* as they are mentioned as *bhadanta, thera, bhatudesaka* (addresses of respect within *samgha*) and *bhānaka* (reciter of text).[38] Artists and craftsmen also started receiving now the patronage of ruling princes. For instance, a Banabasi inscription of the time of Visnukada Chutukulānanda refers to Skandasvāti both as a minister and as a *kammantika* (foreman of a group of artisans). The inscription records gift of a *vihāra* and a tank by a princess, and Skandasvūti was the *kammantika* in both the cases.[39] Thus a hierarchy seems developing among artists now, distinguishing ordinary workers from those who occupied a position of authority under the patronage of rulers or institutionalized religions. The latter performed supervisory roles also, as was the case with Skandasvāti, mentioned above. In these circumstances, it seems that specialization in particular skills also grew among the artists as their tasks diversified. The titles and designations of artists mentioned in epigraphs bring out these distinctions and differentiations within their rank. The titles like *āveśanin* and *navakarmika* seem to indicate a status of authority, specially a supervisory role of those who had such designation.[40] The term *āvesanin* (chief of artists' workshop) occurs seven times in epigraphs of the early Christian era: once at Sanchi in case of Ānanda, a Sātavāhana artist who carved the south Gate of the main *stūpa*, and six times in the cases of artists in ancient Vengī

region in Andhra Pradesh. Other designations like *rūpakāra* (sculptor), *rūpadaksa* (painter-sculptor), *śilālaka* (worker on stone), *mithika* (stone polisher), *kadhicaka* (brick-layer, graduating to working on stone), *śaila-vardhakī* (carpenter-turned stone-worker) *and damtakāra* (ivory-carver)[41] point to the artist who specialized in different skills in their respective domains of work. The *Mahāvastu*[42] mentions many other specialists like *citrakāra* (painter), *vardhakī-rūpakāra* (maker of images in wood), *kārupatrika* (carvers), *pustakāraka* (clay-modellers), *pustakarmakāraka* (plasterer), *lepaka* (decorater), *sthapati* (architect) *and sutrakāra* (expert in measuring by thread). Artists' workshop had come into being already in the times of Panini (4th century BC.).Some of these perhaps represented the places where an *antevāsī*[43] learnt the craft.

It appears that apprentices like an *antevāsī* came to master-craftsmen from distant places to learn the craft and it was the responsibility of the latter to lodge such apprentices in his home or workshop. These apprentices apparently worked for their masters (*ācāryas*) and in accomplishing the prescribed work they had to acknowledge the master-apprentice (*guru-śisya*) relationship perhaps with a sense of pride or otherwise in order to assert their expertise in a fast growing demand of their products. Two stone sculptures and their inscriptions of third century B.C. from Mathura–one representing a Yaksa and another a Yaksinī- refer to Kunika, a master-artist, and to Gomitaka and Naka—who were his apprentices—who respectively carved those sculptures.[44] Emergence of workshops, so also of master-artists and apprentices working under them give reason to suggest the beginnings of what may be termed as the *gharana* system of artists and their style representing the continuities of *guru-śisya* tradition—a tradition which has been so typical in the domain of Indian music and dance. *Gharanas* may have operated through the direct descendants of master-artists and through their apprentices (*antevāsīs*) or disciples who were accepted in the fold though they came from distant places and went back the same way after completion of training. Later texts [45] enjoin that if a master-artist did not impart proper training to his apprentice or if he engaged him in works other than those for which he had joined the *ācārya*, the state could intervene and punish him for ignoring his duty. An *antevāsī*, on his part was required to defray a part of his gains to his *guru* in the form of a *guru-daksinā*. The rules of residence and training were codified to govern the activities of both the master-artist and apprentice. Such regulatory dispensation apparently signifies a valorization of activities concerning arts and crafts.

Master-artists no longer remained confined to their

native places as demand for their work grew considerably. Itinerant artists figure repeatedly in ancient inscriptions. The master-craftsman (āveśanin) Siddhartha of Amaravati and his father were the residents of Nadatura in the district of Kammaka (Andhra Pradesh). But Siddhartha moved to work at Jaggayyapetta.[46] Similarly, an inscription from Amaravati refers to an artist who was a resident of Vīrapura[47] but who had moved to Amaravati for work. The practice of specifying the native place in inscriptions amounts to registering their addresses so that they could be easily approached by patrons for work. Artists who remained localized to particular places of their residence are also known from some inscriptions. For instance, the Chāndaka brothers identify themselves as residents of Mathura. They seem to have operated together with Nandibala who was eldest of them[48]. The ivory carvers who worked on a *torana* (gateway of the main *stupa*) at Sanchi belonged to Vidisha. The evidence about there being a category of itinerant artists allows us to suggest that they represented a class of free labour, free from controls of residence, which afforded them the liberty to move to places at will in search of the kind of specialized work which suited their expertise. The Buddhist *samgha* offered them works in plenty. The *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya refers to *śilpīs*, *kārus* and other artisans who performed work and received wages. A *vardhakī* is recommended two hundred *panas* as wages while a *kāruśilpī* received only one hundred and fifty *panas*. Absence of specific evidence makes it difficult to decide whether rules of forced labour (*visti*) applied on those artists *who* were engaged exclusively in works of art and architecture.[49] It is likely that the rules of *visti* applied on them too. In the Junagarh inscription, the ruling prince Rudradaman takes pride in proclaiming that in renovating the lake Sudarūana he got the jobs done without resorting to *visti*.[50] Such a pride might have stemmed from the fact that this act was more of an exception than the rule. Or, it is possible that rules of forced labour applied to *śilpins* according to their individual place in hierarchy. Those artists who worked for princes or rulers enjoyed greater authority, freedom and wealth too, than the artists who plied their trade in market. Patanjali has stated that a carpenter engaged to work for a king did not entertain private work. Skandasvūti was a *kammantika* but at the same time, he was also a minister. The rulers' patronage to artists may have favourably altered the income and status of individual artists. Also, those of them, who owned workshops and manufactories and employed others of their profession, must have similarly prospered. In the same way, those artisans who joined Buddhist *samgha* rose to the status of *theras* or *bhadanta* and freed themselves from the rigours and constraints of the brahmanical *varna-jāti* system that was restrictive. Their *śudra* status however, seems to have remained un-altered in Brahmanical text.

Little is known about artists of the Gupta times. A notable exception however, is the instance of Yaśa Dinna of Mathura who carved the Buddha images[51] that have come down from Mathura and Kushinagara in Uttar Pradesh. The masons' marks occur in plenty on the Dhamekha *stūpa* at Sarnath and afford some evidence of their self-expression if not with names then at least with symbols. These marks may be identified as the coded insignia, graphemes or symbols (*cinha*) of artists' institutional organizations (guilds or *gharanas*?), which found mention in the later texts.[52]

We may now pass on to artists in the Middle Ages. The early Middle Age in the history of art is marked by a phenomenal growth in art activity. Temple building became a broad-based socio-religious movement in which donors representing a cross section of contemporary society participated with great fervour. Emergence of artists' guilds marks an important development in the early Middle ages distinguishing this period from the earlier ones. Early instances of stonemasons' guilds are few in number and are found only from Bandhogarh (159 A.D),[53] where they made the stone-benches (*asanapatta*-s); Siyadoni (eighth century);[54] where the *silakuta*-s together with betel sellers and oil-millers made a gift to a local temple; and in the Lakshmesvara inscription (eighth century,)[55] where they are mentioned among the eighteen *prkrti*-s, 'artisans' (who constituted guilds of different kinds)[56]. But this situation changed later when we do come across some evidence on artists organizing into exclusive *ganas* or *gosthī*, 'guilds'. A *gosthī* of the *śilpīs* of Vārendra (North Bengal) is mentioned in the Deopada Stone Inscription of Vijayasena (c.1096-1159 A.D.). The inscription refers to *rānaka* Śūlapāni, the crest jewel of the guild of artisans of Varendra' (*Vārendraka śilpigosthī cūdāmani*), his father Brihaspati, grandfather Manodūsa and great grandfather Dharma[57]. The title *rānaka* used for him indicates his position of authority. In another instance, a Cālukyan inscription refers to *sarva siddha ācāryas* who were well versed in the secrets of *śrī śile mudde*'[58]. The term perhaps signifies a 'guild' of artists and the inscription refers to the modalities of expulsion or banishment of artists from their organizational fold, and their re-admission back into it. The inscription thus seems to indicate that artists belonging to particular guilds were bound to observe professional discipline of their fold, failing which corrective steps might have become necessary to discipline them. In any case, the instance offers a hint of

both authority and resistance that surfaced in enforcing the professional codes.

Khajuraho in Madhya Pradesh is also supposed to contain some evidence on artists' groups. This evidence is based on certain label inscriptions on temples and sculptures inscribed with certain proper names which are suffixed with the Brahmi alphabet *ga*. The letter *ga* has been interpreted as an abbreviation for the term *gana*. Seven such *ganas* are supposed to have functioned at Khajuraho and these are identified as Anurū, Bhaita, Mata, Savara, Sidha, Temana and Thavana, among others.[59] But these designations appear so 'provincial' that the status of a 'guild' may be only tentatively acceptable in their cases. Inscriptions from Karnataka, however, offer firm evidence on the existence of artists' guilds and refer to the artists of Saraswati- *gana*.[60] Scattered references to Dasojja, an artist of Balligame (Shimoga District of Karnataka) who belonged to Saraswati *gana* affords details of work performed by him—all in the Hoysala kingdom between AD.1117 and 1152) in the different temple in Karnataka. This included an image of Acyuta at Sitihonda; of Kesava at Mattihall; *śalabhannjikā* figures at Belur, images at the Cannakesvara temple of Belur and Hoyasalesvara temple of Halebidu; relief panels at Sravana Belgola and an inscription at Kalikatte

The titles like *pāthuriyā-paryanga nāyaka, śilpī-nāyaka* and *kulapata sāmanta* designating *śilpīs* and *sūtradhāra* in eastern India[61] similarly indicate existence of confederations of artists whose chiefs carried those titles. It is likely that guilds of artists formed in some fluid modes as a result of their localization in certain particular villages. The records from Karnataka indicate a concentration of artists in the Shimoga district.[62] Eastern Indian inscriptions refer to Poùali, a village in Bengal that produced many famed artists. Among them occur Mahendra, son of Vikramaditya; Sasidhara ; Pushyāditya, son of Chandrādiya; and Śaśideva, son of Hriddeva.[63] It was usual for rulers to establish artisans on the lands close to a temple. Sometimes, monasteries or those who managed temples, also encouraged artists' settlements in the vicinity of temples. After the completion of the Sun temple at Konark, the ruler is said to have established two hundred and twenty-four *pāthuriyās* (stone masons) by the side of the temple, granting fifteen *mānas* of land to each of them. Vāsudeva Mahāpātra, a master-artist was similarly settled in a village [64] The instances of monasteries employing artists are also known from the Malkapuram inscription (Andhra Pradesh). It refers to sculptor, goldsmith and coppersmith, carpenter, stone masons and architect employed by the local śaiva Siddhānta monastery mentioned in the inscription as *Viśveśvara golakī*.[65] The Teli inscription[66] of Korai Ravi

mentions about administration and management of a temple in which painters and sculptors have also figured. When not engaged in temple-building the artists remained settled in villages, serving the community by performing various tasks. Some served in army; others worked as tool makers or depended on agriculture or hunting. When occasion arose, the master-artist among them performed work for patrons away from the village. For instance, Someśvara, a skilled *śilpī* from Magadha worked for the Chandra rulers of Assam.[67] An inscription from Baijnath, east of Kangra district, refers to *sūtradhāra* Nùyaka who hailed from Nagarkot but combining with another artist of the same place he 'fashioned with chisel' a ùiva temple at Baijnath. They both are said to have done this work "in accordance with the teachings of the *śāstras.*[68]

As regards the professional set up of artists in the Middle Ages, changes are evident in their functional categories. A comparison of the contemporary data with that of the earlier phase indicates–(i) disappearance now of certain earlier categories of artists like *rūpadaksa, śailālaka, śaila-vardhakī, kammantika, āveśanin, navakarmika, sūtrakāra* and *sūtragrāhin*, (ii) a continuation of the earlier categories of *sthapati, takssaka, vardhakī and śilpī* and (iii) emergence of new categories like *sūtradhāra, aksaśālin, rūpakāra* and *vijnānika* in the north India and of *rūvāri (rupakāra), ācāri (ācārya)* and *voja (upadhyaya)* in the Deccan and south . The available evidence shows involvement of women also in artistic work. Now, as before, family was the basis of artists' training and the home was the workshop as well as the training center where father and the other elders of the family assumed the role of a *guru*. Crafts in a family did not remain limited only to the male members; women also learnt skills and sometimes produced excellent sculptures. We know of *citrakāra śrī Sātana* whose daughter-in-law (*vadhu*) made the famous statue of Tara known from Mahoba in Uttara Pradesh.[69] This image is now deposited in the State Museum, Lucknow. An inscription of the Cahamānas of Nadol in Rajasthan similarly seems to refer to another woman artist. It is said in that record that when Pāhini constructed a temple Jasadevā and others assisted him in this work.[70] In the latter case, the role of Jasadevi seems to have been substantial and significant to merit her mention by name.

Sūtradhāra occupied the highest position in the artists' professional set up. They planned their work as "Prithu planned the earth".[71] They recruited workers and other experts for carrying out the designated work. The *Baya Cakada*, a record from Orissa, refers to the appointment of Sadāśiva *sūmantarai mahāpātra* as a *sūtradhāra* who then recruited seven different contingents of artists including *karmakāra, murtikāra, svānsya* (stone mason), *cūnurā* and

kamarakantaka (iron caster).[72] The term *sutradhara* implies 'one who holds a *sutra*' which implies a 'thread' i.e., 'measure' as well as 'rule', relating to rituals and arts in the latter case.[73] In that sense the term underscores the logic of things by which the underlying reasoning, argument, activity or comprehension in a skilful act would be entwined together in an appropriate pattern.[74] *Sutradhara*, as a 'holder of the *sutra*', in that light, seems well endowed with a pre-eminent status that seems re-enforced when God[75] or *Kala*[76] (Time) are described as *sutradhara*s who regulate the three worlds.

The *Natyasastra* of Bharata[77] defines *sutradhara* as one who could train others in music (*gita* and *vadya*) as also in reciting a text along with the *bhava*-s (moods) implicit in it. The passage in Bharata also suggests that a *sutradhara* was so designated owing to his knowledge of *sutra*s of dramaturgical performance. The different usages of the term tend to indicate that this office was common to the spheres of drama and arts. This identity is best illustrated in the *Harsacarita*[78] which brings out the similarity in the twin realms in relation to *sutradhara* even as it describes the plays of Bhasa and compares their elements with those of a temples. The comparison in the *Harsacarita* is made by punning the terms like *bhumika* ('role' in drama; 'storeys' in temple) and *pataka* ('sub-plot' in drama and 'fluttering flag' on a temple). Thus, with the help of three paronomastic clauses the relevant verse says that Bhasa gained as much splendour by his plays with their introduction spoken by the *sutradhara*s and by furnishing them with several characters and roles in a manner they figure in a temple, adorned with several storeys and decorated with the fluttering banners. One may further add that the role of a *sutradhara* in the realm of art and architecture may even be more ancient than that in the realm of drama, going back in antiquity to the later Vedic period when *vedi*-s (sacrificial alters) were made with the help of a *sutra* (thread or cord) by the *suta*s. The *Mahabharata* (I. 47. 14-15) seems to support this suggestion, as *suta*, *puranika*, *sthapati* and *sutradhara* are all mentioned as separate designations qualifying the same personage namely, a *suta*.[79]

The expertise of *sutradhara*s in different areas of art activity is borne out in several historical instances, as in the case of *sutradhara* Chiccha who was an "expert in the *sastra* of Visvakarma"[80]; or in the cases of Madhava, Mahidhara and Namadeva in central India who were known as "crest jewels among the *sutradhara*s"— *sutradhara siromani*.[81] *Sutradhara* Pithe is mentioned in an inscription from Bheraghat near Jabalpur where he is credited with planning and constructing temples and other works in the manner in which "Prithu had planned the earth".[82] The *sutradhara* Sampula who constructed the

Bilvapani temple somewhere in Chhattisgarh is described as "*aneka silpa nirmana payodheh paradrsvina*".[83] As a designation, *sutradhara* is not mentioned in early references which however, do refer to *sutragrahin* and *sutrakara*, as in the *Manu samhita* (IV.47-48). It seems likely that these designations derived from the function of measuring the proportions, preparation of the lay out and *hastalekha* etc., in which the use of *sutra* (thread) was essential, requiring an expert handling. *Sutra* was an essential part in the exercise related both to figure work and building activity, at every stage.[84] And whoever was in-charge of such an operation was designated as a *sutradhara* owing to his specific function of measuring out the proportions and building the works accordingly

In inscriptions known almost all over India, *sutradhara*s occur more or less as a universal category of ancient artists who performed different roles and functions in art related activity. They figure as engravers of letters of inscriptions or they are mentioned as planners and executors of buildings; specially, the temples, monasteries and other sundry works that came to be raised whether singly at one site or severally in a larger complex. They are mentioned as serving the monarchs or their dependents who commissioned sculptures and other building works. Private individuals including pontiffs and priests employed them. References indicate their supremacy and skills and also their relative superiority *vis a vis* the other artists in the domain of art. The qualities that *sutradhara*s were supposed to possess are often described in details in the *silpa* texts and in inscriptions.

Eventually, the status and role of the *sūtradhāra*s became so prestigious and lucrative that people of different *varna*s and rank competed for that role as well as that title or designation. An inscription from Rajasthan (966 A.D.) refers to a *ksatriya* who took up the occupation of a *sūtradhāra* along with that designation.[85] An inscription from Kusuma (Rajasthan) similarly refers to a *ksatriya* named Sthavira who engraved this record.[86] The rank of artisans lured many others from different professions. For instance, Nāgapāla, son of *pandita* Uhila and Jayatasimha son of a *bhogika* became engravers, a profession that used to be exclusive to artists; Mallavijaya, son of a *dandanāyaka* took up the work of a *sūtradhāra*.[87] Devagana, a *kāyastha*, is mentioned in a Chhattisgarh epigraph as *rūpakāra śiromani* (crest jewel of sculptors).[88] Some of these master-artists rose to the position of *rānaka*, *thakkura* and *sūmanta*,[89] which are supposed to be feudal titles. Habib, in a different context, says that some of these the titles may represent 'clan monarchies'. These instances, in any case, indicate incursion of persons of other ranks and social status into the functional set up of artists. The rise of some of them to the rank of chiefs

enjoying feudal titles signifies artists' upward mobility in the social hierarchy. As a result of this, the stigma of *śūdra* status on them might have got mitigated. Their knowledge of *śilpaśāstra* has been praised in the epigraphs and an inscription refers to a *śilpī* who was a *śāstra-japī*, " one who could recite *śāstra*".[90] The *Brahmavaivarta Purāna* has legitimized these developments with a story which gives to craftsmen a more respectable lineage. It explains their descent from Viśvakarmā who was reborn as a brahmana to marry Ghritācī, an Apsarā who was reborn as a milkmaid.

Artists seem to have been compensated for their work in different manners. Sometimes they received land as reward; sometimes payment to them was made in cash. Work used to be done by them on contract also. The Malkapuram inscription of Rudra indicates that artists enjoyed the rights on land. The details in the epigraph indicate that officials and others, including the artists employed by the monastery were assigned some land, with the authorization to enjoy their emoluments with the rights of ownership.[91] In case of the artists employed at the *rūpāsa* camp at Konark-when the Sun temple was under construction- the payments on account of contract or wages were handed out to them both in cash and in kind. The text records that artists and other workmen received gifts when the camp was closed and they were dispersed following completion of the temple. Accordingly, the *sūtradhāra*s received from the ruler three *krośa*s of land extending from east to west in the Lankpada *visaya* as an endowment for life with some *daksinā*. Sadānanda *pattanāyaka* received a gift of land in Sadùnandapura. The goldsmiths are said to have received some land for building their homes in Sanālapura where one hundred and eight stonemasons were also granted land. As quoted above, the land measuring fifteen *māna* (one *māna* was equal to one acre or 4820 square yards) was given to each of the two hundred and twenty four stonemasons near the temple site so as to establish a community of stonemasons there.[92] This system of giving land as well as wages or payment according to contract might have been followed in regard to artists elsewhere also. An inscription from Karnataka of the time of the Cālukyas of Kalyānī suggests a land grant to a *cittārī* (painter-sculptor) named Jakka.[93] In yet another case, the cost of building some parts of a temple has been computed to a total of three hundred and thirty *drammas*, a figure that may either represent the cost of building the parts of the monument or refer to the amount in cash accruing to Pāhinī who made them with the help of some other artists.[94] The accrual of material gains from work appears to have induced rivalry among artists. This is particularly evident from inscriptions from Karnataka,

which mention particular sculptors (*rūvāri*) as 'smiters of rival sculptors' in the manner '*bherunda* was to *ùarabha*' or '*śiva* was to Kāmadeva' or '*vajra* was to mountains'. These inscriptions bear out artists' glory even as they denigrate the competitors.[95] But perhaps the most eloquent tribute to them is paid in the *Dhvanyāloka* of Anandavardhana which equates artists to Prajûpati, the Creator and implies that while Prajûpati creates according to defined rules, an artist does so by his independent and free will: *apāre kāvyasamsāre kavirekah Prajāpatih / yathāsmai rocate viśvam tathaiva parivartate*. We may also quote from an epigraph of Karka Sovarnavarsa (812-813) at Ellora where the artist who made the celebrated Kailasa temple (no.16) finds himself pleasantly surprised at his creativity after he had so 'nonchalantly' transcended the Space, as it were, in creating a Kailasa away from its heavenly perch in a manner that even the 'immortals' mistook it for the original. The relevant verse is quoted here in full:

Having seen his wonderful abode (*sannivesa*) situated on the mountains of Elapura, the astonished immortals who travel in celestial cars always take much thought, saying, "This is the abode of Svayambhu-Siva and no artificially made dwellngÖ" Verily, even the *silpin* who built it felt astonishment saying, "The utmost perseverance would fail to accomplish such a work again; aho! How has it been achieved by me (so nonchalantly: *akasmat*)" and by the reason of it, the king was caused to praise his name.[96]

Such eulogies may truly define the imagined status of the ancient artist.

NOTES

1. Cf. R.N.Misra (n d.) "Anonymity of Ancient Artist" *Kalakshetra*, (Madras), Vol.V, no.4, pp.3-9.

2. Such views are no longer tenable and have been considered a-historical in content. Cf. Devangana Desai, (1984) "Reflections on Coomaraswamy's Approach to Indian Art", *Paroksha*, eds. G.M.Sheikh et al (New Delhi) p.61.

3. R.N.Misra (1975) Ancient Artist and Art Activity, (Simla).

4. Cf. S. Settar (1973) "Peregrination of Medieval Artist", *Journal of Indian History* (Trivendrum), 419-435; Srinivas V. Padigar, (1986), "Epigraphy and Some Aspects of the Early Chalukyan Art", *Journal of the Karnataka University* (Soc.Sc.), Vol. XXII, pp.74-88, Srinivas.V.Padigar (1988), "Craftsmen's Inscriptions from Badami and their Significance", eds. Ratan Parimoo et al, *Ellora Caves: Sculpture and Architecture* (New Delhi) pp.398-405

5. A.K.Singh (1993) "Minor Inscriptions from Khajuraho", *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bombay*, Vols.64-66, pp.222-237; R.N.Misra (1984) "Artist in Early Middle Ages", eds. Amita Ray et al, *Indian Studies: Essays Presented in Memory of Prof. Niharranjan Ray* (Delhi) pp.65-72, Fig.1.

6. Cf. Laxman S.Thakur (1986) "Artisans in Himachal Pradesh", *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 23,3, pp.303-312.

7. S. Kramarisch (1958) "Tradition of Indian Craftsman", *Journal of American Folklore*, Vol.71, no.281 (Philadelphia), pp.224-230.

8. S. Sivaramamurti (1934) "Artist in Ancient India" *Journal of Oriental Research* (Madras) Vol.7.pp.31-54; 158-199.

9. Cf. R.N.Misra (1990) "Indian Śilpa Tradition, śilpi and Aesthetics. . ." eds. S. Zingel Ave Lallemant and A.L.Dallapiccola, *Shastric Traditions in Indian Arts,* (Stuttgart) pp. 178-181.

10. Cf. R.N.Misra (1988) "śilpa", ed. Bettina Baumer, *Kalatattvakosa* Vol. I (IGNCA, New Delhi) pp.145-169.

11. Cf., V.S.Pathak and R.N.Misra (1986), "Words and Image in Reference to Technique in Indian Art", *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bombay*, Vols. 56-59, (1981-84 N.S.) pp.280-290.

12. *māmsamekah! pimśati sunayabhrtam, Ṛgveda*,1.161.10.

13. *priyā vyaktā taṣṭāni,Ṛgveda*, 10.66.5.

14. "*ni māyino māmire rūpa asmin, Ṛgveda*,3.87.7;3.87.9.In these references or even elsewhere the word *māyā* from the root *mi* implies acts relating to an object or things; for instance, *Cyavanah! sudair abhinīti vedī*, in the *Ṛgveda* 10.6.1.the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.5.3.3 where brick work is intended; or in the *Atharvaveda* 3.12.5 or 9.3.6 the term *māna* from the root *mi* is used for building. The term *nir-mā* similarly implies 'fashioning', 'making', 'producing' etc. by craftsmen. Cf., J. Gonda (1959) *Four Studies in the Language of the Vedas* (Gravenhage) p.67.

15. R.N.Misra (1975) quoting V.S.Agrawala.

16. *taksad yat Usanā sahasah sahah, Rgveda*,1.51.10.

17. *Saraswatī vayati peśo antarah, Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*,2.6.4.1.

18. Cf. *Ṛgveda* 1.119.7; 7.69 7 for *damśana; ibid*, 1.117.13; 1.112.8 for *śaci; ibid*, 1.39.1 for *kratu*. For *māyā*, cf. J.Gonda (1959) pp.119-193.

19. cf. *Rgveda*, 1.64.1 *apah na dhīrah manasā suhastyah* .According to Sāyana *dhīra* implies someone endowed with intellect (*dhīmān*), and *suhastya* refers to one who has 'good fingers" (*śobhanāguli*). Attention may be drawn to the *Ṛgveda* 5.2.11; 5.29.15 and to 1.67.5 (*sadmeva dhīrah samayā cakruh*), in this context.

20. Cf. J. Gonda (1959) pp.187 ff.

21. *Rgveda*, 10.61.23.

22. Ibid.7.82.4.Artisans also make a thunderbolt (*vajra*) for Indra, *ibid*.10.92.7.They figure in the coronation ceremony of a king. By certain special acts, they accord recognition to royalty. For the chariot maker (*rathakāra*), blacksmith (*karmāra*) and woodcarver (*taksan*), cf. R. S. Sharma (1983) *Material Culture and Social Formation* (Delhi). On *rathakūra*, cf. V. Jha (1974) "Status of Rathakāras in Early Indian History", *Journal of Indian History*, Vol.42 (1-3) pp.39-47.

23. Sacchidanand Mishra (1985) *Prachin Bharat men grama aur gramya jivan* (Gorakhpur)(In Hindi), pp.73-78, 24-26, 56-60 and 24 ff.: for discussion on different settlements like *vraja, chardi, pastya* and *grāma*.

24. These points have been discussed elsewhere and may not bear repetition here. Cf. R.N.Misra (1990) and (1975).

25. Cf. R.N.Misra (1988) p.155.

26. R.S.Sharma (1983) pp.74 ff.

27. Cf. Debi Prasad Chattopadhyaya (1977) *Science and Society in Ancient India* (Calcutta).

28. Āpastamba, 1.6.18; 1.9.14; Gotama, 17.7.17; Cf. R.N.Misra (1975), p. 6.

29. Ibid. pp. 4, 5.

30. The term *śaila-karma* and *śaila rūpa-karma* in the inscriptions of early Christian era apparently distinguish stonework from woodwork and thus indicate changes in techniques and medium employed by artisans. A new class of *śaila vardhakīs* seems to have emerged now with carpenters (*vardhakīs*) turning into workers on stone (*śailavardhakīs*). Svūmin, one such worker on stone, made the facade (*gharamugha*) of the rock-cut cave at Karla. Balaka, another such artist, did similar stone work at Kondane. Inscriptions from Karla and Kondane provide the relevant information. Cf., R.N.Misra (1975) pp.27, 24, 22.

31. Ibid., pp. 9-10. The *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya directs the state to protect *śilpīs*.The state also exercised control over manufactories (*śilpīśālās*) and regulated the salaries of artisans.

32. Cf. Rama Nath Misra (1978) *Bharatiya Murtikala* (In Hindi) p.35. In the *sutra* 5. 4. 95, Panini distinguishes between a village artisan (*grama taksan*) and a *taksan* who worked in his own workshop.

33. Cf. R,N,Misra (1975) p.8.

34. Cf. E.B.Cowell, Ed. Tr. (19??) *The Jātakas* Vol.II, p.18. Another *Jātaka* (no.461) refers to a chief of *vardhakīs*.

35. Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) p.9.

36. For a detailed discussion on the status and function of *gahapati*, Cf. Uma Chakravarti (1987) *Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism* (New Delhi) pp.65-93.

37. Cf. Himanshu P.Ray (1986) *Monastery and Guild: Commerce Under the Sātavahanas* (Delhi) p.111.

38. R.N.Misra (1975) pp. 8, 22-23; R.N. Mehta and S.N. Chaudhary (1966) *Excavations at Deonimori* (Baroda) 121,179

39. R.N.Misra (1975) p. 20. According to Patanjali, an artisan in the employment of a ruler was not entitled to work for people. Cf. Devangana Desai "Terracotta and Urban Culture in Ancient India", a paper presented in Indian History Congress (Calicut 1976). About political patronage to artists and craftsmen, Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) pp. 25-30.

40. Ibid. 10, 16, 17, 20-21, 17-18.

41. R.N.Misra (1982) "Titles and Designations of Artists in Epigraphs" *Sangrahalaya Puratatva Patrika* (State Museum, Lucknow), Vol.29-30 pp.35-38.

42. J. J. Jones, Tr. (1956) Vol. III pp.112, 443.

43. Nārada (5.2.8) includes *antevāsī* also among five different kinds of workers. The other four consisted of *bhrtaka*, the supervisor of the *bhritakas*, and *dāsa*. The *antevāsīs* were those apprentices who came from distant places for training and lodged with the master-craftsman.

44. For the inscriptions, Cf. R. C. Sharma (1976) *Mathura Museum and Art* (Mathura) p.29.

45. Yājñavalkya (2.14.8), Nārada (5.16-17) Brihaspati (16.6) and Kūtyūyana (713) ordain that an *antevāsī* could leave the house of his *ācārya* only with the permission of the latter. He was liable to punishment for dereliction from duty. But an *ācārya* was liable to punishment if he showed indifference to apprentice's work. Cf. R.N.Misra (1982) p.28.

46. Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) pp.16, 20-21.

47. *Epigraphia Indica* (1909-10) Vol.X :Luders List , inscription no.85.

48. Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) p.15.

49. Manu imposes 'forced labour' (*viṣṭi*) on *śilpins*. Cf. Devendra Nath Shukla (1984) *Uttara Bharat ki Rajasva Vyavastha* (In Hindi) (Allahabad) p.151-152.

50. Cf. Dines Chandra Sircar (1965) *Select Inscriptions* Vol. I No.67 (Delhi) p.179-80.
51. Cf. Karl J. Khandalavala Ed. (1992) *The Golden Age* (Marg Publications, Bombay)
52. The *Śukranīti* (II.128 ff) describes different types of workers and in a passage (II.148) it prescribes that each one of them should work, maintaining their identity by adhering to their respective marks: *ukta sanjñāna sva sva cinhair lañchitāṁśca niyojayet.*
53. *Ep, Ind.* XXIV, no. 35, p. 253.
54. *Ep.Ind.,* I. pp.162 ff.
55. *Er.Ind.* XIV, pp.188 ff.
56. K. K. Thapliyal 1996: 87,93,167.
57. Cf. Dines Chandra Sircar (1983) *Select Inscriptions* Vol. II No.24 (Delhi) p.121.
58. *Indian Antiquary* Vol. X p.164.
59. Cf. A.K.Singh (1993) pp.226-229.The author also refers to different artists in groups, pairs or alone engaged in sculptural or architectural work. The label inscriptions seem to suggest that there were different sets of artists to carve different sets of images. Thus, one group carved only Apsaras and leogriffs while the other worked exclusively on the figures of the cult gods and goddesses. Sometimes two or more artists worked to produce the same image. In a particular case, the artist seems to have produced an image of a cult god as well as a minor deity. Ibid.
60. Cf. A.V.Narasimhasmurty (1985) " A Study of Lable Inscriptions of Hoyasala Artists" *Indian Epigraphy and its Bearing on Study of Indian Art* Eds.Fredrick M. Asher and G.S.Ghai (New Delhi) p.216.
61. Cf.Alice Boner (1972) 257-272.
62. Cf. S.Settar et al (1982) "Artists of Memorial Stones: Chalukya-Hoyasala" *Memorial Stones* (Dharwad) p.381.The information is related to the artists who made memorial pillars.
63. Cf. R.N.Misra (1984) p.68.
64. Alice Boner (1972) p. 257-272.
65. Cf. R.N.Misra (1984) p.68.
66. *Epigraphia Indica* Vol. XXVII. pp. 210 ff.
67. Ibid. Vol. XIII. p.295.
68. Ibid. I. p.107, Vol. XI. p.463 . Also, Laxman Singh Thakur (1986) p.307.
69. Cf. C. Sivaramamurti (1962) *Indian Sculpture* (Delhi) pp.5-6.
70. Cf. R.N.Misra (1985) "A Note on the Nadlai Inscription of Kelhana", *Indian Epigraphy,* Ed. Fredrick M. Asher and G.S.Ghae, p.68.
71. Cf.R.N.Misra (1984) "Artist in the Middle Ages" *Indian Studies,* eds. Amita Ray et al (Delhi) p.68.
72. A Boner (1972) pp.257-72.
73. Cf., Frits Staal (1992) "Sutra" in *Kalatattvakosa, ed.,* Bettina Baumer, New Delhi: " IGNCA. p.302.
74. Ibid. For that reason, 'in early philosophy the terms like *grantha, tantra, prabandha, nibandha* etc., derive from the terminology of textile manufacture' and indicate binding together of ideas in the manner the *sutra*-s are bound together to form a piece of cloth. Stall 1992: 302 quoting Rau.
75. *Samarangana Sutradhara* of Bhojadeva (1966) Baroda: G.O.S.25, Line 1.
76. *Vakpadiyam* of Bhartrhari, ed., K.A. Subramania Iyer (1966) Delhi, III.9.4.
77. XXXV.30.
78. Kane's edition, I.15.
79. Radha Vallabha Tripathi (1992) "Sutradhara" in *Kalatattvakosa,* ed. Bettina Baumer, Vol II New Delhi: IGNCA, p.323
80. *Epigraphia Indica ,* Vol. I, p.146: *vijnana visvakarta dharmadharena sutradhararena Chhichchhabhidhena prasadah Pramathanathasya.*
81. Cf., R. N. Misra (1975) p.68.
82. *Ibid.,* p.69.
83. *Ibid.,* p. 70.
84. For instance, according to the *Rajatarangini* (III.348), the town of Srinagara was built after a *sutra* had been laid, marking the place for construction. The *Milinda Panho* (330) similarly refers to a 'city architect' who lays out and raises a city and when "the city was fully developed he might go away to another district". Cf., R.N.Misra (1975: 9). Also, cf., Frits Staal, Bettina Baumer, R. Tripathi (1992) "Sutra" in *Kalatattvakosa, ed.,.* Bettina Baumer, Vol. II, New Delhi: IGNCA, pp. 303-332.
85. *Epigraphia Indica* Vol. XXXVI, pp.47-48.
86. Ibid.Vol. XXXIV, pp. 47-49.
87. Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) p.58.
88. Cf. V.V.Mirashi (1955) *Inscriptions of the Chedi-Kalachuri Era,* CII., Vol. IV Part II, inscription no.93.
89. Cf. R.N.Misra (1975) pp.71, 72; also R.N.Misra (1984) p.68.
90. Cf. V.V.Mirashi (1955) inscription no.104.
91. Cf. R.N.Misra (1984) p.68.
92. Cf. Alice Boner (1974) pp.257-72.
93. Cf. S Settar et al (1982) p.323.
94. Cf. R.N.Misra (1985) eds. Asher and Ghae, p.191.
95. Cf. C. Sivaramamurti (1962) p.4.
96. J.F.Fleet, "Sanskrit and Old Canarese Inscriptions", *Indian Antiquary,* 12 (reprint, Delhi 1984), p.159, lines 14-17; translation, p.163.

Globalization, Governance and Human Development

GHANSHYAM SHAH

In the contemporary policy discourse, the concept of 'Human Development' (HD) occupies the central place. Not only global institutions like World Bank and United Nation Development Project (UNDP), but now most of the governments of different countries and many Indian federal states also prepare their annual HD reports based on the index of variables to watch their progress. There is almost consensus among the policy makers and the mainstream civil society that economic growth within neo-liberal economic policy (globalization) is prerequisite of HD. And, along with the growth, the emphasis is on 'good' governance to achieve the goal. The Tenth Five Year Plan of the Government of India observes, " Good governance is one of the most crucial factors required if the targets of the tenth Plan are to be achieved. It is also the factor, or rather lack of it, which could be the cause of immense disappointment and missed development opportunities (GOI 2002:177)." Again the Eleventh Plan, emphasizing on a vision of inclusive growth reiterates "reducing poverty and bridging the various divides that continue to fragment our society can only be achieved if there is a significant improvement in the quality of governance. "[1]

This paper critically examines the notion of HD as it is used in social science literature and policy documents in the context of market oriented economic growth. I shall then analyze performance of the Indian state in respect to HD. The exercise is based on available government and social science micro and macro data.

I

Theoretical Perspective

The concept of human development is complex and of multi-dimensions. In this paper I confine myself to the concept of HD as it is used in policy documents of the States and UNDP. It has gained currency with the efforts of the UNDP. Mahbub ul Haq, one of the architects of UNDP, spells out the concept in the following manner:

The basic purpose of development is *to enlarge people's choices.* In principle, these choices can be infinite and can change over time. People often value achievements that do not show up at all, or not immediately, in income or growth figures: greater access to knowledge, better nutrition and health services, more secure livelihoods, security against crime and physical violence, satisfying leisure hours, political and cultural freedoms and a sense of participation in community activities. *The objective of development is to create an enabling environment for people to enjoy long, healthy and creative lives* (1999:14 emphasis mine).[2]

This is indeed a laudable objective. How to attain such HD is, however, debatable. Such objective cannot be attained overnight. It is a long term process which calls for prioritization of the tasks and evolving strategies from time to time in a given and changing socio-cultural and economic situation to meet the targets. To initiate and sustain such process the rule of law, relative equality and freedom, the two pillars of socio-political systems, are important. They normatively provide equal opportunities irrespective of gender, race, creed or caste, for all people to 'empower' themselves and opt for choices according to their own preferences. In the process the existing wide gaps in inequalities – social, cultural and economic - need to be dealt with so as the gaps slowly decline. Inequalities in socio-economic status and power restrict the exercise of choices for those who are at the bottom of the ladder of the hierarchy. Greater the gap between the people in the higher echelon and at the bottom leaves the less well-off vulnerable. Such an inequitable system provides better and more opportunities to those of higher status, because of their network and socialization systems, than to those at the bottom end of society. More often than not in such a situation, the stratum at the upper echelon enjoys

Ghanshyam Shah is National Fellow at the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla

hegemony in the form of the value system and ideology over the latter. The elite, belonging to this stratum claim to represent the whole society. They articulate concepts and categories to view socio-cultural 'reality', identify 'problems' to be resolved, chart out the path and approach to 'development'. They construct and prioritize 'needs' to be met with for all (in the context of colonial hegemony and its impact on colonized see Nandy 1983, Ludden 1992). Hence, autonomy of the lower strata in identifying choices is very restricted.

In the present HD discourse dominated and articulated by the world financial institutions and the elite, it is now assumed, almost orchestrated, that market driven growth is the royal path to development. Alternative approaches for the development of human civilizations are believed to have been exhausted with the fall of the Soviet Union. Western capitalist societies have invented the ideal path to development for all people everywhere. According to some proponents of this path, human civilization has reached the end of history with a capitalist economy and liberal democracy. This is the final and inevitable destiny of civilization (Fukuyama 1992). It is argued that the state has actually curbed human freedom and incentives, and people are made dependent on the state for their development. Such a state is antithetical to the well-being of all – including of the poor. It is better therefore for the state to withdraw and confine itself to the minimum functions of maintaining law and order. In the contemporary dominant discourse the mantra is : let the economy flourish and be free from politics. The market is a dynamic force for self-corrections; and would make 'it possible for the separation of the economy from the political and cultural spheres of existence".[3] Bill Clinton asserted in 2004 before the World Economic Forum, "We have to reaffirm unambiguously that open markets are the best engine we know of to lift living standards and build shared prosperity".[4] The responsibility of the state is to facilitate market oriented economic growth. It is required to maintain macro-economic stability and guarantee property rights. This economic trajectory is considered to be sacrosanct. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, architects and monitors of the neo-liberal trajectory, claim that their policies are essentially apolitical in nature and simply reflect the 'value free' principles uncovered by 'positive economics' (Thomas 2000).

The champions of this trajectory emphasize good management, now euphemistically called good governance on the part of the state. Intervention of the state in the social sphere needs to be kept to a minimum. Given this, UNDP defines governance as "the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions, through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and mediate their differences ".[5] In the mechanism of governance, accountability and transparency are the core parameters, and so is equality before the law. But 'empowerment' and 'participation' of the people are often repeated, rarely spelled out particularly their operational part: how to attain them in a situation of unequal power relationship. Within this neo-liberal framework 'good governance' guarantees 'property rights' and the maintenance of macro-economic stability. But redistribution of growth – nationally and internationally – is not even mentioned. Relative equality in income, assets and opportunities is not on the agenda. Nor does it give importance to the social and economic security of the population. Needless to say, insecurity of job, income and health breeds uncertainties, anxiety and fear of unknown situations. Insecure persons tend to become vulnerable to the manipulation of power mongers. I would submit that without relative equality and social security accountability, transparency, decentralization, electoral democracy, though very important elements of 'governance, cannot in themselves contribute to human development.

II

Growth and Social Insecurity

India's economic growth in terms of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has been at an average around 3.5 per cent per year between 1950 and 1970s. During the period from 1980 to 2008 the GDP has gone up to 6 per cent, and in 2009-10 the government claims that it has reached to 7.5 per cent (Bose and Chattopadhyay 2010). Our policy makers now claim to be on the threshold of becoming world's economic power. A question arises: to what extent has the rise in GDP generated employment opportunities and what is the nature of employment?

In statistical terms the growth of employment – principal and subsidiary work together- as measured by National Sample Survey (NSS) shows a decline. The report of the National Commission for Enterprise in the Unorganised Sector (NCEUS), 2007 calculates that between 1993-94 and 2004-05 – that is in the decade when the neo-liberal reforms of the early 1990s started to take off – the rate of employment growth declined to 1.85 per cent from the previous ten years when it went up a little over 2 per cent on average. And the growth in employment has declined further in the recent years

between 2005 and 2008. "This is the lowest rate of employment generation in the last three decades, even lower than the previous spell of jobless growth of 1993-2000 when employment increased by less than 1 per cent per year (EPW 2010)." The downward trend is evident both in rural as well as urban areas in the first decade of this century.

Moreover, whatever the growth in employment that has been witnessed is mainly within the informal economy. With a 'flexibilisation' labour policy under liberalization the informal sector receives increasing importance in the production process (World Bank 1995, Breman 1995). Over a period of the last two decades the unorganized sector has generated more employment than the organized sector. In fact the proportion of the latter in providing employment declined from 7.24 per cent in 1991 to 6.38 in 1999. And it has further declined after 2000. At the same time, significantly the share of the organized sector in net domestic product has increased 36.7 per cent to 39.1 per cent; which is the reverse in the unorganized sector. The reason for this, however, is not due to the low or inefficient productivity of the unorganized workers. It is primarily because the organized sector uses capital intensive and labour saving technology. Moreover, several industries obtain many parts of their main product through subcontracting the work to the small-scale unorganized sector. By following such tactics the corporate sectors avoid management of labour and can also save taxes under MODVAT (Modified value added tax).[6]

The formal sector is one that employs more than ten workers and is registered under the Factories Act. Under the Act the industry is supposed to provide 'social security' to the workers. The provisions include weekly paid holiday, sick and casual leave, medical care, pension/provident fund etc. Under the statutory provisions Rules for hire and fire are stringent about providing security of job to the workers. But all those who work in the formal sector do not get these benefits. As many as 37.8 per cent of the workers in formal sector are in informal employment without any benefits of the formal sector (NCEUS 2007). Several private manufacturing companies flout rules under one or another pretext. They employ many workers on temporary contractual basis who do not get the benefits of various provisions of the social security. More than ninety-two per cent of the units of Small Scale Industries (SSI) have not registered under the Factories Act[7]. Social security in its various forms is available to less than five per cent of the labour force. The number of beneficiaries of the Employees State Insurance Scheme (ESIS) has not increased correspondingly with the rise in number of

factories in the 1990s. Special Economic Zones (SEZ) are free from labour laws. Elsewhere, liberalization has brought about increasingly relaxed labour laws in favour of the employers. The workers' right to strike has been attacked. It is now easier for the employers to 'fire' the workers at will. Those companies having one thousand workers do not require the government's permission to lay anyone off. Many big companies have reduced their labour force. For example, Tata Engineering and Locomotive reduced its staff by 10,000 (29 per cent) between 1996 and 2000. Tata Consultancy retrenched 1300 workers in 2009. Similarly Mahindra and Mahindra, Bajaj Auto, and Associated Cement Companies, to name but a few have gradually reduced the labour force by 30 per cent. One thousand workers were getting sacked in a single day in 2009. Some industries have reduced the pay of the workers. On the other hand their productivity and profit margins have increased. Tata Steel, for example, has reduced its labour force by 40 per cent while productivity has risen to 146 per cent (Spencer and Sanyal 2002). The proportion of 'casual labour' amongst the workforce has increased from 15.4 per cent in 1987-88 to 16.8 per cent in 1999-2000; and the trend remains more or less the same thereafter (NSS: 2010). The share of the 'self employed' remains more or less the same. The proportion of the 'regular employed' workers however, has declined during the same period (NSS 2001; and Kundu 1997). Many small-scale industries (SSI) do provide 'regular' employment, although not all who get regular employment in this sector have 'secure' jobs. One reason for this is that the mortality rate of the SSI industries is very high compared to the large industries as many entrepreneurs do not have enough capital and skill to sustain their place in the market. Nearly 10 per cent of the SSI units were 'sick' in 2000[8]. In fact, the growth of employment in this sector has declined from 13.21 per cent during 1971-80 to 8.15 per cent during the eighties and to 7.92 per cent during 1991-94 (Roy Chowdhury 2003). In several places these industries actually prefer to have a turnover of workers so that they need not pay social security benefits to all the workers. Employers prefer temporary workers because they have more control over them.

Several industries pay wages at piece-rates related to quantum of production, and workers are not paid on days they do not work. Weekly holidays or absence from work for health reasons are unpaid. Hence, people tend to work for as many days as they are offered work, and also for longer hours in order to reach the production levels that will pay them better. In small-scale industries such regular workers often labour for twelve to fourteen hours a day (Shah 1997). Needless to mention, that neither most

of the self-employed, nor casual workers, get work for a full year.

Contract labour is a common feature in big corporate industries, public sector industries, as well as SSIs. The operation of many cash crops such as sugarcane, tobacco, groundnuts, banana etc. and also tea and coffee plantations rely on the labour contract system. The system is also prominent in brick kilns, quarries and the construction industries of irrigation dams, roads and public buildings (Shah et. al. 1993). Labour is employed through middlemen called contractors or *mukadams* who not only recruit labour but also supervise their work. The contractors are responsible for the quality and quantity of production. The contractors frequently remove the workers from one unit to another to keep control over the workers. As a result, a majority of the labourers never have the opportunity to work for the same master for long periods. Workers are not paid directly by the factories, it is the contractors who pay their wages; generally less than the rates stipulated under the Contract Labour Act.

As the opportunities of stable regular employment decline workers are forced to take refuse in casual and self-employed work (Sarkar and Mehta 2010). They sell their labour and depend on the vagaries of market. Internal competition among themselves over selling material and labour has increased as their numbers in 'self-employed' activities have multiplied. In Ahmedabad one of the former mill workers said, "While selling drinking water, we have to fight like dogs to attract customers (Naronha and Sharma 1999:104)". As they live in a permanent state of anxiety, they become vulnerable to any temptation that caters for their immediate needs. Two dalit youths who participated in the 2002 carnage against Muslims in Gujarat told me that they were concerned with money. They worked for whoever paid them for any work (Shah 2004). Breman rightly observes, "Organised activities, even to pursue political aspirations, are no longer within the reach of the former mill workers. Their attention has been narrowed down to the immediate concern of taking care of themselves and the members of their households. In this scenario, there is no room for broad social engagement or long term perspective. Instead there is a need for them for survival that has made them vulnerable to political forces eager to divide them along communal lines[9]. The participation of the poor in the Gujarat 2002 massacre underscores fragmentation of the working class. The situation is similar in many urban areas of the country. In Bombay, the Shiv Sena and Maharashtra Navnirman Sena instigated attacks against workers from North India. Launching a "Me Mumbaikar" campaign, they propagate

that work must rightfully be given to Maharashtrians before the immigrants. Similar trend is emerging in Tamil Nadu where Karaunanidhi government plans to reserve jobs for Tamil speakers[10].

It is clear from the above evidence that the high growth rate has hardly helped the poor in terms of social security. At the most, the programmes like the proposed food security and employment guarantee scheme provide them some relief to keep their body and soul together. Of course, these programmes are not unimportant. Growth however, ironically is by and large a jobless with increasing dismantling of the organised sector. Markets have not evolved safety networks for the workforce and a large section of the population is without social and economic security. Inequality has clearly increased and has indeed sharpened in the post reform period (Sarkar and Mehta 2010). The Report on 'Human development in South Asia 2003' (MHHDC 2004) points out that overall focus of the multilateral organizations working in the region is focused more on GDP growth and balancing budgets, than on the reduction of poverty. The governments have not adopted job creation as an explicit policy commitment. And it hesitates, despite its promise before the elections, in providing social security to the workers in unorganized sector.

III

Poverty and Basic Needs

Statistically speaking, the proportion of people living below the poverty line has declined in India from around 54 per cent in the early 1950s to 33 per cent in 2000 and 27.5 per cent in 2004. There is however no significant decline in the absolute number. Around 300 million persons live below poverty line. It has been argued by several economists and planners that there was a steep downward trend in poverty during the late 1990s following the path of a structural adjustment programme. Liberalisation has accelerated economic growth and hence overall prosperity leading to the poor being able to escape poverty. Hence, economic growth is good for the poor (Dollar and Kraay 2002).

Many contest such statistical evidence. Some economists question the methodology of computation and interpretation of official data (Sen 2000; Mehta and Venkatraman 2000). According to some the trend is quite the opposite (Patnaik 2004). The intricacy of methodology is beyond my competence therefore I will not deal with that aspect. However, on the basis of my field work in Gujarat I will follow the observations of those social scientists who are themselves personally involved in

micro level studies. According to them, there is, at any rate, no obvious pattern of 'acceleration' or 'slowdown' in the rate of poverty during the 1990s (Deaton and Dreze 2002).

Even granting that poverty has declined, social discrimination continues. The poor from all social strata have not benefited equally. Among the poor the worse sufferers continue to be from the socially disadvantaged groups like Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Their process of coming out of the poverty line is slower than other groups. Severity of poverty is also very high among them (Sundaran and Tendulkar 2003). So is the case with women workers (Jhabvala 2003).

The downswing in the rate of poverty in the 1990s however does not reflect in the availability of food and nutrition intake of the people. There is a substantial decline in per capita calorie consumption during the last 25 years (Dealton and Dreze 2009). According to the economic Survey 1999-2000 of Government of India there has been a slow decline in the availability of per capita food-grains per day from 485 grams in 1991-92 to 427 grams per day in 2002-2003. For the bottom 30 per cent of the population, the per capita cereal expenditure at constant prices was almost stagnant during 1970-89 but declined during 1990-98. The national Family Health Survey also shows that in 1998-99 in rural areas nearly 50 per cent of the children were malnourished and in urban areas 39 per cent children were malnourished (Moderate and severe). "While India has made considerable progress in poverty reduction, the overall improvement in nutritional status has been rather slow. Economic growth although resulted in decline in income poverty but has not translated into either commensurable increase in food energy intake nor significant reduction in malnutrition (Radhakrishan et al. 2004: 3129)".[11]

More important is that the process of movement from poverty to non-poverty is not linear, as several micro studies warn us. Evidences from different parts of the country show that several families, identified as living the above poverty line also go down below poverty line. Aniruth Krishna's meticulous studies of Gujarat and Rajasthan villages bear out these facts. A study of 36 village communities of four districts in Gujarat (2003), one of the fastest developed states, nearly ten percent of the all village households escaped from poverty in the last 25 years, but another six per cent concurrently fell into poverty during the same period. He observes that "growth in the state hardly provided positive results all around; in fact, very different and opposite – pathways were travelled by different households."[12] Urban scenario is not much different. Jan Breman's study on Ahmedabad (2004) provides evidences of 'downward mobility' in the

city. Parshikar and Despande's study on Pune (2008) shows that 17 percent of the families have moved down in their occupation. The downward mobility was found across all the castes. Obviously, the families who are on the border of the above poverty line are the most vulnerable to become poor. But, thanks to the nature of our economic policy and fluctuating markets, some families who were at one point relatively better off are pushed below the poverty line (Shah 2010).

Potable Water

According to the Government of India's figures nearly 80 per cent of the population is provided with 'safe drinking' water. The figures do not tell us how frequently and in what quantity people get potable water. We must ask, too, how safe is the safe water? For instance in Gujarat Government claims to provide 'drinking water' to over 90 per cent of the villages. But as many as 25 per cent of the villages get no water at all, not to speak of 'safe' water for nearly three months when their tanks, wells and rivers dry up. They have to wait several hours for tankers and/ or walk more than 2 km to get a bucket of water. Similarly, according to General Manager of the State's Water Works department, groundwater in 36 districts in UP was not fit for drinking water in 2003. In most of the urban areas the majority of the residents get piped water for less than one hour a day in summer. Moreover, only 19 per cent of the urban poor had house-level water connection as compared to 62 per cent of the non-poor in 2006.[13] In urban slum localities people wait in long queues for several hours to get a bucket of water. According to a national survey carried out by Public Affairs Centre (PAC) 25 per cent of the households reported breakdowns of taps/hand-pumps once in three months. Sometimes it takes several weeks to get these repaired. Only 27 per cent of households were fully satisfied with the quality of water and 20 per cent were satisfied with the adequacy of water (Paul et. al. 2004).

Newspaper reports on the incidents of contamination of water are frequent. Many chemical industries pollute river and ground water so making drinking water even more unsafe for the poor residents. Pollution of Ganga near Lucknow and Kanpur in UP, Tapi in Gujarat and Godavali in Andhra Pradesh are examples of this. Drinking water often gets contaminated with traces of cadmium, fluoride, arsenic, nitrates, lead and also uranium. In Punjab 87 per cent of the children below 12 years have uranium levels high enough to cause diseases because of the high level of uranium in drinking water.[14] In several areas industries overuse groundwater for their manufacturing plants depriving the surrounding villages

of the source of water. In Goa five star hotels store water for the customers that, in turn, deprive the nearby villagers of their share. The plants for beverages and so-called mineral water use common resources of stream and ground water at the cost of the local inhabitants. The continuous pumping of water from the bore-wells to meet the requirements of these factories has led to a significant decline in the supply of water in the surrounding area. Moreover, the water from these depleting sources has become saline and hard, unsafe for drinking (George 2002).

Health and Health Care System

Infant mortality rate (IMR) has gone down significantly from 146 in 1951 to 110 in 1980 and reduced further to 90 in 1990. But then it has remained more or less at the same level throughout the 1990s and thereafter. There is a striking variance, more than twice, of IMR between the upper and lower strata. IMR rate for the poorest 20 per cent is 97 per 1000 live-births, whereas for the richest 20 per cent it is only 38. One finds the same pattern in the anaemic condition of women across the strata. 60 per cent of the lower strata of society suffer from anaemia, as against 41 per cent women of the upper strata. Incidents of Tuberculosis, Malaria, and respiratory infections over a period are increasing. Diarrhoea and gastro/hepatitis continue to remain endemic both among the urban and rural poor. Simultaneously, the cases of HIV/AIDS are rising. And death by different communicable diseases such as dengue, cholera, kala-azar, hepatitis, malaria, swine flu etc. is not declining.

Private, charitable/voluntary and public health care systems existed, though on a small scale and largely in urban centers before independence. In the fifties the government made concentrated efforts to develop the public health system with emphasis on the primary health care system. Besides starting primary health centers (PHCs) and sub-centres public hospitals began to grow both in number and facilities. However from the 1970s onwards the government spending on health care has remained more or less stagnant. During 2009-10 the Union government has allocated 2.1 per cent of its total expenditure for health which comes to 0.35 per cent of GDP. Gradually, private health sector has taken over the voluntary and public health care system. 19 per cent of the hospitals in 1974 were private. Their proportion increased to 45 per cent in 1984 and 68 per cent in 1996. Many public hospitals including PHCs are under-equipped in terms of staff, physical infrastructure and medicines. Moreover they are over burdened as the overwhelming majority of the patients from the lower strata who cannot afford the higher charges of the private hospitals and therefore use public hospitals. Furthermore, many of the medical and paramedical staff from the urban middle class are indifferent to poor patients (Paul et al. 2004). The private sector has increased its share of outpatients and inpatients since the 1980s. Two-thirds of the patients of the private hospitals are relatively rich. Household consumption expenditure on health care has increased from 5.4 per cent in rural and 4.6 per cent urban areas in 1993-94 to 6.6per cent and 5.2 per cent respectively in 2004-05 (Bonu et al 2007). The poor have to spend a disproportionately higher percentage of their incomes on health services than the rich. One incidence of hospitalization forces poor households to borrow money and then pay high interest for many years (Baru et al 2010). In addition they also lose wages for being absent from their workplaces. This, in turn, compels them to delay seeking treatment. According to NSS more than three-quarters of their spending is on minor ailments, infectious and communicable diseases. Nearly 20 per cent of the poor do not seek treatment for financial reasons. Because of the expenses incurred during illness as many as 3.5 per cent of the population falls below the poverty line in one year (Baru et al 2010).

Education

Over five decades the literacy rate has gone up from 18.33 per cent in 1951 to 65 per cent in 2001. The rate of female literacy also improved faster during the 1990s. This has, of course, reduced the difference in the male-female literacy rate from 24.84 in 1991 to 21.7 in 2001. According to the Sixth All-India Education Survey (1999) 71.18 per cent villages have primary schools. And 94 per cent of the rural population has access to primary schools within a distance of one km. The enrolment ratio of children in the age group of 6-11 years has reached 95 per cent. However enrolment does not necessarily mean that students are retained for at least five years. The dropout rate from class I to V has not declined significantly. It was 40-67 per cent in 2000-2001; and was 42.6 per cent in 1990-91. Around 142 million children still do not have access to primary education due to either unavailability of schools or/and their socio-economic condition (Malik 2010). Moreover, infrastructure facilities- buildings, drinking water, blackboards, classrooms etc.- are not evenly available in all schools. According to a survey, one fourth of the teachers in primary schools do not regularly attend those schools (World Bank 2004). In rural areas, 60 to 70 per cent of the children belonging to different classes sit in one dilapidated room and are being taught various subjects simultaneously by a single teacher

(Shiv Kumar 2003). Moreover, monthly per capita household expenditure for education in the last decade has sharply increased for all the groups of the population. Even the expenditure of the poor households who somehow send their children to either public or private schools has been doubled (Tilak 2009).

Moreover, the gap in quality of education has widened between the disadvantaged and well off sections in the last four decades. There are three types of schools within the system. These are: (a) government run schools, (b) private schools for the poor and middle classes, and (c) elite schools for the rich. Particularly in urban areas, the number of schools of the latter two categories has increased significantly. Such schools are expensive and claim to provide a 'better education' than the government managed schools. But all private schools are not of the same standard. A few which are well equipped are meant for the very rich. Most of the private schools (particularly of the second category) do not give better education than the government schools. More than 85 per cent of the private primary schools are unrecognised and they account for 38 per cent of all primary schools and 42 per cent of total enrolment (Ahluwalia 2010). Anomaly in schooling reflects in access to higher education and employment. A student educated in elite private schools has a far better chance of gaining admission to higher education and better-paid employment than a student from government schools. By far the largest number of applicants for admission to management schools, technology faculties, medical colleges, top institutions in various fields, administrative services etc. have received their schooling in private elite institutions. Earlier literacy and schooling was a source of upward mobility for the poor, but it no longer helps them as economic opportunities to improve their condition have sunk. Ironically, the system of education simply perpetuates inequality in society; and will continue to do so despite the new Right to Education Act. .

The Impasse

Of course, it is beyond doubt that basic amenities have increased with the passage of time with varying speed and quality. The poor do indeed have more access to them than they did in the past. Yet only 40 per cent of the population enjoys all the basic amenities. One fifth of the households still live in a state of 'abject', or a 'moderate' state of deprivation, such as too little drinking water, lack of *pucca* (brick) houses and literacy, not to speak of access to health services. The quality of these services and satisfaction with them are far from being at a desirable level (Srinivasan and Mohanty 2004). With the present

rate of growth it must be asked how many more decades the country would require to provide basic amenities and provide quality services (health care and education) that satisfy the citizens?

In the midst of certain improvements there are also some disturbing reversals. As mentioned above, IMR has almost stagnated in the last decade. The nutrition levels and calorie intake of the poor have declined. 12 million people suffer from Vitamin A deficiency. Wages of the farm and non-farm sector workers in different parts of the country have not increased in correspondence with rising prices. Hence their capacity has remained as low as in the 1980s. Despite a surplus of 65 million tons food grains, 200 million people go hungry and 50 million people are on the brink of starvation. People in some parts of the country continue to die because of chronic hunger. And the incidents of farmers' suicide in the last five years have increased in several parts of the country. Inequality across the social/occupational groups has increased during the last decade (Dealton and Dreze 2002, Sarkar and Mehta 2010). Along with this, discrimination based on gender and caste continues to perpetuate. There is a striking decline in female-male ratio among children, from 945 girls per 1000 boys (in the 0-6 age group) in 1991 to 927 girls per 1000 boys in 2001. Domestic violence against women shows no sign of decline. The practice of dowry has increased in various social groups where it never existed in the past. Similarly, atrocities against the dalits, tribals and minorities have continued unabated. And, the number of incidents of rioting and killing of Muslims has also increased at an alarming rate in the last decade.

IV
Growth and Human Development

It is true that economic growth has contributed to some extent in a reduction of destitution. Over the last five decades more and more poor people, in comparison to the past, have gained some access to certain public services such as food, education, modern health services and 'safe' drinking water. IMR and longevity have improved. Statistically speaking the HD index has moved from 0.416 in 1975 to 0.609 in 2009. With the present rate of growth other things remaining constant, India would require at least the next sixty years to attain a high position in the HD index.

Those countries, which already have high HD, are also in the race for high economic growth. In these countries unemployment is rising and a wage freeze is being introduced. Health and education are increasingly being

privatized. There are also more cuts every year on social security provisions such as unemployment benefits and healthcare costs. The cuts in the social sectors have been made not because of a decline in rates in economic growth, but because of the state's unwillingness to tax profiteers from public goods. In India and elsewhere, the state increasingly protects Capital, provides subsidies, all kinds of concessions and infrastructure facilities to industrial entrepreneurs. Andre Gorge argues:

The social security system must be reorganized, and new foundations put in its place. But we must also ask why it seems to have become impossible to finance this reconstruction. Over the past twenty years, the EU countries have become 50 to 70 per cent richer. The economy has grown much faster than the population. Yet the EU now has twenty million unemployed, fifty million below the poverty line and five million homeless. What has happened to the extra wealth? From the case of the United States, we know that economic growth has enriched only the best-off 10 per cent of the population. This 10 per cent has garnered 96 per cent of the additional wealth. Things are not quite bad in Europe, but they are not much better.

"In Germany since 1979 corporate profits have risen by 90 per cent and wages by 6 per cent. But the revenue from income tax has doubled over the past ten years, while the revenue from corporate taxes has fallen by a half. It now contributes a mere 13 per cent of the total tax revenue, down from 25 per cent in 1980 and 35 per cent in 1960. Had the figure remained at 25 per cent, the state would have annually netted an extra 86 billion Marks in recent yearsÖDevelopments have been similar in other countries.[15]

As we have seen in the case of India the economic growth has not generated enough employment. The present-day development of high technology reduces the requirement for human-labour. It is capital intensive. As a result, "the global employment situation is grim and getting grimmer," ILO observes, "Social exclusion of the most vulnerable is intensifying.[16]"

On the other hand, 95 multinationals of India's top 900 companies have increased their share of profits from 7.70 per cent of total profits in 1994-95 to 10.82 per cent in 2002-2003. The growth rate of their net profit was 225.05 during the period. Despite their poor sales, their profits have increased because their expenditure on salaries and wages fell from 11.99 per cent in 1994-95 to 10.70 per cent in 2002-03. The rise in profit is also tax-free. At the global level the tax yield from corporate profits fell by 18.6 per cent between 1989 and 1993. Their proportion of total fiscal revenue has gone down by nearly a half (Beck 2000: 5). In India, during the last decade corporate taxes have not only been reduced but industries have received several concessions to boost production and marketing. Last year (2009) the Indian government had given away almost Rs. 60,000 crores as tax cuts to manufacturers of cars, consumable durables etc.[17] At the same time the 'black economy', estimated at around 60 per cent continues to dominate the Indian economy (Kumar 1999; Harris-White 2003). Tax evasion is rampant, as high as 50 per cent, as observed by the Comptroller Auditor General in the recent Study.[18]

The purpose of economic growth in the capitalist mode of production is enhancement of private profit. It provides incentive to Capital to make investments which encourage growth. To this end markets have to be expanded and new ones invented. Hence, such growth is geared not only to cater for the existing needs of the population, but it also has to manufacture needs as well as create greed in society. Consumerism is promoted, and that breeds a sense of envy among those who cannot possess what the others have; as one advertisement puts it: "owner's pride is neighbour's envy." In the process the relative deprivation and poverty are perpetuated. The champions of such models of development glorify and legitimize inequality. The former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher advocated, "It is our job to glory in inequality, and see that talents and abilities are given vent and expression for the benefit of us all".[19] Incentive for entrepreneurship is of course necessary for the growth of wealth and society provided they are used for social goods. A more important question is: what should be the ratio of inequality? In India an agricultural labourer or casual labour earns an average of Rs. 6,000 a year, not to speak of a labourer in a drought prone area who barely earns Rs. 3000.Whereas, the top chief executive officers of the corporations earn an average of Rs. 60 lakhs; not to speak of those at the very top who get above Rs. 90 lakhs plus many additional perks. Gap between poor and rich has widened glaringly in the last three decades.

The expansion of all kinds of industries as well as 'development' projects like irrigation dams, thermal power, roads etc. take away resources such as land, forest, river and marine-life that had been used by the poor people for their livelihoods. Forest areas are decreasing every year and so is biodiversity. Environmental degradation continues unabated. Ground and river water, land as well as crops–vegetables and food-grains - get contaminated with industrial effluents. With high industrial growth and consumption, the quantum of solid waste is mounting. Seven largest of the 100 or so industrial development estates in India produce 2.20 lakh tons of hazardous waste a year. As a result, natural resources are not only quickly becoming depleted but also endangering the environment. It is now estimated that if the present rate of climate change continues, thanks to industrial technologies and the greenhouse effect, more

than one million plant and animal species would become extinct by 2050. Those who would suffer most would be the people from the developing countries[20].

In the present uncontrolled market-driven growth only those can survive who have capacity to produce more and expand markets, and those who can buy more and more. In order to increase the purchasing capacity people are pushed in to a rat race, competing with each other for scarce goods. Space for individual choice and autonomy is decreasing. The philosophy of social Darwinism dominates the lifestyle of the well off. The rest are pushed to imitate the rich for their survival or else they get eliminated from existence. Oswaldo De Rivero persuasively argues,

The underlying Darwinism of the neoclassical, ultra-liberal message that inspires current capitalist globalisation, turns the economy into the paramount factor determining all other options, whether political or social and even cultural; nothing could be closer to the Marxist ideology. However, the archetype is not the robot-like *homo sovieticus*, but rather the *homo economicus*, whose sole motivation is money, the ability to consume more material goods, who is aggressively competitive, a kind of predator loose in the Darwinian jungle of social and economic deregulation. In this jungle, not only companies but also individuals, each social group, each community, must be fittest, the strongest, the best. Those who are not competitive must be eliminated from the economic arena, regardless of social, moral or environmental implications. This is a zero-sum game, where there is no co-operation. You win or you lose.[21]

There is enough historical and contemporary evidence to show that uncontrolled market driven growth is self-destructive for human civilization. It is dangerous for the environment. It is unsustainable and increasingly becoming devoid of ethical values for common goods. Its potential for enhancing human development is questionable. The market is indifferent to the needs of the majority of the people whose purchasing capacity is limited. The corporate sectors - local or trans-nationals - do not take social responsibilities though they talk about social commitments. More often than not many of them do not even take responsibility for the welfare of their own employees. Managing Director of the IMF, Michel Camdessus, also accepts the negative aspects of the free market:

A new paradigm of development is progressively emerging. . . A key feature of this is the progressive humanization of basic economic concepts. It is now recognized that markets can have major failures and that growth alone is not enough and can even be destructive of the natural environment and of social and cultural goods. Only the pursuit of high-quality growth is worth the effort. . . growth that has human person in the center. . . A second key feature is the convergence between respect for ethical values and the search for economic efficiency and market competition.[22]

V

Overview

Economic growth is important but not panacea for HD. There is no significant relationship between the level of growth and a decline in poverty. At the most the relationship is weak and does not take into consideration the households that were not poor but have then become poor in the high growth regions (Krishna et al. 2003, Shah 2010). More important, there is no relationship at all between market-driven growth and the level of HD. Some of the Scandinavian countries stand higher in HD than the USA and UK, though their economic growth is not higher than the latter. So is the case with Sri Lanka in South Asia and Kerala in India. The present market-driven economic growth does not facilitate "good and safe working conditions, freedom to choose jobs and livelihoods, freedom of movement and speech, liberation from oppression, violence and exploitation, security from persecution and arbitrary arrest, a satisfying family life, the assertion of cultural and religious values, adequate leisure time and satisfying forms of its use, a sense of purpose in life and work, the opportunity to join and actively participate in the activities of civil society and a sense of belonging to a community."[23] The present nature of growth is jobless and does not provide social and economic security to the majority of the workers. In fact it generates more and more insecurity and inequality. It legitimizes social Darwinism. Excessive market oriented growth is as dangerous and disastrous as excessive statism. The market has rightly been considered, " from Marx to Schumpeter, as an 'anarchic', 'subversive', 'revolutionizing' entity, and a disorganising pattern of social arrangements. At best, the market's contribution to the creation of social order is strictly contingent upon its being firmly embedded in constraints, restrictions, regulations, limitations, status rights, and informal social norms imposed upon it from the outside, by either the state or the community."[24] The role of the state in social management and an even distribution of benefits generated from growth is very important in facilitating HD. The prevailing ideology is of market oriented economic system which does not address the issue of distribution. In fact, it has reinforced old forms of insecurity and created "new ones of a magnitude, complexity and urgency never encountered before in the history of humanity."[25]

NOTES

1. Government of India, Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007-2012, *Inclusive Growth*, Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2008, p.223.

2. Mahbub Haqua, *Reflections on Human Development*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999, 14.

3. Harriss-White Barbara., *India Working. Essays on Society and Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p.2.

4. www.answers.com/topic/world-economic forum, accessed on September 21, 2010.
   Similar patronizing mission was launched by Harry Truman who put 'world development' on America's agenda said in 1949, "... We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.
   More than half of the people in the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is handicap and a threat both to them and to our prosperous areas...
   I believe we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development (Cited in Ludden 1992; 248)".

5. *Governance for Sustainable Human Development, A UNDP Policy Document*. New York. UNDP,1997, p.12.

6. Under the scheme of Modified Value added tax, the taxes are born by small-scale industries, and since their inputs are cheap, then pay fewer taxes than large firms.

7. Estimate is based on the Second All-India Census of SSIs in 2004-05.

8. Reserve Bank of India classified SSIs into four categories on the basis of bank advances: standard, sub-standard, doubtful and loss. " As soon as the advances come under the category doubtful position" of the concerned unit, it is classified as 'sick'. Third Survey of Small scale Industries. Governement of India. 2004.
   A recent study (2009) observes, "Industrial sickness is growing at an annual rate of about 28per cent and 13per cent respectively in terms of number of units and out standing number of bank credit. It is reckoned that as of today there are more than 2 lakhs sick units with an outstanding bank credit of over Rs7000crore nearly 29000 units are added to sick list every year. www.articlesbase.com, Business, Small Business accessed on 16 Sept. 2010

9. Jan Breman, *The Making and Unmaking of an Industrial Working Class*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004, p. 221.

10. *The Times of* India, June 29, 2010

11. Low level of nutrition is, however, not indication of poverty alone. It is also because of food taboos as well as changed life style and marketing of the consumable commodities.

12. Anirudh Krishna, 'Falling into Poverty: Other Side of Poverty Reduction", *Economic and Political Weekly*. 38 (6) February 8, 2003,p.11.

13. Urban Health Resource Centre, http://uhrc.in/module-ContentExpress-display-ceid-92.html accessed on 12th October. 2010.

14. *The Times of India,* June14, 2010.

15. Beck Ulrich Beck. 2000. *What is Globalization*. London: Polity Press, 2000, pp. 5-6.

16. Caroline Thomas. 2000. *Global Governance, development and*

17. *Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality*. London: Pluto Press, 2000, p. 31.

18. *The Times of India*, July 21, 2010.

19. *Ibid.*, July7, 2010.

20. Thomas,*Global Governance, development and Human Security*, p.14.

21. *Hindustan Times*, January 9, 2004.

22. Oswaldo Deivero, *The Myth of Development: The non-viable Economies of the 21ˢᵗ Century*. London: Zed Books, 2001, p.80.

23. Thomas,*Global Governance, development and Human Security*, p.93.

24. Paul Streeten, "Ten years of Human development". *In Human Development Report 1999*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999, p.17.

25. Claus Offle, 2000. "Civil society and social order: demarcating and combining market, state and community". *Archives europèennes de sociologie*, 41 (1), 2000, p.89.

26. Barbara Harriss-White, 2003. *India Working. Essays on Society and Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p.2.

WORKS CITED

Ahluwalia Isher Judge. 2010. "Social Sector Development", in Acharya Shankar and Raakesh Mohan (Ed.) *Indian Economy: Performance and Challenges*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Baru Rama, Acharya A., Acharya S., Shiva Kumar and Nagaraj K. 2010. "Inequalities in Access to health Services in India: Caste, Class and Region", *Economic and Political Weekly* 45 (38) September 18, 2010.

Beck Ulrich. 2000. *What is Globalization*. London: Polity Press.

Bonu S., Bhusan I. and Peters D. 2007. *Incidence. Intensity and Correlates of Catastrophic Out-of-Pocket Health Payments in India*. Working Paper. Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Bose Amitava and Chattopadhyay S.. 2010. " The Analytics of Changing Growth Rates", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45 (28) July 10, 2010.

Breman Jan. 1995. " Labour, Get Lost. A Late capitalist Manifesto". *Economic and Political Weekly* . 30 (37) September 16.

Breman Jan, 2004. *The Making and Unmaking of an Industrial Working Class*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Deaton Angus and Dreze Jean. 2002. "Poverty and Inequality in India: A Re-Examination" . *Economic and Political Weekly*. 37 (36) September 7.

Deaton Angus and Dreze Jean. 2009. " Food and Nutrition in India: Facts and Interpretations". *Economic and Political Weekly*. 44 (7) February 14.

Dollar David and Kraay Aart. 2002. " Growth is good for the poor". *Journal of Economic Growth. 7*.

EPW. 2010. "Jobless Growth" *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(39) September 25, 2010.

Fukuyama Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

George Abey, 2002. 'Affluence and poverty', In Lead India (ed.) *Rio, Johansesburg and beyond: India's progress in Sustainable Development.* Hyderabad: Orient Longman.

GOI (Government of India). 2002. *Tenth Five Year Plan, 2002-2007. Dimensions and Strategies.* Delhi: Planning Commission.

GOI (Governemnt of India). 2008. *Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007-2012. Inclusive Growth.* Delhi: oxford University Press.

Haqu Mahbub Ul. 1999. *Reflections on Human Development*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Harriss-White Barbara. 2003. *India Working. Essays on Society and Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jhabvala Renana. 2003. "Liberalization and Women". *Seminar* 531. November.

Krishna Anirudh 2003. 'Falling into Poverty: Other Side of Poverty Reduction", *Economic and Political Weekly*. 38 (6) February 8.

Krishna A. Kapila M., Porwal M. and Singh V. 2003. "Falling into Poverty in a High-Growth State". *Economic and Political Weekly*. 38 (36) December 6.

Kumar Arun. 1999. *The Black Economy in India*. New Delhi: Penguin

Kundu Amitabha. 1997. 'Trends and Structure of Employment in the 1990s: Implication for urban Growth'. *Economic and Political Weekly*. 32 (24). June

Ludden David. 1992. " India's Development Regime", in Nicholas B. Dirks (ed) *Colonialism and Culture.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Malik Ashok, 2010. "Set Priorities Right", *The Times of India*. September 17, 2010.

Mehta Jaya and Venkatraman. 2000. "Poverty Statistics: Bermicide's Feast". *Economic and Political weekly*. 35 (27) July 1.

MHHDC (The Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre). 2004. *Human development in South Asia 2003: The Employment Challenge* Karanchi: Oxford University Press.

Nandy Ashis. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Naronha, E and R.N. Sharma. 1999. ' Displaced workers and withering welfare state', *Economic and Political Weekly*. 34 (23)

NCEUS. 2007. *Report on Social Security for Unorganized Workers*. Delhi: Ministry of Small Scale Industries, GOI.

NSS. 2001 *Employment and Unemployment in India 1999-2000. Key Results*. Delhi: National Sample Survey Organisation Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, GOI.

NSS. 2006. *Employment and Unemployment Situation Among Social Groups in India 2004-05*. Delhi: National Sample Survey Organisation Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, GOI.

NSS. 2010. *Employment and Unemployment Situation in India 2007-08*. Delhi: National Sample Survey Organisation Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation, GOI.

Offe Claus, 2000. "Civil society and social order: demarcating and combining market, state and community". *Archives europeùennes de sociologie*, 41 (1).

Palshikar Suhas and Deshpande R. 2008. Intergenerational Occupational Mobility across Caste Groups: A Study of Pune City. Pune: University of Pune.

Patnaik Utsa. 2004. " Rural India in Ruins." *Frontline*. February 28.

Paul Samuel, Balkrishnan Suresh, Gopakumar K., Sekhar Sita, and Vivekananda. 2004. "State of India's Public services, Benchmark for the States", *Economic and political Weekly39 (9) February 28, 2004*.

Radhakrisna R., Hanumantha Rao K., Ravi C. and Reddy B. 2004. "Chronic Poverty and Malnutrition in 1990s". *Economic and Political Weekly. 39(28) July 10*.

Roy Chowdhury. 2003. "Old Classes and New Spaces Urban Poverty, Unorganised Labour and New Unions" *Economic and Political Weekly*. 38 (50) December 13.

Rivero Oswaldo De. 2001. *The Myth of Development: The non-viable Economies of the 21st Century*. London: Zed Books.

Sarkar Sandip and Mehta B. 2010. "Income Inequality in India: Pre-and post-Reform Periods", *Economic and Political Weekly*. 45 (37) September 11.

Sen Abhijit. 2000. Estimate of Consumer Expenditure and Its Distribution: Statistical Priorities after NSS 55th Round". *Economic and Political Weekly*. 35 (51) December 16.

Spencer Michael and Sanyal Sanjeev. 2002. "Will India challenge China?" *Global Market Research Deutsche Bank*. December 18.

Shah Ghanshyam, Kannan K.P., Bose Pradeepkumar and

Hargopal G. 1993. *Migration in India.* New Delhi: National commission of Rural Labour, government of India.

Shah Ghanshyam. 1997. *Public health and Urban development: The Plague in Surat.* Delhi: Sage Publications.

————, 2004. Under-privileged and Communal Carnage: A case of Gujarat. (15th Wertheim lecture). Amsterdam: Amsterdam School.

————, 2010. "The Poor: Beneficiaries to Citizens", *Indian Journal of Human Development.* 4 (1).

Shiv Kumar A.K. 2003. "Common School System: End Apartheid in Education." The *Times of India.* November 22

Streeten Paul. 1999. "Ten years of Human development". *In Human Development Report 1999.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Sundaram K. 2001. " Employment and Poverty in 1990s, Further Results from NSS 55th Round – Employment-Unemployment Survey, 1999-2000'. *Economic and Political Weekly.36 (32) August 11.*

Sundaram K. and Tendulkar Suresh. 2003. "Poverty among Social and economic Groups in India in 1990s." *Economic and political Weekly 38(50)* December 13.

Srinivasan K. and Mohanty S.K. 2004 "Deprivation of basic Amenities by Caste and region, Empirical Study Using NFHS Data". *Economic and political Weekly.39 (7)* February 14.

UNDP. 1997. Governance for Sustainable Human Development, A UNDP Policy Document. New York. UNDP.

Thomas Caroline. 2000. *Global Governance, development and Human Security: The Challenge of Poverty and Inequality.* London: Pluto Press.

Tilak. J.B.G. 2009. "Household Expenditure on Education and Implications for Re-defining the Poverty Line in India". (Paper prepared for the Planning Commission) Delhi. Planning Commission

World Bank. 1995. *World development Report 1995. Workers in an Integrating World.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

World Bank. 2004. *World development Report 2004.Making services Work for the Poor people.* Washington: World bank.

The Middle Class in India: An Overview

RITA KOTHARI

Sai Paranjape's acclaimed film *Katha* (1983) shows the protagonist Rajaram Pushottam Joshi living in a chawl in Bombay in India of the 1980s. Dressed in a half-sleeved shirt and slightly shapeless trousers, he missed his first bus to work almost every single day. The city transport bus required a passenger to muscle his way on board, brutally elbowing aside anyone who got in the way. But Rajaram was constrained by his own norms of civility and fairness. So he got left behind at the bus stop, along with an old toothless woman — two timorous souls who would not, or could not summon up the aggression and ruthlessness demanded by metropolitan life.

The visual imagery returns to the spectator as Rajaram goes through several comic-tragic travails; the mockery he evokes by putting up a Hindi (not English) name-plate on his door, his ineptness at wooing a girl or an employer, and his overall belief that it was alright to live in middle-class housing. The middle-class-ness forms the fulcrum of this essay which aims to highlight the various discourses around this human condition and maps the field to raise questions that remain unasked and unanswered.

I

To my mind, Rajaram was one of the last members of a vanishing class that made do with what it had, lacking in the aspiration, the drive and the inventiveness, and more importantly, the desire to be elsewhere. As a Brahmin with enough education and respectability for a safe and secure job, he was member of the middle class. However, in films, made barely a decade after *Katha*, Rajaram was replaced and forgotten, consigned to the dustbin of of an era barely remembered. What we encounter instead, starting with the onset of the 1990s, the decade marking India's entry into the global market through the economic reforms of 1991 — are young(er)

Indians. Hailing from small towns (*Bunty aur Babli*, 2005), or 'old' middle-class families in Bombay (*Rangeela*, 1995) and Delhi (*Oye Lucky! Lucky Oye!*, 2008) and (*Khosla Ka Ghosla*, 2006). Raring to redefine themselves, they represent the expanding middle class. Shedding what they do not want (clerical jobs, restrictive circumstances) and eagerly embracing all that India after liberalisation had to offer (money, the English language, brand names, career opportunities) they stand out by their desire to do well.[1]

The class they represent is 'the darling of the official discourse and policy makers'and one that 'sets the terms of reference of Indian society' (Jaffrelot and Van der Veer, 2008 : 19). In the city of Ahmedabad where I live, this class is the addressee for whom the new flyovers are built, and hoardings announcing posh houses with attributes such as 'real aura' and 'truly elite' and 'sheer solace,' put up to seduce them into the fantasy of belonging to a middle class that is not just Ahmedabadi, or Indian, but global.[2]

The characteristics outlined above are used to both identify and define what the marketers and sociologists have called the 'new middle class.' Its newness and growing visibility "embodies the emergence of a wider national culture, one that has shifted from older ideologies of a state-managed economy to a middle class culture of consumption." (Fernandes, 2007). Hatcher notes that "It is connected in complex ways with the South Asian diaspora, sharing spiritual truths and habits of consumption throughout a web of global trade, travel and entertainment...Freed from the need to labor, and flush with capital, this middle class expresses and defines itself in the marketplace"[3]

The size of this class is debatable and its exact definition contestable. Like 'poverty,' the 'middle class' is perceived differently in different countries at different levels of economic development. Some observers have

Rita Kothari is Professor of Culture and Communication at the Mudra Institute of Communications, Ahmedabad

applied a rich-world concept of the middle class to the developing world.[4] An overwhelmingly economic dimension informs most discussions on the middle class in contexts of business, market and media. Surveys by the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) and income cut-offs suggested by scholars such as Sridharan (2004) on the one hand, and market research techniques focussing upon consumable durables. Ravallion on the other, contests the size.[5] But they tell us little about the middle -class world that might privilege one things over another. Why would hiring a cook not mean a more legitimate entry into a certain socio-economic sphere than buying an air-conditioner? What makes a product a better index than services? How does owning a car say more than enrolling one's child in an English medium school? Even those who claim not to make assumptions about the middle class as an already formed group, persist in using " ownership of durable goods" as a signifier of the existence as well as expansion of the middle class (Maitra 2009).

However, I draw from Brosius's compilation of figures that point to the following data:

The annual growth rate of millionaires in India from 2000 to 2005 is among the highest in the world (accompanied by China, Argentina and Kazakhstan), averaging more than 15 per cent. By 2006, an estimated 83,000 millionaires lived in India; by 2008, India reached 141,000 .... In 2004 the National Council for Applied Economic Research(NCAER) published a report entitled 'The Great Indian Middle Class' and estimated that in 2010 almost 4 million households will belong to the 'near rich' to 'super rich' category.[6]

The middle class draws attention for several reasons ranging from its collusion with state-driven development of which it is the chief beneficiary to its right wing Hindutva politics, its virulent attitude towards affirmative action, and its sheer size (the putative 350 million) and potential for redirecting global economy. Some of the enduring concerns in the middle class owe to a view much prevalent today that countries which have a larger middle class tend to have higher growth rates; that this class is the backbone of the market economy as well as of democracy. The middle-class habit of capital accumulation and savings also creates opportunities of leisure, consumption and entrepreneurial activities. Of particular interest, at least in India and China of the last twenty years, is the middle-class consumer whose demand for consumer goods pushes overall income levels of the countries.[7]

II

But is there 'a' middle class? Or does it exist only in language, a reification achieved through negation – by being neither upper nor lower strata of society? Would the middle class of a developing world also be a middle class in the developed West? Such questions assail all those who are engaged with middle class-ness, refusing to take for granted it as an a priori phenomenon, a self evident truth. Joshi (2010) very rightly points out that most scholars (number crunchers as well as social scientists) who use this category treat the middle class as an already understood social group, sometimes dividing it into smaller sub-groups based on economic resources or status. Scholars and journalists alike treat 'the middle class' as a fully formed, sociologically bounded, category defined primarily by economic indicators, ignoring the extent to which social classes do not simply 'emerge' but are 'made.' It is productive to bear in mind, says Joshi, there is no particular moment when the middle class is finally made, rather much like most other social formations, it is always in the making.[8]

A view that this term only be comprehended when context-specificity is accounted for, allowing us to speak of it in its plural forms has gained currency in contemporary scholarship (Joshi 2010, Scarse 2002). However what remains common to the many views regarding India's 'old' and 'new' middle class, including the ones that question such binaries is that the middle class is a phenomenon of the capitalist era. The phrase was first used in Great Britain, by the end of the 18th century, to designate those 'who have some education, who have some property and some character to preserve" and would not apply to a feudal economy.[9]

Among the early and foundational books on the middle class was B.B.Misra's *The Indian Middle Classes : Their Growth in Modern Times* (1961). According to him the growth of the Indian middle classes from about the middle of the eighteenth century to modern times – is in the main a story of the social policy and changes that occurred in the course of about 200 years of British rule, largely as a consequence of Western education and modern capitalist enterprise, reforms and legal administration.[10] Commenting upon the Indian situation, Misra says:

Institutions conducive to capitalist growth were not lacking in India before British rule. A money economy had developed in India at an early period of her history. Merchant guilds, hundis, operations...however the guild power in India remained purely money power, unsupported by any authority of a political or military nature. It collapsed as soon as the king found it convenient to call in the aid of priestly and knightly elements. The limitations arising from the existence of caste, the foundation of the Hindu caste system, were no less menacing to a merchant guild.

In spite of the potential of a middle class bourgeois development therefore (because priests and kings continued to be superior) the

immobility of the caste organisation and general despotism precluded such a development. They could not go beyond caste orders; and form a generalised class. Moreover the caste system was related to law of property and since land constituted a more or less exclusive means of livelihood, except for the artisans who in part earned their living from handicrafts..society was divided into fixed status groups. There were intermediate categories as well but no middles classes of the type we understand.[11]

The strongest impulse governing this formation was that of the British imperialist agencies to form a class of intermediaries in India, reflected in Macaulay's oft-quoted desire to create '...a class of persons Indian in blood and colour but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect' (1835). Exposed to a western-style education, a generation of what pejoratively came to be called 'brown sahibs' brokered relations between India and the West; now resisting, now succumbing, and at times 'synthesising' the two. It is in their 'cultural entrepreneurship' that Joshi urges to look for the 'middleness.' He argues that middle class-ness was central to a variety of undertakings in colonial India including politic related religion, gender, caste, reform and of course, nationalism. In contrast to the marketeers' perception of this as a consumptive class, the middle class in colonial India was not a social group that could be classified as occupying a median position in terms of standard sociological indicators of income, consumption, or status. In fact many representatives of this class hailed from the upper strata of Indian society and although many of them needed to earn for their living, their ancestors had traditionally served the rulers and big landlords. Their interventions in a public sphere, albeit facilitated by the British, were the hallmark of a class that emerged in the nineteenth century.

Meanwhile, what began as a drive to create a class through English education, also embraced in the course of time technological changes and advancement of industry, land reforms and urbanisation, leading to the inclusion of many other groups such as merchants, agents and proprietors leading us to a conceptualisation as comprising both propertied and non-propertied class Misra's inclusion of both intellectuals and property owners resonates with the Weberian definition of the middle class . Weber differentiates the propertied from the non-propertied class, but within the former he distinguishes the large proprietors from the 'petty bourgeoiseie' and among the latter, the working class from the 'intelligentsia,' which does not own property but has skills. In the Weberian reading of the class structure, the 'petty bourgeoisie' and the 'intelligentsia' are certainly the mainstays of the middle classes (see Misra and Markovits in Joshi, 2010).

Meanwhile, Markovits draws our attention to a glaring gap in discourses regarding the middle class. According to him, the 'brown sahib' narrative has unduly dominated our understanding of the middle-class in India. Where are the merchants in this, he asks? He demonstrates how the class formed through English education and the one formed through changing economic and commercial contexts such as the rise of port cities, depletion of opportunities in princely states, influx of migrants, new industry etc have historically appeared unconnected, although the roots for both go back to colonial India. The two narratives also represented two different worlds that had little to with each other. In Markovits' words: "the mercantile world of India in the pre-independence period, in spites of its own great internal diversity, remained largely separate from the world of the English educated middle classes which were more conspicuous and influential, politically and culturally."[12]

If such was the case in colonial and the first few decades of postcolonial India, there is clearly a shift now. Bound by conspicuous consumption and cultural practices that legitimized their own centrality to political and economic discourses in India, the two merge especially in the period after economic liberalisation. The variegated view expressed by Misra fifty years ago is replaced by Pavan Varma's (1998) undifferentiated and monolithic 'Great Indian Middle Class,'— a generalisation that makes an easy basis for him to mourn its apolitical, consumerist and self-absorbed role in contemporary India. It is useful to see that even in the past the middle class formed through colonial education wielded power and influence, but evoked suspicion even in the past, albeit for slightly different reasons.

III

The historical material on the middle class is expressive of some suspicion about its authenticity, which is now reinvented as suspicion about its ability to think beyond itself. Joshi's edited volume is particularly useful in this regard. Through a range of different essays, it shows how, through the ages, the arrogation of centrality and representation that particular class took upon itself. This is reflected below in Pherozeshah Mehta's words : "It is because the masses are still unable to articulate definite political demands that the functions and duty devolve upon their educated and enlightened compatriots to feel, to understand and to interpret their grievances and requirements, and to suggest and indicate how these can best be redressed and met."[13]

The resonances this carries for the present moment are not hard to miss. At the same time, the stated claim of

the middle class representing the masses' interest, already specious in the past, appears to have further diminished, and its inauthenticity now comes not from being a 'microscopic minority,' but an excluding majority.

A section in Joshi' book focuses upon how the middle class was viewed in colonial India by the masters who allegedly created it, and also by some of its own members. Citing the farewell speech of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava in 1888, Joshi shows how in order to refute demands made by the newly formed Indian National Congress for greater representation of Indians in the colonial administration, Dufferin stressed the illegitimacy of the middle class as a representative voice of India. Without using the term, Dufferin pointed to "a microscopic minority of educated Indians" who could not be expected to represent India's tremendous diversity.[14] How the British could have represented this diversity remained an unasked question. In contrast to Dufferin's cavalier attitude, Aurobindo Ghosh made a more direct attack : "I mean those of us who have got some little idea of the machinery of English politics and are eager to import it into India along with cheap Liverpool cloth, shoddy Brummagem wares, and other useful and necessary things which have killed the fine genuine textures. ..And if I were to describe that class by a single name, I should not hesitate to call it our new middle class."[15]

Elsewhere, Nehru refers to them as "déclassè intellectuals" who were of no help when India's morale was sinking. It paved a path for Gandhi, who despite being a well-to-do bania, overcame the self-absorption of his class and became an architect of an authentic politics.[16]

Simultaneously with his disparagement of the middle class, couched in varying terms, Joshi also alerts us to voices that upheld this class as a carrier of Englightenment and modernity, a view contested by Bayly by considering possibilities of precolonial public spheres in India. Arguing that India did not learn the values of individuality, rationality, and social communication only from colonial education, Bayly describes the form of cultural and political debate which was typical of North India before the emergence of the newspaper and public association. (see Bayly 2009). Meanwhile, the historic charges against the lack of authenticity of the middle class, are overlaid by charges of consumption in recent times, and also "an inescapable desire to escape the rest of India." (Krishna 2006)

IV

Scholarship after 2000, that is in recent years, points to a shift from sweeping generalisations about the middle class to micro-studies focussing upon particular strands that constitute it. The variance in both quantitative and qualitative studies, the struggles to define from "income to membership to terminology" (Brosius 2010) have led some to focus on the middle class as an arena of social behaviour, of negotiation between wants and desires, histories and futures. For instance, Scrase (2002) examines the impact of economic reforms on cultural identities in West Bengal and employs ethnographic methodology and narratives to show how cultural identity is being "transformed, resisted, or reinterpreted."[17] The transformation processes are built upon pre-existing hierarchies and world views, so that the *abhijat bhadralok's* responses may differ from those of the *sadharan bhadralok*, illustrating factions within the middle class. Hatcher argues that flowing from the middle class is a particular blend and brand of Hinduism manifest in "temple building, ritual practices, contemporary guru and self-realisation movements, 'or popular iconography."[18] Potdar seeks to explore relationships between the middle class in India and user generated contents and attends to the evolving nature of languages (s) and form(s) of expressions that reflect a changed dynamic between collective selves and digital milieu. Potdar stresses upon the middle class as a "social agency, as one that has shifted from the use of technology to its appropriation."[19] Brosius, mentioned earlier, draws from Bordieau's concept of 'distinction' that shapes habitus, capital and cultural production. Taking urban forms of leisure, pleasure and consumption in the city of Delhi, Brosius provides a rich narrative of the symbolic contests that the new and urban middle class in Delhi appear to go through. Patricia Oberoi's study of the cultural practices of the middle class played out through food, weddings and other 'pleasures of the nation,' relies upon consumption as the leitmotif of the middle class.[20] Less known in the allegedly academic circles, but a finely tuned and humane study on the middle class is a collection of essays by Santosh Desai (2010).

Desai is not concerned with the middle class's lack of responsibility or its failure to abide by secular values, nor is he interested in counting heads to sell white goods. However, his acute observations on the middle class, as an insider looking from within, provides food for thought to people of different (if not antithetical) persuasions. Desai looks at the quotidian—a zone that helps him examine how consumption is not new, but its demands are different; how public-owned conversations through open postcards have given way to more individual conversations through text messages; how the institution of marriage has not changed as an arrangement between social units, but the need for fair complexion and money

has gone up, and so on. Change and continuity in Desai's essays do not emerge as distinct and chronologically marked entities, but silent and coded experiences yet to find a language.

All this, however scattered, has helped uncover the middle class as a verb, a performance and predicament bound with negotiation in some form or the other. There is a lot more to be done, especially in terms of the many linguistic and regional diversities within the middle class, the rural middle class that remains conspicuously absent , the middle classes' relationship with India's different languages, the absence of the tribals in the sphere and imagination of the middle class, and a range of cultural practices that we have not yet found a name for, but may well be common (only?) to the middle class(es).

NOTES

1. See Rita Kothari, "English Aajkal : Hinglish in Hindi Cinema" in *Chutnefying English : The Phenomenon of Hinglish*, eds. Rita Kothari and Rupert Snell. Penguin India (forthcoming)
2. See Christiane Brosius, *India's Middle Class : New Forms of Urban Leisure, Consumption and Prosperity*. Routledge India, 2010.
3. Brian Hatcher "Bourgeois Vedanta : The Colonial Roots of Middle Class Hinduism" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Volume 75 : 2. (2007), p.301.
4. Martin Ravallion, "The Developing World's Bulging (but vulnerable) Middle Class" Policy Research Working Paper 4816. The World Bank Development Research Board, 2009, p.17.
5. Ibid., p.4.
6. Brosius, *New Forms of Urban Leisure, Consumption and Prosperity*, pp. 2-3.
7. Christopher Jaffrelot and Peter van der Veer eds. "Introduction," *Patterns of Middle Class Consumption in India and China* . Sage India, 2008, pp. 11-34
8. Sanjay Joshi, ed. *The Middle Class in Colonial India*, Oxford University Press, 2010,. pp. Xv-lvi
9. Christopher Jaffrelot and Peter van der Veer,. *Patterns of Middle Class Consumption in India and China*, p.11.
10. Sanjay Joshi, The *Middle Class in Colonial India*, pp.36-37.
11. Misra, B.B. "The Middle Class of Colonial India : A Product of British Benevolence" in Joshi, *The Middle Class in Colonial India* , p. 38.
12. In Joshi, *The Middle Class in Colonial India*, p.124.
13. Ibid., p.11.
14. Ibid., pp.3-9.
15. Ibid., p.12.
16. Ibid., p.18.
17. Timothy Scrase, "Television, the Middle Class and the transformation of cultural identities in West Bengal, India" *The International Journal for Communication Studies* , Volume 64 (4), 2002, p. 324.
18. Ibid., p.300.
19. Ashutosh Potdar, "User generated contents and urban middle class," *Mashing Up Culture* eds. Eva Hemmungs and Maria

Ryman. Proceedings from the Counter Workshop, Uppsala University, May 13-14, 2009, p.82.
20. In Christopher Jaffrelot and Peter van der Veer, *Patterns of Middle Class Consumption in India and China*.

WORKS CITED

Brosius, Christiane. (2010) *India's Middle Class : New Forms of Urban Leisure, Consumption and Prosperity*. Routledge India,

Fernandes, Leela (2007) *India's New Middle Class : Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform*. Oxford University Press.

Hatcher, Brian (2007) "Bourgeois Vedanta : The Colonial Roots of Middle Class Hinduism" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Volume 75 : 2. Pp. 298-323

Jaffrelot, Christopher and Peter van der Veer eds. (2008) Introduction. *Patterns of Middle Class Consumption in India and China* . Sage India pp. 11-34

Joshi, Sanjay ed. (2010) Introduction . *The Middle Class in Colonial India*. Oxford University Press. Xv-lvi

Misra, B.B. "The Middle Class of Colonial India : A Product of British Benevolence" in Joshi, 2010. pp. 33-46

Kothari, Rita "English Aajkal : Hinglish in Hindi Cinema" in *Chutnefying English : The Phenomenon of Hinglish*, eds. Rita Kothari and Rupert Snell. Penguin India (forthcoming)

Krishna, Sankaran (June 2006) "The Bomb, Biography and the Indian Middle Class" *The Economic and Political Weekly*, pp. 2327-2331.

Maitra, Sudeshna (2009) "Who are the Indian Middle Class" A Mixture Model of Class Membership Based on Durables Ownership (PDF)" York University.

Scrase, Timothy (2002) "Television, the Middle Class and the transformation of cultural identities in West Bengal , India" *The International Journal for Communication Studies* , Volume 64 (4) : 323-342

Bayly, C.A. (2009) "The Indian Ecumene : An Indigenous Public Sphere" in *The Indian Public Sphere : Readings in Media History*. Ed. Arvind Rajgopal Oxford University Press. 49-64

Potdar, Ashutosh (2009) "User generated contents and urban middle class" *Mashing Up Culture* eds. Eva Hemmungs and Maria Ryman. Proceedings from the Counter Workshop, Uppsala University, May 13-14.

Uberoi, Patricia (2007) "Aspirational Weddings : The Bridal Magazine and the Canons of 'Decent Marriage' in Jaffrelot Christophe and Peter van

der Veer *Patterns of Middle Class Consumption in India and China* . Sage India pp 230-262

Ravallion, Martin (2009) "The Developing World's Bulging (but vulnerable) Middle Class" Policy Research Working Paper 4816. The World Bank Development Research Board (pp.1-28)

Sridharan E (2004) "The Growth and Sectoral Composition of India's Middle Class : Its Impact on the Politics of Economic Liberalisation" *India Review*. Vol. 3 : 4, pp. 405-428.

Desai, Santosh (2010) *Mother Pious Lady : Making Sense of Everyday India* . Harpercollins and The India Today Group.

Markovits Claude "What about the Merchants? A Mercantile Perspective on the Middle Class of Colonial India" in Joshi 2010. Pp. 118-131.

Nehru, Jawaharlal " A Class in Need of Help" in Joshi, 2010. Pp. 17-21

Ghosh, Aurobindo Ghosh " A Cheap Shoddy Import" in Joshi, 2010. Pp. 10- 13.

NEW UNDERSTANDING OF INDIAN SOCIETY: ENCOUNTERS WITH SOCIOLOGY
By S.R. MEHTA

Latest from IIAS

Development is a slippery concept as it involves the configuration of economic, political, social, cultural, psychological and environmental factors in its conceptualization. Historical circumstances, built-in social structural and cultural impediments and inequalities of varied nature have been identified as confronting the development of Indian Society.

The Indian Society has been observed to be subjected to different pulls and pressures of paradigm shifts during the last six decades of its developmental journey. Its recent encounters with globalization have further set in tremendous changes in our politico-economic and socio-cultural life. No doubt it is on the move but its pace is slow, its direction is not the desired one and the changes recorded in it are uneven.

The present study is an attempt to analyse the changes and understand the new parameters that may affect our way of life. These changes need the right direction lest we get trapped in the same crises as were witnessed by the developed world. The way ahead, perhaps lies in having moral along with material aspect, for the development of our society.

Book Reviews

Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui, *Indo-Persian Historiography up to the Thirteenth Century*, Delhi: Primus Books, 2010, pp. viii + 208, Rs 795.

The establishment of the Delhi Sultanate during the early thirteenth century constitutes a watershed in the history of South Asia. During this period, a predominantly Turkish ruling class conquered vast territories in northern India and erased the remnants of Rajput feudalism. With the aim of legitimizing its power, it sponsored a record of its achievements in the official language, Persian. We are familiar with some of these writings, as these have been employed by modern medievalists to reconstruct the history of the Delhi Sultanate. In the book under review, Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui, a distinguished Aligarh-based historian and author of nearly a dozen books, analyses the writings of six historians who lived in northern India during the thirteenth century. At the outset, Siddiqui maps the evolution of historiography in Arabic during the ninth century when the writers assessed the authenticity of facts and eliminated romantic tales. With the beginning of official historiography in the eleventh century, the focus narrowed to the ruler and his court. Persian historiography, which developed in the hands of Gardezi and Baihaqi who documented the history of the Ghaznavids, exercised a strong influence on the Indo-Persian historiography of the thirteenth century.

Fakhr-i-Mudabbir is seen as a writer who carried forward the tradition of Arabic historiography and became a trend setter for Persian historiography in the Indian subcontinent. His family had been associated with latter Ghaznavid rulers, but migrated to Lahore in the wake of invasions of Ghuzz Turks in Ghazni. He began his literary journey with the compilation of *Shajra-ul-Ansab*, which contains 136 genealogical tables pertaining to Prophet Muhammad, caliphate and succeeding Muslim dynasties. To this, he added a prologue which became popular as *Tarikh-i-Fakhruddin Mubarak Shah* and

Tarikh-i-Fakhr-i-Mudabbir. After emphasizing the significance of monarchy, it describes the military success of Sultan Muizzuddin in Ghazni after the ouster of Ghuzz Turks. More importantly, it describes the political career of Qutbuddin Aibak from his appointment as commander of Kuhram and Samana in 1192. It also narrates post-1206 administrative arrangements of Aibak, with reference to the conciliation of local chiefs and management of land grants held by Muslim theologians. It throws interesting light on Turkish tribes of Central Asia, focusing on their social life and cultural mores. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir's second major work, *Adab-ul-Harb wa ash-Shujaa* (Ways of War and Chivalry) was dedicated to Sultan Iltutmish. Treating the Ghaznavid polity as a reference point, it uncovers the functions of state departments like public censor, intelligence, diplomacy, tributes and taxation. It devotes a large space to the modes of warfare and use of horses, including their diseases and cures.

Siddiqui places Ali Kufi's *Chachnama* in the cultural context of northern India during the early thirteenth century. At this juncture, Persian literature received a considerable impetus owing to two factors viz. the adoption of Persian culture by the Turkish ruling class and the migration of people from Persian speaking lands of Khurasan and Transoxiana. The need of the time was to translate Arabic classics into Persian, besides collecting information on the nature of Arab rule in Sind. Ali Kufi, who had been driven to Uch in adverse circumstances, decided to fill the second part of the need. During his search at Arur, he discovered a book on the Arab conquest of Sind, which had been written in the obsolete Hejazi Arabic dialect. He translated the text into Persian and, in the process, added information on the pre-Arab Brahamin dynasty which was based on popular legends. The elevation of the minister Chach to the throne was attributed to his liaison with the queen of Raja Sahasi. Similarly, the execution of Muhammad bin Qasim was attributed to the revenge by the two daughters of Raja Dahir who had been presented to the caliph. Despite these

weak points, Ali Kufi supplements the accounts of Arab writers on the subject. We learn that the migrant Ilafi Arabs served both Raja Dahir and the Arab conqueror. The Arab regime, which was committed to maintain the existing social hierarchy, was advised to adopt non-interference in religious affairs of the ruled.

A migrant from Nishapur, Hasan Nizami was commissioned by Qutbuddin Aibak to record his achievements in northern India. Opening his *Taj-ul-Maasir* with the second battle of Tarain, he provides details about the Jat rebellion at Hansi and Aibak's visit to Ghazni in 1193. He omits the events that occurred between 1197 and 1206 as well the administrative reforms of Aibak that were introduced after 1206. Nizami's lack of interest may be attributed to Aibak's sudden death. As he adopted Iltutmish as his new patron, he resumed the work and carried the chronicle to 1217. However, the exercise was marred by an overpowering desire to glorify the role of Iltutmish and lack of chronological sequence. While describing the events where Iltutmish was present along with Sultan Muizzuddin and Qutbuddin Aibak, Nizami magnifies the image of his patron to the extent of overshadowing his two masters. Not surprisingly, Nizami fails to perceive the enthronement of Iltutmish as usurpation. What is burdensome and irritating, Nizami's prose is extremely verbose and ornate, being loaded with needless similes and metaphors. Yet Nizami's effort is not without merit. The complete texts of royal orders, which were issued by Aibak and Iltutmish to their provincial governors, provide crucial insights into the process of state formation in the nascent Delhi Sultanate. Equally significant are references to the availability of luxury goods that were imported through long distance trade.

A native of Bukhara, Sadiduddin Muhammad Aufi travelled extensively in the different parts of the Islamic world. After serving as a preacher in Nishapur, he joined a group of merchants and took a ship for Cambay. During the course of a visit to Uch, he presented his *Lubab-ul-Albab* (Persian translation of an Arabic anthology on early Persian poets) to Nasiruddin Qubacha. It was at the instance of Qubacha that Aufi assumed the task of writing *Jawami-ul-Hikayat wa Lawami-ul-Rivaayat*. Spread across four volumes and encyclopedic in range, it dealt with the political traditions of various Muslim kingdoms and practices of early Muslim mystics. Prized by Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya and Ziauddin Barani, it served as a source of inspiration for the Delhi Sultans in matters of state policy. Its choice of historical episodes was aimed at underlining the significance of political sagacity, military strategies and spiritual values. Its account of early mystics – including Abu Ishaque Ibrahim bin

Adham, Abu Ali Fuzail bin Ayaz and Abu Saeed Abul Khair – served as a model of piety for subsequent generations of sufis in India. It notes the presence of Muslim merchants in the Chalukya kingdom of Gujarat as well as the Hindushahi kingdom of Punjab and Kabul. It demonstrates the superior military tactics of the Ghaznavids against their Indian opponents, but does not hesitate to expose the weaknesses of the Ghaznavid empire during the post-Mahmud period, as manifested in debased currency and internal conflict in the ruling class. Its anecdotes of the Shansbani rule in India and Khurasan provide insights into the political culture of the age. Though Aufi's first patron was Nasiruddin Qubacha, yet the former fails to provide adequate space to the latter's achievements as an autonomous ruler. In the wake of Qubacha's death (1228), Aufi shifted his loyalty to Nizamul Mulk Junaidi, the *wazir* of Iltutmish. That is why Aufi gives to Junaidi the credit for the political and administrative measures of Iltutmish. In Siddiqui's view, Aufi's account was not only supplementary and corroborative, but also served as a corrective to the histories of Ibn-i-Asir and Juzjani. It also became a model for latter writers like Maulana Fazlullah Binbani, Shaikh Rizkullah Mushtaqi, Abdul Qadir Badauni and Abdul Haq Muhaddis Dehalvi.

Minhaj-i-Siraj Juzjani, the author of *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, is hailed for initiating the trend of writing dynastic history in the *tabaqat* (layers) genre. Juzjani, whose elders served the Ghurid rulers in Afghanistan and Central Asia, migrated to India in 1227. During the course of a long career in the service of the Delhi Sultanate, he held many judicial and ecclesiastical offices, besides headship of seminaries (*madrasas*). In his *Tabaqat-i- Nasiri*, which spreads across 23 chapters, he offers a comprehensive account of the Muslim dynasties of Iran, Central Asia and northern India. The opening account of prophets mentioned in the Quran is followed up by that of Prophet Muhammad, four pious caliphs and two major caliphal dynasties, Umayyads and Abbasids. As a digression, Juzjani delves into pre-Islamic Iran. Drawing from the classics of Firdausi, Tabari and Maqdisi, he praises the institution of kingship, besides economic and cultural developments. While reconstructing the history of the Muslim dynasties of Iran and Central Asia – Saffarid, Samanid and Buwahid – the focus is on conquests, public works and justice. The history of the Ghaznavids was largely based on the works of Utbi, Baihaqi and Imadi. The achievements of Sultan Mahmud are manifested in his great conquests, magnificent court, grand army and vast resources. The section on the Saljuqids, which is marred by factual errors and popular legends, seeks to glorify the rulers, Malik Shah and Sanjar, but fails to give

any credit to the famous *wazir* Nizamul Mulk Tusi.

The most significant portion of Juzjani's chronicle, comprising last eight chapters, has been devoted to the Khwarizm Shahs, Shansbanis and Mongols. We learn that the polity of Khwarizm was segmentary in structure, as the rulers distributed the territories among their sons who ruled as autonomous chiefs. The account of Shansbanis of Ghur was characterized by freshness and objectivity, though it was composed when there was no surviving ruler who could be flattered in the hope of reward. The achievements of Malikul Jahal and Alauddin Jahansoz are followed by those of the two brothers, Ghiasuddin Muhammad bin Sam and Muizzuddin Muhammad bin Sam. Attention has been paid to the Ghurid interest in monuments and learning, with particular reference to the revival of Ghazni. The description of Ghurid wars against Khwarizm Shah is more detailed than that of their expeditions in northern India. The account of Delhi Sultans, from Qutbuddin Aibak to Alauddin Masud Shah is brief and disappointing. Juzjani employs the technique of criticizing important rulers through subtle hints, because overt negative judgement was impossible. While praising his patrons (Iltutmish and Balban), Juzjani does not fail to appreciate the merits of their rivals. This enables us to revise the existing views on Qubacha, Yaldoz, Qutlugh Khan and Imaduddin Raihan. Juzjani's account of the Mongols, with reference to Chingez Khan and his successors, is quite valuable as it is based on personal experience as well reports of merchants and immigrants.

Of all the historians dealt with in this volume, Amir Khusro was the only one to have been born in India. An aristocrat to the core, he was a product of the cultural efflorescence which was manifested in the Delhi Sultanate. He benefited from the scientific rationalism encouraged by the Khaljis, while imbibing a universal humanism owing to a close association with Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya. Though he acquired widespread fame as a Persian poet, he excelled himself in several literary genres and styles. His contribution to Persian historiography can be assessed on the basis of five historical *masnavis* and two prose works. Unlike his predecessors (Fakhr-i-Mudabbir, Hasan Nizami and Juzjani), Amir Khusro shifted focus to social and cultural life and, writing from an Indian perspective, displayed a strong sense of identity with India and Delhi Sultanate. His historical *masnavis* are devoted to political events like the conflict between Sultan Kaiqubad and Bughra Khan, the military campaigns of Sultan Jalaluddin Khalji and the rise of Ghazi Malik to power. They also illumine the cultural life of Delhi, artistic features of the fort of Jhain, techniques of warfare, progress of various sciences and Hindu religious practices. The first prose work, *Khazain-ul-Futuh*, describes the administrative reforms and

military expeditions of Alauddin Khalji, besides the topography of towns. The significance of the second prose work, *Ijaz-i-Khusravi*, lies in specimens of documents – *farmans, fatehnamas* and *arzdashts* – offering advice to the ruling class on dealing with the Mongols, *zamindars* and traders. He lauds the measures for price control and advocates religious freedom for non-Muslims. Surprisingly, he disapproves the appointment of low born to public offices, caricatures the Afghans and indirectly criticizes the Deccan policy of the Khalji rulers. In Siddiqui's view, Amir Khusro had little interest in the past and excelled in describing contemporary conditions.

This book is an important contribution to the study of the Delhi Sultanate. It examines not only the content of the major historical writings of the thirteenth century, but also places them in their respective historical contexts. It identifies the outstanding aims and concerns of the writers, with reference to the prevailing system of patronage. It does not hesitate to caution us regarding the prejudices and limitations of the writers. It provides English translations of numerous passages from the original texts, so that we are able to understand their nature, style and importance. The book, while confirming the reputation of Siddiqui as one of the most prominent medievalists of South Asia, promises to illumine the path of students of medieval Indian history.

<div align="right">

SURINDER SINGH
Professor of History
Panjab University, Chandigarh

</div>

B.V. Sreekantan, ed., *Science, Technology and Society*, Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, 2009. Pp. xiv+202, Rs. 350.

The book is a collection of papers presented at a three day national seminar on 'Science, Technology and Society' jointly organized by Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla and National Institute of Advanced Study, Bangalore during 26-28, March, 2006. The aim of the seminar, in the words of the editor "was to bring to focus the series of problems that the Indian Society is facing which are becoming more acute day by day which however can be solved or mitigated to a large extent by judicious and timely application of Science and Technology." The papers have succeeded in realizing this aim.

The area of 'Science, Technology and Society' studies is an established academic discipline in the western universities. The area concerns the interaction between scientific and technological ideas and practices, on the one hand, and the social factors and forces, on the other. Focusing on the Indian context such an undertaking can

be very stimulating and challenging due to the specificity and uniqueness of the issues to be addressed. Not surprisingly the area of 'Science, Technology and Society' studies in the Indian context has witnessed a steady growth of literature which is impressive in terms of the breadth of scholarship and depth of analysis. The book under review is a commendable addition to such a literature.

The impressive features of this collection are:

1. the wide canvas of the focal theme which includes almost all core domains of the Indian scientific and technological endeavour; in fact, the breadth of the canvas has compensated for the absence of thematic unity;
2. technically competent articulation of the achievements and challenges; and
3. clarity and lucidity of presentation that make an esoteric area accessible to a non-specialist. Moreover, the inclusion of papers on science and technology education has broadened the focus of the book. Before coming to some overall critical observations, a few words about some of the papers are in order.

Professor V.K. Atre in his paper lucidly brings out the nature and the promise of micro-system technology at the core of which lies the development of smart materials. He underscores the radical change in the nature of technology best exemplified by the success of miniaturing the technological gadgets. Prof. Atre graphically describes the multifarious application of smart material technology whose scope is limited only by our imagination. India could not participate, for historical reasons, in the world transforming process we call 'Industrial Revolution.' In fact, we missed the silicon revolution too. However, we can more than compensate for the missed opportunities by taking up in a big way an initiative in ushering in the micro-system technology which is only a decade old and Indian technologists are working in that direction for the last five to six years. According to him, "If we miss this revolution also. . . we would have missed most of the main technological revolution". The significance of Porfessor Atre's contribution lies in pin pointing one of the directions which is promising in so far as the innovative possibilities of Indian science and technology are concerned. However, Professor Atre could have explored the factors that might possibly come in the way of utilizing this crucial opportunity.

Professor Sukumar Banerjee provides a graphic account of Indian achievements in nuclear technology. For a non-expert he has effectively portrayed its application not only to energy sector but also to health care, Agriculture, Food processing and industry. While convincingly showing that the Indian scientists and technologists did strive for self-dependence in nuclear technology and are even capable of sharing certain important items of that field with others, he acknowledges that the real breakthorough in our endeavour comes only when we attain self – sufficiency in nuclear fuel – a possibility that can be realized only by building thorium based reactors. However, granting that it takes a few decades, how far are we in building at least a prototype of thorium- based reactor ? Professor Banerjee could have dealt with the question whether our effort in that direction has matched the urgency. That the Indian space programme has been the most successful one is widely accepted. Professor Kasturirangan very ably substantiates such a view. But, more importantly, he deals with the question of deploying this new science and technology for societal development in a country with its specific geographic location, natural setting and resources. The author has striven to enlighten those of us for whom space programme is only about rocket launching not knowing what for. He has brought out the possibilities of its application to the problems concerning disasters, detection of mineral resources, management of natural wealth and more importantly, harnessing it for education and health care. After reading this paper one wonders whether our space programme can be a role model for the rest of our science and technology initiatives.

Professor Sukumar Devotta's paper confronts head - on the most urgent problem India is facing, viz, the environmental degradation. He has done justice to this gigantic challenge by taking into account all aspects of this crisis. In our over zeal for production our callousness towards environmental protection has cost us what we cannot even fathom accurately. The principle of 'Polluter pays' hardly works with us. Particularly instructive in this connection is the author's attempt to explode certain myths. For example, we believe that hydro power is safe, not knowing that dams produce as much methane as carbon-di-oxide. After drawing our attention to the fact that the future fuel will be hydrogen on which our work, surprisingly, is minimal, Professor Devotta makes a case for new industrial model wherein the waste from one is a raw material for another. The question remains whether we should have industries whose waste can not be raw material at all. This question indicates the need to initiate a new model of industrialization which is radical because it first involves substantial amount de-industrialization. The ushering in of the knowledge economy organically linked to globalization has provided India a challenge

and an opportunity. Professor Rama Rao and Prof. Anitha focus on this phenomenon and in doing so reflect on our higher education system in general and university education in particular. The institutes of higher education need to undergo drastic changes in order to be vehicles for India's transition to a knowledge intensive society. They need to be the resource base for scientifically trained manpower without which mere increase in the Raw & D expenditure will be inconsequential. Transforming enormous human resource, which India is sumptuously endowed with, into human power that creates wealth demands that university system increase its capacity for absorbing more persons and enhance the quality of education imparted to them. The authors are optimistic about the possibility of raising the number of Ph.Ds to the level of the US, though such an increase is not on the agenda of those who manage the higher education system in India. The paper is highly instructive regarding both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of higher education as it stands today. The authors should have discussed, apart from the emerging social ethos of the new middle class that has an antipathy towards 'hard' and non-remunerative options like pure science and high technology, the negative impact of the inadequate school education both in terms qualitative adequacy and quantitative spread. The brute fact that state-run schools are becoming dysfunctional and private schools are inaccessible to the overwhelming majority of our people makes a mockery of our educational planning. And equally importantly, the authors should have focused on the less than desirable conditions of college education which seems to be the weakest link in the whole chain of education.

Professor Mukunda's paper gives an account of the steps taken by bodies like Indian Academy of Science to provide a wholesome and effective science education by organizing workshops and refreshes courses and initiating new programmes like Integrated Master's programme and Integrated Ph.D. programmes. Such steps can be excellent supplements to a rigorous college education in science in whose absence those steps become inadequate, it not cosmetic, in stemming the rot. We all agree that human resource is to India what oil is to the middle eastern countries and the former, unlike the latter, is not exhaustible. But the state of our school education and college education hardly inspire any confidence in our endeavour to build a rich human resource base. The products of such a system are bound to put serious limits to whatever we do at the post-graduate and research level.

Professor Rama Rao and Prof. Anitha righly underline the need for bridging the gap between universities and agency laboratories as an important step for universities to become more than purveyors of knowledge and achieve the status of co-producers of knowledge. But this is an uphill task given the orientation that our universities have inherited. This would not have been so if research was not placed in the early years outside the agenda of university education. In his debate with Homi Bhabha, M.N. Saha insisted upon making universities the loci of both pedagogy and research. But the views of Bhabha prevailed. Along with education, health care stands as a pillar of a sustained development of human wealth. The crisis in health care is deeper than the one in education. No doubt we have been able to increase life expectancy, eradicate several deadly diseases and control epidemic disasters, as the 2006 report on the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health informs us. But such achievements are more than offset by the stagnation one witnesses in reducing malnutrition, infant and maternity deaths.

Professor M.S. Valiathan's remarkable paper hits the nail on our pretentions in health sector. Having 16.5% of the global population, India's share in the disease burden of the world is 20%. The main source of the crisis is poverty which "aggravates illness which in turn drives people into penury". Ill health is the surest way of transforming poverty into destitution.

Though technology is only one of the many factors in the health care system, the intensive and extensive application of technology has altered the system beyond recognition; India's achievement in coming to terms with the technological transformation of its health care system has not been even modest. As Professor Valiathan notes, "While India imports 45% of the total requirement for medical technologies, the percentage risen to 95% in the high technology segment". The reason is our pathetic performance in the field of medical instrumentation. No doubt innovations take place in the India based R and D laboratories owned by Multinational corporations. Such innovations are the results of the labour of Indian scientists and technologists. But such innovations are of no consequence to India itself since the labour of its scientists and technologists do not at all add to the indigenous knowledge capital. In fact, the MNCs raise the price of equipments by 70% for sale in the very developing countries where the equipments were innovated. The result is the phenomenon of five star hospitals for the wealthy while the less fortunate are left to their fate. Such polarisation can be a greater threat than any imaginable epidemic. Professor Valiathan draws our attention to Dr. Sikka committee report which analyzed this grave scenario. The committee recommended ways of mandatory participation of academia and industry in

all R and D projects pertaining to medical instrumentation. It also insisted upon a mission mode approach to overcome the bureaucratic hurdles which can set at naught a nascent industry.

On the whole the book provides a clear and delete candid account of the Indian endeavour in science and technology – the tasks achieved, challenges ahead, potential capabilities and countervailing factors. The fact that the views presented are based on experience and reflections of the insiders lends the work an added significance. It deserves to be read by the practitioners of science and technology in our context. Also, it is an indispensable text for a core course in 'Science, Technology and Society' Studies programmes in India. However, one feels the conspicuous absence of papers by historians of science and sociologists of science. There is hardly any critical discussion in the book on the historical factors, pre-colonial or colonial, that have a bearing on the current situation in Indian Science and Technology. Secondly, we do not have a well worked out response to the negative reception by grass- roots workers and some sections of our society to some of the technological applications to the domains like agriculture and health. Thirdly, one expects an informed position regarding the conditions under which the deployment of a technology becomes economically viable. For instance, one needs to know within what limits nuclear technology is economically viable and in what ways it needs to be supplemented by alternative energy sources like, say, solar energy, the research work on which should have been started long back. Fifthly, though none of the authors believe, we may be sure, in the naïve 'Use-abuse' theory of science and technology (i.e. the discredited view that science and technology are in themselves good though they might have been misused / abused by some vested interests), there is hardly any reflection on the lessons we have learnt from the western experience that shows how science and technology can be easily made to serve, with impunity?, the interests of the military – industrial complex that can undermine democratic ways of life, individual and collective. More surprising is the complete silence regarding how far science and technology in India have promoted the goal of national self – reliance which was top on the agenda of independent India. Even more importantly, the reader is not enlightened about the role of modern science and technology in India in delegitimising non-modern knowledge systems that still sustain the lives of the bulk of our people and which were so well anchored in the material and cultural practices of our people that even the imperialist onslaught could not decimate them. Finally, a reader interested in the theme expressed by

the title of the book has to look elsewhere to get some clues regarding the organic link between the kind of science and technology we promote and the kind of society we envisage. It is because of the issues such as these that questions about science and technology are too important to be left only to scientists and technologists. Is it not time that the potential members of science and technology profession in India be exposed to such seminal issues right from their graduate training?

S.G. KULKARNI
Professor of Philosophy
University of Hyderabad

Jagdish N. Sinha, *Science, War and Imperialism: India in the Second World War*, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008, Pp. iv + 278, $ 79.00 (paperback)

"This is an extremely lucid and significant work, which elaborates certain aspects of "Organising for Science" in a new way. It focuses on the elaborate linkages between the colonial state and the appearance of elite cadres of scientists who established the paradigms of Science as an aspect of nation building. The new readings Jagdish Sinha provides us is with regard to the background to this endeavour, which is located around the questions of the significance of agriculture to the colonial government. The emphases on agriculture which Lord Curzon insisted on, was then replaced historically during the years of the Second World War, by the technological drive to a scientific domain which was seen to be consistent with modernism. It now made no distinction between peace and war in the quests of science as progress. The history of institutions is carefully mapped in this new book for new readers. The colonial government establishes links with dominant industrial families. "While these measures led to an unprecedented industrial growth and expansion, they did not necessarily imply any significant innovation and research," (p. 70). However, Ramaswamy Mudaliar realised the value of industrial research, and set up Board of Scientific and Industrial Research in 1940, under the department of commerce. J.N. Sinha tells the story in a detailed way, with many footnotes and references, each allowing the reader to follow up the complex trail for himself or herself. It may not be an original work, drawing on both well known classics in the Sociology and History of Science Policy, but it is a major work, where the art of splicing and configuring secondary as well as primary materials, leads us to important questions about the new canvas, that the Sociology of Science increasingly leads us to. Unfortunately Brill has overpriced the book, as a statement on the neocolonialism in academia and the

dissemination of materials, so an Indian publisher will have to come forward to take the book to the larger audience in third world countries where the intelligentsia of the local peoples in Paolo Freire's terms, will have to negotiate with the ways in which colonialism and science do not go away!

The subject of who is the intelligentsia of the people will always be of interest to the historian. In an interesting paragraph, J.N.Sinha writes,

After virtually maneuvering the removal of the Director of the Institute, Nobel Laureate, Sir C.V.Raman, the Government of India wanted to have a British as the new Director. The Council of the Institute however opposed the move and wanted to have an Indian instead. Knowing this, the government entered into a secret liaison, among others, with the Dewan of Mysore State, Sir Mirza Ismail – a Muslim who disliked Bengalis, the British Resident in Mysore, and the Tatas, the Tatas and Mysore State being the principal founding trustees of the Institute. While authorities received enthusiastic support from the Dewan and the British Resident, the Tatas declined to interfere with the decisions of the Council. The official maneuver failed as a result, and J.C. Ghosh, another Indian scientist of repute who espoused the cause of science for national reconstruction, was eventually appointed Director. This episode makes two points clear. First, the refusal of the Tatas to toe the official line proves how the Indian Industrialist, despite their association with the government and the global system of capitalism, had come closer to the local scientific leadership on the question of managing science in the interest of the country. Secondly the Indian Scientific leadership was no less concerned and jealous of their rights and independence than their counterparts in politics (p.50).

C.F. Andrews, as a former teacher of St Stephen's college, always believed that learning from History was important for reconnaissance with the present. When the scion of the Tata house embraces Narendra Modi to enhance a deal, which will statistically in terms of mobile-metal, clog up the roads, we know that the corollary of economic actions, which are for immediate personal gratification will cause intense disruption of the ecological system. Decades ago, Shiv Visvanathan argued that there is no such thing as peaceful use of nuclear energy, because the problem of waste and societal surveillance will always be larger than the problem of immediate energy gratification. Many social scientists and millions of grass roots activists have argued for the right of peasants to survival, so that ecology must be foregrounded as the natural right of local communities. Today, Bharat Jhunjoonwala, with his team, fights for the recognition of the Ganga as the right of the people to survive on her banks. Peoples' movements have always believed that the co-existence of industry and agriculture is possible. In fact the work of people like Uzramma and Laila Tyebji, of Dastkar, has set up the symbioses of traditional knowledge groups and artisans, and IIT trained activists

to recover indigo as an agricultural and craft commodity.

If we are to understand the impact of people's struggle to make sense of their environment in the new contexts of globalization, where the malls and the waste generated are the new idioms of imperialism in the 21st century, the recovery of these debates that Sinha brings to us are crucial. That Binayak Sen gets arrested and charged for sedition is the symptom of what is seen to be the real syndrome, thirty percent of India as the Ministers at the Centre says, is in the hands of Maoists. Why is it so? The PUCL and the PUDR will have a great deal of mobilization to do, before they too become banned. Hunger and poverty are very visible details of life, the wealth of the earth spills out spite of its commercialization, and when treated as the s poils of one group or community, the human context of life becomes decimated. Binayak Sen is very well loved in Vellore, where he trained as a Doctor, and where he came to recuperate when he was released on bail. If he spent his life working with the poor, then that is what he will be remembered for. Community Health has always depended on those who gave their time, so JNU scholars too will have a lot to say about new forms of hegemony!

Susan Visvanathan
Professor of Sociology
Jawaharlal Nehru University

Ernst Fürlinger, *The Touch of Sakti: A Study in Non-dualistic Trika Shaivism of Kashmir*, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2009, Pp. 288, Rs. 690.

The so-called 'Kashmir Saivism', more correctly the non-dualistic Shaivism of Kashmir or Trika with its philosophy of Recognition or *Pratyabhijna*, has been studied in the last few decades in its various dimensions: philosophical, historical, Tantric exegesis, aesthetical, and the traditions and texts involved are so rich and varied that there is much scope for further detailed studies. The present study focuses on a very specific concept, or rather symbol, the Sanskrit word *sparsa*, 'touch', and more specifically *saktisparsa*, 'the touch of the divine energy'. Although it seems to refer to a limited area, this concept can be used as a key to the understanding of the spirituality of the school, as the author aptly shows.

Professor Andre Padoux, eminent scholar of Tantra and Kashmir Saivism, especially of *mantrasastra*, has contributed a very perceptive Foreword to the book *The Touch of Sakti: A Study in Non-dualistic Trika Shaivism of Kashmir* by Ernst Flrlinger. The author in his Introduction gives a survey of the history and literature of Kashmir Saivism, mainly based on the extensive historical and

textual researches of Professor Alexis Sanderson. He then goes into the "different meanings of Sparsa in Indian tradition," as a necessary background for the specific meanings in non-dualistic Kashmir Saivism.

The second chapter is devoted to important hermeneutical reflections. Here he elaborates on the difficulty of translation, or rather on the untranslatability of certain terms of the Sanskrit philosophical terminology. He analyses the most central concept of practically all Indian philosophy, *cit* (with its synonyms *caitanya*, *samvit*): "Is Cit 'Consciousness'?". Although I agree with his posing the problem, the solution to leave such terms untranslated does not really serve the purpose of mediating between two traditions (and that is what every translation tries to do). He also addresses the important term *vimarsa* in the philosophy of *Pratyabhijna* Whether or not one agrees with the conclusions arrived, the importance of this chapter is to make the reader aware of the hermeneutical implications while interpreting such terms and texts of another tradition. The sharpening of the awareness of difference is essential.

Chapter three is the centre of the study: "The Touch of Sakti (*Saktisparsa*)" which he analyses in selected texts of Trika. This chapter shows the fruitfulness of the approach of the author, because he takes into account not only the philosophical or sensual meanings of 'touch' but its many other implications: linguistic, spiritual, sexual etc. The first section analyses the term in the *Sivastotravali* of Utpaladeva, along with its commentary by Ksemaraja (foremost disciple of Abhinavagupta and a prolific commentator). Here the word *sparsa* (and synonyms) assumes the mystical connotation, as Utpaladeva again and again prays for the bliss arising from the touch of the lotus feet of the Divine, an image based on the widespread tradition of touching the feet of the guru or the *murti*. However, this devotional meaning is interpreted in a non-dualistic way, where the 'feet' are understood as the divine energies or Saktis. The poetic and mystical beauty of the *Sivastotravali* is particularly present in the verses connected with 'touch'. In this connection the author also makes an excursus on the term *samavesa* , 'absorption'. A major section of the study is devoted to the Tantraloka of Abhinavagupta and its various uses of the concept of *sparsa*. In this text the manilayered meanings of the term unfold, particularly in the Tantric and yogic sense. This chapter is particularly rich.

In the conclusion the author reflects on "The question of the liberating and critical potential of Trika Saivism." To quote from his conclusion: "Focusing on our topic, 'the touch of Sakti', we have found different contexts and meanings in which the word *sparsa* occurs in connection with Sakti, the divine power, revered as the Goddess.

An interesting conclusion is how significant is this experience of touch in the context of *kundalini yoga*, associated with the experience of 'the touch of ants'Ö The most important result of our study is that we found that *sparsa* denotes one of the highest stages of the spiritual process, of the rise of *kundalini*, even above the experience of enlightenment (*vijnana*). . ." (p. 248) He shows that the importance of *sparsa* in the spiritual ascent is connected with the centrality of Sakti in non-dualistic Saivism. "And every moment it can happen that one is touched by the rays of the Power and one's true nature of supreme light and joy (*ananda*) unfolds. . ." (p. 250)

The importance of "the touch of Sakti" lies precisely in the connection between the sensual and the transcendental, a connection which Abhinavagupta has presented in the most rigorous and consistent way.

The author ends with some reflections on the present-day relevance of such a study. This relevance is obvious when considering the problems and tensions humankind is facing at this juncture. One of the insights of Trika is precisely: "At the core of this Tantric Advaita tradition is the conviction or the experience of the interconnectedness of reality. . ." (p. 254), a connectedness which is essential for modern man to re-discover.

The present book is part of a thesis submitted at the University of Vienna. Unfortunately the second part has not been translated, which deals with a comparison with Western mysticism (Heraclitus, Plotinus, Augustine), and the metaphor or experience of 'touch' in these authors. This part would throw much light on how spiritual-philosophical and mystical traditions, each one seen in its own light, can also enrich and enlighten each other.[1]

Anyone interested in the Tantric and Saiva traditions will profit from reading this book, and also those who are interested in mysticism in a wider sense.

NOTE

1. The German publication contains the entire thesis: *Verstehen durch Berühren. Interreligiöse Hermeneutik am Beispiel des nichtdualistischen Sivaismus von Kashmir*, Innsbruck-Wien:Tyrolia, 2006.

Bettina Bäumer
Former Fellow, IIAS

A. R. Kidwai, *Literary Orientalism: a companion*, New Delhi: Viva Books, 2009. Pp. xix + 374, Rs. 895.

Said did not treat Orientalism as "a mere political subject matter or field that is reflected passively by culture, scholarship or institutions; nor ... a large and diffuse collection of texts about the Orient; nor is it representative

and expressive of some nefarious 'Western' imperialist plot to hold down the 'Oriental' world." (1979: 12). For him, it is the study of hegemonizing relations between West and East whose historical and social setting involves "a considerable dimension of modern political-intellectual culture, and as such has less to do with the Orient than it does with 'our' world." (Said, 1979: 12) As a style of thought, based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction between "the Orient" and "the Occident", it has allowed a whole range of writers to accept the basic distinction between East and West "as the starting point for elaborate theories, epics, novels, social descriptions, and political accounts concerning the Orient." (Said, 1979:2-3).

"Literary Orientalism" is a shade that emerges from this all encompassing perspective of Orientalism. It is accommodative because it can easily accommodate poets and writers from Chaucer (1343-1400) to Doris Lessing (1919-). Despite being fairly accommodative, Literary Orientalism is a rather unknown field of English studies. Readers are confronted with a host of questions regarding the genesis of the term "Literary Orientalism", its significance, present status, scope and relevance. Answering these questions is not simple. It poses a formidable challenge and, therefore, demands deft handling. The challenge assumes more significance because it is located in the backdrop of ecumenically accepted though much debated term "Orientalism", which has a historically problematized past and a controversial present. Prof. Kidwai is indeed not shy of facing this challenge. He takes upon himself the task of informing readers about "Literary Orientalism" and he does so in a manner which is both academic and informative. *Literary Orientalism: a companion* is an attempt towards finding answers to a host of uncomfortable questions by "way of listing and classifying relevant material," which comprises bibliographic details of more than 300 critical books, 900 articles, conference presentations and 400 dissertations. This *Companion* is the first of its kind that charts out the genesis of Literary Orientalism and brings into sharper focus the contributions of 45 select British men of letters to this strand of English studies.

The book is spread into six chapters. Chapter I titled "Samples of Literary Orientalism: Writers, Works and Critical Studies" starts with Joseph Addison (1672-1719) and ends with W. B. Yeats (1865-1939). Chapters II, V, and VI have been titled as "Critical Books on Literary Orientalism", "Role of the *Arabian Nights* in the Development of Literary Orientalism" and "Role of the Oriental Tales in the Development of Literary Orientalism", respectively. Inasmuch as Literary

Orientalism has gathered wider currency and scholarship, the remaining two chapters provide testimony to this recent spurt and interest in this sub-field reflected in the burgeoning number of articles and dissertations dealing with Literary Orientalism. Hence, "Articles/Conference Presentations on Literary Orientalism" and "Doctoral Dissertations on Literary Orientalism" form the basis for Chapters III and IV, respectively. Each chapter in the book provides a detailed bibliographical survey, which will, indeed, be of immense help to researchers and scholars. An illuminating and crisp Preface and a lucid Introduction makes this little-known sub-field of English literature accessible to students.

European attitude towards oriental inferiority is quite well known. Macaulay's infamous Minute of 1835 denigrating literature in Arabic and Sanskrit language is a confirmation of such attitude. However, most specific has been the European perception of Islamic Orient which was, as Said has rightly pointed out, "regularly associated in England either with the problems of empire or with the corruption of fancy." (Said, 1983: 270) Its focus was never on highlighting the prestige of high culture or systematic learning, rather with intrigue and debauch, difference and hostility. Writing *Literary Orientalism: a companion* also stands for "the depiction of the Orient/Orientals in Western literary texts" with the professed aim of treating 'Orient' as referring to "the lands to the east of the Mediterranean and stretching through Asia, mainly Turkey, Arabia, Persia, China, Japan, India and also covering Africa ...[with] strong and unmistakable religious, sociocultural and emotional overtones." (Kidwai, 2009: xiv)

Certainly Europeans have a long history of coming to terms with the Orient, and this justifies Kidwai's assertion that "Literary Orientalism as a subfield of English studies had come to the notice of critics and research students much before the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism*...[and] even these pre-1978 critics seem familiar with the tropes of representation, cross-cultural encounter, empathy and of employing the Oriental setting as a pretext for grappling with or interpreting some wider or sensitive issues closer home." (Kidwai, 2009: xv) In fact, one can find the trace of orientalism in philological tradition. The traditional philology was interested in research into ancient writing. As Al-Dabbagh (2010) has rightly observed, the traditional philologists "believe that philological studies, which consisted of the collection of ancient writings and the establishment and interpretation of true texts, appeared both in the West (where they corresponded to the Hellenistic period) and in the East (where they

corresponded to the time of the Han Empire). Therefore, in spite of the fact that orientalism, as a term, became widely used only in the nineteenth century, it goes back, in practice, to Antiquity..." (Al-Dabbagh, 2010: 21) But there is more to the phenomenon of orientalism, for it principally deals "not with a correspondence between Orientalism and Orient, but with the internal consistency of Orientalism and its ideas about the Orient ... despite or beyond any correspondence, or lack thereof, with a 'real' Orientalism." (Said, 1979) The Literary Orientalism of the pre-1978 critics is accommodative and equally sympathetic in its portrayal and treatment of cultures of the East discernible in the classics of the English literature and European-authored literary texts, but in dealing with this term in ideological and specific sense the methodological problems that one may encounter in such a broadly construed field as this are or will be difficult to handle.

There is definite and unmistakable foregrounding of one religious group in this companion. As Kidwai points out, "This companion to Literary Orientalism focuses on the treatment of only Islam and Muslims in Western literary Orientalism, to the exclusion of other religious, ethnic, linguistic or racial groups in the Orient, who otherwise happen to be equally important." (Kidwai, 2009: xv) Notwithstanding the positive side of this focus which Literary orientalism with "religious, sociocultural and emotional overtones" can bring in providing a better human understanding of 'Other' cultures, the religio-cultural determinism may also lead to its being a self-

validating and hermetic occulation. Also in the exclusivity of the treatment of Islam and Muslims some prominent members falling in the league of literary orientalists, such as Renan and Louis Massignon, have been inadvertently missed out. Renan's 1883 speech that he gave at the Sorbonne entitled "*L'Islamisme et la science*" is a positively chilling and provocative statement on Islam and Science. Massignon, like Renan, must be seen "within the great structure of French cultural, political, and colonial domination of the Muslim world." (Said, 1983: 282) But unlike Renan, he had a passion for Islam. To quote Said (1983), "Renan's epistemological attitude toward Islam ... is one of divestiture and judgement, and Massignon's of sympathetic assumption and rapproachment." (1983: 282) And both should have found place in the *Companion*.

WORKS CITED

Al-Dabbagh, A. *Literary Orientalism, Postcolonialism and Universalism*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2010

Kidwai, A. R. *Literary Orientalism: a companion*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2009.

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

Said, Edward W. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983.

S. IMTIAZ HASNAIN
Professor of Sociolinguistics
Aligarh Muslim University

LOVE AND GENDER IN THE RIG VEDA *AND THE MEDIEVAL PUNJABI LITERATURE*
By J.S. GREWAL

Latest from IIAS

Three lectures in this volume explore the theme of love and gender in the literature created in north-western India - the *Rig Veda*, the Sufi poetry, and the narratives of love. A textual analysis of the *Rig Veda* reveals the complexity of gender relations in a society that was marked by a large degree of freedom and respect for women and the emergence of patriarchal family. More than 2000 years later, the first Sufi poet, Shaikh Farid, takes the patriarchal framework for granted but places women at par with men in relation to God. Sultan Bahu's position is close to that of Farid. However, Shah Husain and Bullhe Shah set the patriarchal family aside and sang of love between human beings and God as the basic relationship, with radical implications for a society that regarded the ideal of personal love as a form of social deviance. The narrative of love between Mirza and Sahiban by the poet Peelu writing during the reign of Akbar underlined the tragic tension between personal love and social norms. The poets of the tale of love between Heer and Ranjha - Damodar, Muqbal, Ahmad and Waris - tend to bring love between human beings ('*ishq-i majazi*') into parallel prominence with love for the divine ('*ishq-i haqiqi*'). The resolution of tension between personal love and social norms in their works became the source of vicarious emotional experience for their listeners that resulted in catharsis. The narratives of love have remained as popular among men as the Sufi poetry.

ISBN: 978-81-7986-082-3   Rs. 175/-

UNDERSTANDING ITIHĀSA
BY SIBESH BHATTACHARYA

Latest from IIAS

Understanding Itihāsa is an in-depth exploration of the traditional Indian outlook on past. It examines how early India looked at human past, how it considered and evaluated the value and significance of past and how it endeavoured to preserve the memory of the past it regarded as preservation worthy. The work may be called an elaboration and clarification of Indian Philosophy of History.

Understanding Itihāsa in fact stoutly and cogently contests the stereotypical view that early India lacked a sense of history. With patience, care and sympathy the monograph studies and analyzes a host of terms and concepts that developed in early India relating to human past, the methods of its preservation and the concerned expertise in those fields. The material studied spans from the Rgvedic period to the Early Medieval and includes literary, epigraphical and numismatic. The monograph gently and firmly asserts that the currently dominant view of history may not be the only valid way of looking at past.

MAPPING THE BODHICARYĀVATĀRA: INTERPRETIVE ESSAYS ON MAHAYANA ETHICS
By PABITRAKUMAR ROY

Forthcoming

Mapping the Bodhicaryāvatāra is an interpretive study of the great Mahayana ethical treatise focusing on *Bodhisattvayāna* as it is variantly called.

The *Bodhicaryāvatāra* is a world classic, and author, Santideva is a hallowed name in Mahayana discourse, his views and ideas are regarded as of great authority, and the text is incorporated in the *Tengyur*, the Tibetan cannon of apocryphal writings.

The *Bodhicaryāvatāra* is a philosophical poem, and the theme is the ethicised consciousness of a bodhisattva, the one who vows to dispel the misery of the human kind, and for that noble purpose alone he wishes to attain Buddhahood. His holiness the Dalai Lama's discourses are replete with inspiration drawn from Santideva's work.

The present study is an analytic-descriptive inquiry into the scope and extent of the *pāramitās* or virtues, and how when they are perfected lead to the apex of moral endeavour of *prajñā*. The author seeks to situate the text in the continuum of the ethical thinking and literature of the East as well as the West, and even cutting across the so-called Theravada-Mahayana divide. In course of the study of the author has raised points of the doubt as regards conceptual linkages and ideas in Buddhist ethical thought and practice, and attempted to resolve as well the issues. This is a philosophical study with an East-West perspective in view.

ABHINAVAGUPTA'S HERMENEUTICS OF THE ABSOLUTE ANUTTARAPRAKRIYĀ: AN INTERPRETATION OF THE PARĀTRIŚIKĀ VIVARAṆA
By Dr. Bettina Bäumer

The Parātriśikā Vivaraṇa by the great Kashmiri philosopher and mystic. Abhinavagupta is an extensive commentary on the Parātriśikā Tantra, and it is one of the most profound texts, not only of non-dualist Kashmir Śaivism, but of Indian philosophy and mysticism in general. The present work attempts to make this difficult text accessible, by culling out the important themes and offering an interpretation. The main focus is on the understanding of the Absolute (Anuttara) and the ways to realize it. The central theme of mantra also leads to a mysticism of language with its philosophical implications. All these reflections and practices are inscribed in the theory that everything is related to the totality, every part contains the whole of reality (sarvam sarvatmakam). It is this holistic vision of Abhinavagupta, based on the Tantras, which makes this work so relevant in our times of fragmented aspects of life and knowledge in search of integration. No doubt, in the view of the Tantra and of Abhinavagupta, language and mantra provide the key.

This fascinating book is an important contribution to studies and interpretations on Kashmir Śaivism, its spirituality and philosophy, and on Abhinavagupta in particular.

ISBN: 978-81-246-0572-1   *Price: 1000/-*   *Co-published with DK Printworld*

RECOGNIZING DIVERSITY: SOCIETY AND CULTURE IN THE HIMALAYA
Edited by CHETAN SINGH

Studies of mountainous regions invariably tend to be contextualized as that of the highlands and mountain people in opposition to the 'other' — the lowlands or plain's people. Breaking away from this trend, this volume examines the remarkable diversity of social, religious and political institutions within the Himalayan region.

Though generally associated with orthodox Brahmanical tradition, the region is home to heterodox and non-conformist social practices. The contributors examine key issues of diversity in environment, marriage customs, gender relations, ethnicity, the status accorded to women, religious practices, dietary habits, and folk traditions in the Himalaya. They emphasize that while certain customs are widely representative of a shared Himalayan culture, there is no single underlying rationality for the entire region.

The volume underlines how diverse religious and cult practices of the region created a society that embraced pluralism and nurtured a rich, vibrant folk tradition. It also illuminates the broad aspects in which the Himalayan societies are markedly different from the adjacent lowlands of South Asia. This book would be of considerable interest to scholars and students of Himalayan studies, social anthropology and sociology.

ISBN: 978-01-9806-9089   *Rs. 650/-*   *Co-published with OUP*