Imagining the Other: Dissenting voices in nineteenth-century British colonial discourse.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Imagining the Other:
Dissenting Voices in Nineteenth-Century British Colonial Discourse

by

Anne Myfvanwy Dickson

A Dissertation

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

English

Lehigh University

April 30, 2001

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 27, 2001
Date

Dissertation Director

April 27, 2001
Accepted Date

Committee Members:

Rosemary J. Mundhenk

Addison C. Bross

Patricia C. Ingham

Nicola B. Tannenbaum

Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the guidance and support of individuals from every corner of my life. My dissertation director, Professor Rosemary Mundhenk, has been an exacting critic and a staunch ally throughout, and the members of my dissertation committee—Professors Addison Bross, Patricia Ingham, and Nicola Tannenbaum—have provided valuable editorial feedback and many, many kind words. The Dissertators Anonymous Supper Club, comprised of Harold Halbert, Cecile Kandl, and Precie Schroyer, made this entire endeavor bearable with constant cheerleading and occasional dinner breaks. Kiera Wilhelm, as always, allowed me to understand my motivations and trepidations, and helped me find a way through all my doubt. Several friends, in particular Carole Brown, Brenda Campbell, Stephen doCarmo, Sheila Gatsos, Tamara Kendig, Jennifer Holodinski, Mark Manegold, Carl Razza, Kerri Regan, Lori Reiss, John Woznicki, and Joe Zebrowski, supported my decision to go into dissertation-seclusion, and welcomed me with open arms when I came back out. Ann and John Frega (my first GPs) reminded me of their love and support with a steady supply of "check-in" letters and emails. Josephine Nobile (my GM) never lost faith in me, and her constant, generous offers to help have made me feel incredibly loved and valued. She is truly a kindred spirit.

Finally, I'd like to dedicate this work to Tony Botzas, for reminding me daily how to eat an elephant (one bite at a time); to my brother, Chris, for sending positive energy transmissions upon demand; to my father, Barry, for encouraging me to put the pen to the paper; and to my mother, Terry, for always knowing what to pray for on my behalf, even before I do. I feel blessed beyond measure by your faith in me, and I offer you all my most humble gratitude and my deepest love. Thank you for walking through this with me. I would, without a doubt, be lost without you.

Lehigh University
April 30, 2001

Table of Contents

Abstract 1

Introduction: Dissenting Voices:
Postcolonial Theory and the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse 2

Chapter 1: *Almost, but not quite*:
Mimicry, Essentialism, and the Hybrid Space of Wilkie Collins' *Armadale* 25

Chapter 2:
Mary Kingsley's Mimic-Text: *Travels in West Africa* 72

Chapter 3:
Pretty Miss Neville: Challenge and Reconciliation in the "Symbolic" Novel 124

Conclusion:
Re-reading (and Re-Writing) the World 174

List of Works Cited 177

Curriculum Vitae 189

Abstract

Three nineteenth-century British texts, Wilkie Collins' *Armadale* (1866), Mary Kingsley's *Travels in West Africa: Congo Français, Corisco, and Cameroons* (1897), and Bithia Mary Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville* (1882), subtly yet powerfully challenge the colonial ideology of Victorian Britain. Using postcolonial theory, especially the work of Edward Said, Dennis Porter, Abdul JanMohamed, and Homi K. Bhahba, as the basis for my discussions, I examine Collins' and Croker's novels and Kingsley's travel account as ambivalent textual artifacts, texts revealing that colonial discourse, ostensibly monolithic and univocal, could be challenged from within the hegemonic order. More specifically, chapter 1 argues that anxieties produced in the British imagination by two colonial rebellions, the Indian "Mutiny" of 1857 and the Jamaican Morant Bay rebellion of 1865, surface in Wilkie Collins' *Armadale* in the form of a split representation of the African-West Indian/British Ozias Midwinter. Chapter 2 examines Mary Kingsley's *Travels in West Africa*, suggesting that Kingsley's travelogue of her 1894-95 journey simultaneously gives voice to colonialist representations of Africa/the African and denies the viability of such representations. Finally, chapter 3 discusses Bithia Mary Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville*, an Irish novel that depicts colonial relations from the perspective of the colonized Irish. Although its critical eye is turned toward the British, I argue, in the end, Croker's "Anglo-Indian" romance presents an image of heterogeneous, peacefully coexisting alterity. In presenting textual moments during which apparently static categories of norm/Other and colonizer/colonized waver and break down, these texts illustrate that colonial ideology was both at work and under siege in the nineteenth century.

Introduction

Dissenting Voices: Postcolonial Theory and the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse

Europe is springing leaks everywhere.
--Jean Paul Sartre

Nineteenth-century British fiction and travel literature are often preoccupied with what Mary Louise Pratt terms "contact zone[s]," "social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other" (4). Textual representations of contact zones—forests of Africa, military camps of India, streets of London, villages of Ireland—depict intense negotiation and struggle between the colonizer and the subject he/she hopes to colonize. At the same time, however, texts themselves are contact zones: they represent a struggle concerning colonial ideology itself. During the nineteenth century, Britain's hegemonic determination to believe in British superiority and to bring "civilization" to its colonies was threatened by its growing anxiety about that determination and project. My study addresses this internal struggle, and examines the discursive heterogeneity of competing norms and warring ideologies represented within the dominant discourse of colonizing Britain.

The theoretical starting point of my study is Edward Said's *Orientalism*, yet this work itself springs from two interconnected modes of colonial discourse analysis: one that examines texts produced within what Bart Moore-Gilbert calls the "metropolis" (produced by the colonizing nation, in other words), and one that examines texts produced within spaces colonized by that metropolis. According to Moore-Gilbert's discussion of the emergence of postcolonial theory into the academic limelight, most examinations of "metropolitan" literature prior to Said separated the text from the context

that produced it, ignoring the cultural and political forces bearing on its production and thus producing a kind of blindness to the political and social domination practiced upon colonized nations.[1] Similarly, examinations of literature produced *within* colonized spaces were also guilty of a methodological blindness. Rather than examining the circumstances under which non-European, or so-called "Commonwealth," literatures were produced, Commonwealth literary studies sought to draw connections "between individual [non-European] writers like Soyinka or Achebe and, firstly, the British tradition, secondly, other Commonwealth novelists, and only last, if at all, between such figures and other Nigerian authors" (*Postcolonial* 27). In so doing, they attempted to claim, following scholar A. Norman Jeffares, that "all of us are members of a common culture" (Jeffares, "Introduction" to Press xvii). Clearly, however, the proposed "common culture" was defined in predominantly British terms. Commonwealth studies simply replicated notions of a British "norm" against which other cultures should be measured.[2]

From this context, Said's *Orientalism* emerges, and with it, according to Moore-Gilbert, postcolonial theory (*Postcolonial* 34).[3] *Orientalism* departed from forms of colonial discourse analysis that were not sufficiently politicized[4] by bringing to bear on them post-structuralist and Marxist theories of discourse and power. Grounding his work in Michel Foucault's notion of discourse and in Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony, Said combines a dizzying number of sources from a variety of disciplines to show that the relationship between Europe and the Orient is a discursively created and maintained "relationship of power and domination" (*Orientalism* 5). Colonial discourse—understanding "discourse" to mean, in the terms laid out by Foucauldian theory, cultural "narratives" that produce and sustain "order" by presenting themselves as "truth" or "the

way things are"—produces a notion that the European is superior to the non-European. This notion became the guiding principle of cultural hegemony; that is, it became the "cultural form [that] predominated over others . . . a collective notion identifying 'us' Europeans against all 'those' non-Europeans" (*Orientalism* 7).

More specifically, according to Said, from the 18th century onward, the Orient and the Oriental became objects of study, something/someone to document, to understand, and thus, to rule. Various scholarly disciplines took part in such study, invariably depicting the "positional" superiority of the West by placing the West/Westerners in discursive and/or metaphorical hierarchical relationships with the East/Easterners. No matter where one looked, one could find representations that cast non-Europeans as different and deficient to a European norm: where the West was intellectually advanced, the East was intellectually primitive; where the West was civil, just, and moral, the East was backwards and barbaric. As Said explains, the differences between East and West, and thus the proclaimed superiority of the latter over the former, were ostensibly proven and illustrated "by the developing sciences of ethnology, comparative anatomy, philology and history . . . [as well as by] a sizable body of literature produced by novelists, poets, translators, and gifted travelers" (*Orientalism* 40).

Such representations, produced by variegated fields of study, converged to become the discourse of colonial ideology, which presented itself as "fact" or "truth" and helped to "justify" the political/social subjugation of "Other" races to the conquering Western power. As Said explains, in colonial discourse "there are Westerners, and there are Orientals. The former dominate; the latter must be dominated, which usually means having their land occupied, their internal affairs rigidly controlled, their blood and

treasure put at the disposal of one or another Western power . . . The sense of Western power over the Orient is taken for granted as having the status of scientific truth" (*Orientalism* 36, 46). As distinctions between European norm and non-European Other became fixed in the public consciousness as "truth," as so-called "knowledge" of the Other proliferated, as the Other's supposed primitiveness, barbarity, and moral and intellectual backwardness were repeatedly contrasted to European civility and cultural, social, moral, and intellectual advancement, colonial expansion could be justified on the basis of the profound "fitness" for rule of the European people. Europeans represented themselves as "true" leaders; they represented their "Others," in turn, as "truly" in need of *being* led. Europeans, such discourse proposed, could "help" those Others attain more advanced levels of civilization (*Orientalism* 31-9).[5]

Said's work has provided a theoretical springboard for innumerable scholars in the fields of colonial discourse analysis and postcolonial criticism. Although Said's study was limited to the British, French, and American colonial relationship with what is now known as the Middle East, scholars have long since rearticulated his work into more general terms. Any study that examines the relationship between the colonizing West and the Others against which it defines itself owes a debt of gratitude to Said's theoretical framework, and some of the most well-known and prolific thinkers in the postcolonial field have been happy to pay it. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen, for instance, have marked *Orientalism* as "the catalyst for much new work [in Western theory] . . . and still an indispensable reference point" (1), while Ania Loomba calls *Orientalism* "foundational" to colonial discourse analysis (43). Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak seem to agree with this pronouncement, Bhabha claiming that "*Orientalism*

inaugurated the postcolonial field" ("Postcolonial Criticism" 465) and Spivak designating *Orientalism* as "the source book of our discipline" ("Marginality" 56).

This is not to say, however, that critics have unanimously accepted the accuracy or viability of Said's claims. In fact, much work that follows Said's has sought to extend Said's insights, rather than simply apply them in other analyses. As Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman have claimed, "the majority of responses [to Said's work] have been of the 'yes, but . . .' variety" ("Introduction" to "Theorizing the West" 128). Aijaz Ahmad's *In Theory*, for instance, accuses Said of ingratiating himself with third world intellectuals while simultaneously remaining complicit with, in his refusal to acknowledge, contemporary forms of Western violence that are still prevalent in Western contact with other cultures (165-66). Another criticism leveled at Said is that he does not adequately account for resistance to colonialism by the colonized. Megan Vaughn charges that "Said appears to have placed himself in the position of denying the possibility of any . . . agency on the part of the colonised. . . . [T]his theoretical position runs counter to Said's professed political aim of effecting the dissolution of 'Orientalism'" (3).[6]

In the context of my study, the element of Said's work that has been most usefully challenged and rearticulated by other scholars is his treatment of the possibility for resistance *within* colonial discourse. At times, he implies that meaningful resistance to the dominant discourse can be achieved by individuals situated within the hegemonic order. Here he differs from Foucault, who claims in *Discipline and Punish* that the "subordination of one group by another," which is affected through discourse, is "non-reversible" (222-3). No individual voice can be heard, because all voices are contained within and thus disciplined by the framework of that dominant discourse. Resistance, in

other words, is impossible. Said, however, explains that "unlike Michel Foucault, to whose work I am indebted, I do believe in the determining imprint of individual writers upon the otherwise anonymous collective body of texts constituting a discursive formation like *Orientalism*" (*Orientalism* 23). Certain individuals, he posits, "are perfectly capable of freeing themselves from the old ideological straightjacket" (*Orientalism* 326) and presenting challenges to dominant ideology.

Despite these moments of departure from what Moore-Gilbert calls a "pessimistic Foucauldian" perspective (*Postcolonial* 51), however, Said ultimately seems much less willing to believe in the liberatory potential of voices within the dominant order. His return to Foucauldian thinking, of course, is ironically at odds with his own position as critic. If hegemony can not be criticized from within, how, we might ask, is Said able to criticize it? Nonetheless, in the end, colonial discourse as Said explains it is, for the most part, what we might call "univocal."[7] That is, it is static and unchanging, unchallenged by alternate modes of representation from within the hegemonic order. It produced and reproduced the binary oppositions between East and West that themselves produced and reproduced Europe's belief in its own unquestioned and unquestionable superiority to such an extent, Said claims, that it is possible to deem "every European, in what he could say about the Orient, . . . a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric" (*Orientalism* 204). Even Said's later reformulation of *Orientalism*'s theories, for instance in *Culture and Imperialism*, which does leave more room for resistance to colonial discourse, reiterates the conclusion that the so-called positional superiority of the West is apparent in "almost any text one looks at in the nineteenth century" (*Culture and Imperialism* 126).

The controversial notion that colonial discourse is unchallengeable and ultimately unchanging has led to the most productive elaborations of Said's work, and these elaborations have led directly to my own study. Specifically, the works of Dennis Porter, Abdul JanMohamed, and Homi Bhabha have discussed the ways individual texts may voice dissent to the dominating discourse of colonialism.

For Porter, Said does not pay enough attention to what Porter terms "literary" texts. By "literary," Porter does not mean texts that have traditionally been considered "aesthetic" objects or products of "high" culture. Indeed, Porter seeks to avoid the "mystification which has traditionally distinguished among all written products a category of the literary and has then gone on to separate it from all other forms of textual production" by naming "literary" "all texts—traditionally literary, philosophical, historical, etc.—which are of sufficient complexity to throw ideological practices into relief and raise questions about their own fictionalizing processes" (153). These textual productions, he says, often seem to display an adherence to colonial ideology but are, in fact, "fissured with doubt and contradiction" (155).

Using T. E. Lawrence's *The Seven Pillars of Wisdom* and Marco Polo's *Travels* to situate his argument, Porter claims that a "dual overdetermination, that of an author as well as that of a text" contributes to discernible textual ambivalences within colonial discourse. Porter argues that authors' divided political loyalties as well as the apparently unruly qualities of language itself (language, while the author's attention is "diverted from properly hegemonic questions . . . releases forces that have a capacity for producing the unexpected" [160]) contribute to the ambivalence of these texts. Why Porter locates some moments of textual ambivalence within the range of authorial intention and others

seemingly outside of the author's control remains unexplained, but the overall argument of this essay is essential to my own theory of colonial discourse. For Porter, and for me, texts that might on some level seem to espouse traditional notions of colonialist ideology can, on another level and at the same time, illustrate the multivocal quality of colonial discourse: "Orientalist discourse, far from being monolithic, allows counter-hegemonic voices to be heard within it" (155).

Abdul JanMohamed hears counter-hegemonic voices as well, but he interprets such voices differently than Porter. Like Said, JanMohamed believes that colonial discourse is structured on binary opposition. JanMohamed, however, more explicitly than Said, grounds his discussion of colonial discourse in the material circumstances of colonialism, giving explicit *reasons* for colonialist representation of the Other. According to JanMohamed, during the "dominant" phase of colonialism, the colonizer imposes military power and bureaucratic control over the colonized nation in order to exploit the material resources of the colonized space. As this occurs, colonialist literature seeks to divert attention from the economic reasons for expansion and attribute the subjugation of the Other to Europe's "civilizing mission." To this end, literature employs what JanMohamed calls a "Manichean allegory" to assert the essential differences between colonizer and colonized, to "prove" that the colonizer is a natural leader and the colonized is a natural and grateful follower. "If such literature can demonstrate the barbarism of the native is irrevocable," JanMohamed explains, "or at least very deeply ingrained, then the European's attempt to civilize him can continue indefinitely, the exploitation of his resources can proceed without hindrance, and the European can persist in enjoying a position of moral superiority" (62).

Every text, he says, centers on the Manichean allegory—with no exceptions. JanMohamed does, however, admit that the degree to which texts employ it varies. He classifies texts as either "imaginary" or "symbolic," depending on the extent to which they use the Manichean allegory. These terms are, of course, taken from Jacques Lacan's description of the stages of human development, and characteristics of JanMohamed's "symbolic" and "imaginary" texts parallel characteristics of Lacan's developmental stages. In Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, the imaginary stage is a pre-lingual realm of existence, in which the individual attempts to maintain his/her belief in his/her unity with all Other things (the mother, the world, etc.). As the individual becomes aware that Others exist, and thus that he/she is *not* the Other but a distinct entity, the individual seeks to disavow this notion and, in Malcolm Bowie's words, to "remain 'what one is' by gathering to oneself ever more instances of sameness, resemblance, and self-replication" (92). The presence of the Other is deeply troubling, therefore, and is greeted with aggression and the desire to "dissolve" Otherness into what Anthony Elliot calls a "misperceived" wholeness of self (92-3). Hence, in JanMohamed's scheme, imaginary texts are "structured by objectification and aggression. . . . [T]he native . . . reveals the [imperialist's] self-alienation. . . . 'Imaginary' texts, like fantasies which provide naïve solutions to the subjects' basic problems, tend to center themselves on plots that end with the elimination of the offending natives" (65, 67).

The Lacanian symbolic realm, on the other hand, is reached when the individual enters linguistic structures. In this realm, the self accepts the existence of the Other and recognizes its separateness from Others. Through language, the individual then becomes a "subject," an "I" (Bowie 92, Elliot 95). According to Malcolm, the symbolic is a "realm

of movement rather than fixity, and of heterogeneity rather than similarity. It is the realm of language, the unconscious, and an otherness that remains other" (92). Similarly, JanMohamed calls a text "symbolic" when it at least attempts to accommodate difference, trying neither to obliterate nor to disavow it. Symbolic texts challenge, although often with little success and often to further the colonizer's material cause,[8] the binary oppositions that keep factions pitted against one another in antagonistic relationships, implying instead that peaceful heterogeneity is possible.

Despite the fact that JanMohamed claims that all texts are structured on the Manichean allegory and thus implies that all texts to one extent or another inevitably support dominant colonial ideology, his study illustrates that texts within the dominant discourse can challenge that discourse, even "subconscious[ly]" (61). Counter to Said's vision, then, colonial discourse can be *divided* within itself. It can implicitly resist the very binaries upon which it rests, even if it is ultimately unable to escape them. Alternatives to—and within—colonial discourse can be identified.

Homi K. Bhabha's vision of the heterogeneity of colonial discourse is in some ways akin to JanMohamed's, as Bhabha too relies on psychoanalytic theory to complicate Said's work. While he agrees with Said (and with JanMohamed) that colonial discourse produces and exercises power through an "articulation of forms of difference" ("Other Question" 67), Bhabha notes that Said's focus on binary differences between colonizer/colonized is a "historical and theoretical simplification" that assumes "that power is possessed entirely by the colonizer" ("Difference" 200). His own work is consistently determined to complicate the notion of binary difference by applying what he calls an "analytic of ambivalence" ("Other Question" 67). For Bhabha, *ambivalence*,

rather than essential difference, lies at the heart of the colonial encounter, and it is inextricably linked to the workings of the human psyche, especially as schematized by Lacan. Bhabha relies heavily, for instance, on Lacan's notions of subject formation as a process during which one defines oneself against an Other. Bhabha's transposition of Lacanian psychoanalysis into the realm of colonial relations is more elusive than JanMohamed's, perhaps because it is employed in conjunction with poststructuralist attention to the ambivalence of text and language, perhaps because of the intense difficulty of Bhabha's prose,[9] but it has, nevertheless, allowed Bhabha to focus on the affective space *shared* by colonizer and colonized—a profoundly ambivalent space of psychic recognition and disavowal of colonial authority by both parties in the colonial encounter—to show that power is constantly contested and renegotiated within the colonial sphere.[10]

For Bhabha, the workings of colonial power follow a trajectory similar to Lacanian subject formation. Just as the Lacanian self can only exist in relation to the Other, in the colonial space, continued control by the colonizer depends on the colonized subject's reflecting back at the colonizer the colonizer's vision: of itself as leader, of the English world view as universal, of English law as natural and inevitable, of the colonized as willing subject. There is always, however, constant opposition to the colonizer's authority: "a pressure, and a presence . . . acts constantly, if unevenly, along the entire boundary of authorization" ("Signs" 109). Bhabha articulates two ways that such resistance is manifested: mimicry and hybridity. In both cases, though in different ways and with different effects, the colonizer's vision is not simply reflected back in

total; it is, rather, returned in a "partial" form ("Signs"114) so that it undermines authority and challenges the colonizing power.

Europeans have long sought to create mimics, who, in adopting a Western world view (inclusive of language, religion, notions of 'civilized' or 'appropriate' behavior, and so on), would be easily controlled by the colonizer. Creating mimics meant creating a "colonial subjectivity" ("On Mimicry" 87) that was "partial"—"almost the same [as the colonizer] *but not quite*" ("On Mimicry" 86). The mimic would behave *like* the colonizer, would display all the behaviors and adopt all the beliefs that constitute an acceptable English subject, but he/she would be barred from the power (and equal treatment) enjoyed *by* the colonizer, because he/she would remain undeniably Other, undeniably not-the-colonizer, by *the very act of mimicry itself.* In Bhabha's terms "to be Anglicized is *emphatically* not to be English" (87). Mimicry seems, then, a particularly effective mode of solidifying colonial authority. Yet the very doubleness that seems to allow mimicry such authoritarian success—the mimic's simultaneous similarity to and difference from the colonizer—is also exactly what renders it "ambivalent." The practice of mimicry is rife with what Bhabha calls "slippage," or, as I understand him, with moments of disconnection between its intended function (here, discipline) and its effect. That is, "mimicry," Bhabha says, "is at once resemblance and menace" (86).

It is on one hand a device of control imposed by the colonizer and adopted by the colonized, while, on the other hand, it represents a decided threat to colonial power. This threat exists on a literal level, of course: the mimic becomes capable to displacing the colonizer within the colonial space (taking his/her job, filling his/her role as "ruler"). The hierarchical divisions separating colonizer/colonized become blurred as mimicry

destabilizes essential definitions of identity/authority. For Bhabha, however, mimicry's menace has more to do with the affective ambivalence of identification as a means of gaining authority than with the material existence of colonizer/colonized. As I mentioned above, the colonizer gains his/her sense of authority by seeing that authority reflected by the Other. The Other must mirror back to the colonizer exactly the world view that the colonizer asserts. But when a colonized subject mimics, he or she does not simply reflect back the colonizer's world view. Instead, the mimic offers the colonizer a partial image of him/herself—an image of authority that is *not* authority, but a *lack* of authority, an image of a self that is not a self, but an Other ("On Mimicry" 88-9, 91). In so doing, mimicry undermines the colonizer's sense of his/her sovereignty and destabilizes colonial control. In other words, the colonizer gains and attempts to retain power, paradoxically, by creating that which guarantees it instability: "the success of colonial appropriation depends on a proliferation of inappropriate objects that ensure its strategic failure" ("On Mimicry" 86).

Similarly, colonizing control is contested by another ambivalent colonial construction, closely related to mimicry: "hybridity." While mimicry, however, refers to a person, "hybridity" refers to a colonial space in which power is negotiated and rearticulated in different forms. According to Bhabha, colonized subjects who are faced with the imposition of foreign authority do not simply embrace wholeheartedly that which is expressed by the colonizer as the "truth." As Bhabha's parable of the English Book, the Bible, as a symbol of Western authority makes clear, colonized subjects do not replace their world view with the colonizers'. Instead, they integrate elements of the colonizer's world view with their own, producing a *new* space that is neither entirely

"European" nor entirely "not-European;" it is, rather, a "specifically colonial space of negotiations of cultural authority" ("Signs" 119), a space of "hybridity." Governed by a hybrid knowledge (partly that of the colonizer, partly that of the colonized), the hybrid space "articulate[s] the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate[s] them within the deferential relations of colonial power" ("Signs" 110). As such, the space "retains the actual semblance of the authoritative symbol but revalues its presence." Rather than simply reflect back the colonizer's authority, in other words, it "terrorizes authority with the *ruse* of recognition, its mimicry, its mockery" ("Signs" 115). Like the mimic, who *seemed* like the colonizer but caused a psychic disintegration of the colonizer's authority, hybridity threatens colonial power by both accepting and denying colonial forms of knowledge. "[T]he boundaries of authority," Bhabha explains, "are always besieged by 'the other scene'" of alternate knowledge ("Signs" 116).

Bhabha's work is essential in any discussion of colonial relations, because it refuses to rest on the binary divisions posited by Said. Instead, Bhabha claims that a much more complicated relationship exists between colonizer and colonized, one which is constantly negotiated and transformed, one which is productive of previously unimagined spaces. In addition, I find Bhabha's concepts of mimicry and hybridity particularly illuminating when they are applied to a study of the ways in which colonial authority in Victorian Britain could be contested from *within* the dominant discourse. While mimicry and hybridity are, as Bhabha has argued, effects of the colonial encounter that allow for the undermining of colonial authority in the *colonized* world, I propose that they can be viewed in kind when they appear in the discursive world of the colonizer.

That is, the presence of mimicry and hybridity in ostensibly "Orientalist" discourse can indicate a rebuttal of, or at least an implicit challenge to, colonial ideology.

Taken in sum, Said's *Orientalism,* and Porter's, JanMohamed's, and Bhabha's reworkings of that text's conclusions, provide the base for my own discussion of colonial discourse in nineteenth-century Britain. Their work appears by name or by implication in each of the following chapters, as I chart the ambivalence that defines three colonialist texts: Wilkie Collins' *Armadale*, Mary Kingsley's *Travels in West Africa*, and Bithia Mary Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville.* Said's foundational claim that the relationship between Europe and its Others was represented discursively and was a means of attaining and maintaining power is an unstated assumption in each of my discussions. In addition, Porter's and JanMohamed's notions that texts can be internally divided, and Bhabha's insight that representations of the colonial encounter are ambivalent, are guiding precepts that run throughout my entire study. Furthermore, JanMohamed's call to avoid treating colonial discourse "as if it existed in a vacuum" (60) is heeded in each chapter, as I begin my discussions by situating each text within a distinct historical moment. The common idea among all of these scholars (excepting Said), that colonial ideology can be resisted from within the dominant discourse, is essential to my study as well. Exactly how such resistance is manifested is the subject of each chapter that follows.

While none these primary texts is overtly "about" a specific colonial engagement, particular colonial encounters between Britain and its Others lead to what I see as the divided narration of each—narrations that, in one way or another, challenge the overriding precepts of colonial discourse. Chapter 1argues that anxieties produced in the British imagination by two colonial rebellions, the infamous Indian "Mutiny" of 1857

and the much less critically-discussed Jamaican Morant Bay rebellion of 1865, surface in Wilkie Collins' *Armadale* in the form of a split representation of the African-West Indian/British Ozias Midwinter. Reports of British brutality during the two rebellions forced the British to question the essentialism of colonial discourse, which claimed that the British were, by their nature, more civil and just than their so-called "savage" Others. By casting the "hybrid" Midwinter as the moral center of the novel while simultaneously depicting him as essentially Other, the text voices similar concerns and displays a challenge to the discourse of colonialism. Chapter 2 examines Mary Kingsley's *Travels in West Africa: Congo Français, Corisco, and Cameroons* as what I call, re-casting Bhabha's terminology, a "mimic-text." That is, Kingsley's travelogue of her journey through previously unexplored parts of Africa simultaneously gives voice to colonialist depictions of Africa and the African and denies the viability of such representations. In its attention to the way Kingsley's lived experience within Africa differed from what she had been led to expect by colonial discourse of various kinds, and in its depiction of colonial "mimics," Kingsley's narration betrays a deeply divided relationship with colonial discourse. Finally chapter 3 discusses Bithia Mary Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville* as a "symbolic" novel, in an application of JanMohamed's terms. This Irish novel depicts colonial relations from the perspective of the colonized Irish, and as such, its critical eye is turned toward the British. By resisting anti-Irish stereotypes and re-enacting the very process of British colonization of Ireland, the novel challenges colonial discourse's notions of British superiority and of the appropriateness of British rule. Nonetheless, in the end, I argue, Croker's "Anglo-Indian" romance presents an image of heterogeneous, peacefully coexisting alterity.

I have deliberately chosen to discuss works from a variety of discursive "locations" (one English novel, one English travelogue, and one Irish novel) in order to show that ambivalence within colonial discourse was not limited to any one genre or locality. My inclusion of Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville*, however, deserves a further word of explanation. While I am to some extent uncomfortable "appropriating" an Irish text and placing it within a British context—as such publications like the Field Day Anthology of Irish Literature has recently sought to rescue Irish texts from just this kind of "literary colonization"[11]—I have done so in order to examine the ways in which a non-English British subject, both inside the "British Empire" and a victim of its colonial ideology, resists colonial discourse.

Examining these various textual contact zones provides a view of a cultural ideology at work and under siege during the nineteenth century. In presenting textual moments during which apparently static categories of norm/Other and colonizer/colonized waver and occasionally break down, these texts illustrate that hegemonic concepts can be, ultimately, disrupted from within. Alternate voices can be heard, and new spaces of respected and coexisting difference can be imagined. The presence of such alternative ideas in colonial discourse does not in itself forecast the inevitability of material change, I admit. But it does, at the very least, remind us that power is mediated in discursive forms and can be challenged in kind.

*

I end with a scene that my colleagues in academia will, perhaps, read with a shudder of recognition. It is the first day of the semester, and my first-year literature class listens anxiously as I explain what's in store for them in the next 15 weeks. After the

obligatory discussion of attendance policy and office hours, I tell them that we will be reading, among other things, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* and Wilkie Collins' *The Woman in White*, both, I explain, incredibly interesting nineteenth-century British novels. After class, I chat with an Engineering major who has some reservations about the class. He's worried that the reading schedule will keep him from his engineering homework, he says, "and besides, I'm sort of reluctant to spend so much time doing something that really, well, just doesn't *matter*." He immediately becomes nervous and tries to recant: "Not that English is, you know, pointless or meaningless...it's just that it doesn't have anything to do with, like, the *real world*."

Although my dissertation is not overtly concerned with pedagogy, I include this brief vignette because it illustrates a misconception that my study, I hope, implicitly seeks to correct. The assumption that literature study is somehow removed from the "real" work of society is common, although it often goes unstated by students (or friends, or family members) who are afraid to offend the teacher by vocally doubting that her chosen vocation has any value beyond the academy's Ivory Tower. What they do not see, what they refuse to consider, is that reading literature critically *does* have implications in the world outside of academia. It can, I propose, promote a mode of thinking that helps students and non-students alike become more fully-aware, conscientious, and non-combative participants in a social sphere that is, unfortunately, all too often marked by either tacit acceptance of "the way things are" or by resistance to the status quo that can only be voiced through (often violent) adversarial confrontation. More specifically, using postcolonial theory to read works of literature, as I do in this study, gives us the tools to critically examine not only literature, but also the "real world" we inhabit.

My suggestion that literary study can be useful, even essential, in the world outside of academia stands in direct opposition to Ahmad's argument in *In Theory.* Ahmad criticizes postcolonial theory for its *lack* of political action, for its tendency to replace more traditional forms of activism with a theoretical examination of discursive structures.[12] For Ahmad, postcolonial theory's implied claim that "*reading* is the appropriate form of politics" (3) is politically limiting in its conflation of abstract activities with material effects. I am troubled by what seems to be Ahmad's reliance on traditional models of political activism, as such models are rooted in adversarial intractability and often in physical violence. On the contrary, I believe that "reading," that carefully examining discourse of all kinds (written, spoken, viewed), *is* a means to achieving material change, a step that should necessarily predate any other, more violent, activism. Postcolonial theory's discussions of socio-political power illustrate that political power *and resistance to it* have been and continue to be mediated in *discursive* form. Resistance to dominant ideology *can* be lodged, in other words, without resorting to violence.

Postcolonial theory, then, in teaching us how to read texts for their ambivalence, for the way they both create *and defy* dominant social structures, presents a model, should we choose to see it as such, for political activism that is based not on antagonistic argument or physical struggle but on identifying dissenting voices within an apparently hegemonic sphere. Such dissenting voices, it seems to me, as others join them, can radically challenge existing structures, moving from the margins of society to the center, and displacing the dominant structures they criticize. While it would be naïve to propose that dialogue is always an adequate means of resistance—sometimes, admittedly,

oppression must be combated through more physical means—I am convinced that it *is always* the place to begin.

An underlying hope of my work, then, is that, by studying nineteenth-century textual artifacts for the way they both create *and resist* ideas that seem inevitably "true," we can see that challenging overriding social discourses can at least begin as a peaceful (sometimes implicit) exchange of ideas. While I do not claim a tangible progression leading from the publication of the works I discuss to material social change in Victorian Britain, I do hope to show that applying postcolonial analysis to examinations of nineteenth-century texts allows us, if we listen, to hear dissent within the dominant.

Notes

[1] See, for example, Molly Mahood's *The Colonial Encounter: A Reading of Six Novels* (1977), which claims that authors like Forster and Conrad should be studied for their apolitical stances, and Alan Sandison's *The Wheel of Empire*, which suggests that literature of empire contains allegories of 'universal' states of being. Mahood has been soundly criticized by Abdul JanMohamed, who argues that Mahood's study "restricts itself by severely bracketing the political context of culture and history" (59). Similarly, Benita Parry contends that Sandison's study is "calculated to drain the writings of historical specificity [in order to] naturalize . . . the principles of the master culture as universal forms of thought" (51).

[2] B. Argyle's study of Australian fiction, for instance, criticizes scholars who focus on national identity rather than on more "universal" subject matter. He finds it "a pity in these universal times to find so many modern Australian critics bogged down in being Australian" (61). See also A. Norman Jeffares' call to make "standard British English" the language of choice for all Commonwealth literature. Jeffares claims that "our ultimate job may well be to keep the language homogeneous, so that when somebody writes in one part of the Commonwealth he or she will retain an audience in another part" ("Introduction" to Goodwin xv). For a similar argument, see William Walsh's *Commonwealth Literature*.

[3] Robert Young, on the other hand, locates the first instance of postcolonial critique with Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* in 1961. Using Sartre's preface to that work as a base for his argument, Young asserts that critiques of the "structures of colonialism"

grew from reactions against Western Humanism. See Young's *White Mythologies*, pp. 118-26.

[4] This is not to imply that resistance to the ostensibly apolitical precepts of Commonwealth literary studies was absent before Said. Indeed, Moore Gilbert notes that from the very beginning, Commonwealth literary studies were criticized by scholars who cited the political implications of the so-called "universal" but nonetheless normative (and European) paradigms laid out by those calling for a relative, humanistic reading of literature produced by non-European cultures. See Moore-Gilbert's *Postcolonial Theory* 29-33.

[5] To avoid over-generalizing about the forms of knowledge that contributed to colonial discourse in the Victorian era, I will examine them in relation to the particular historical circumstances surrounding the production of the specific texts I discuss in each of the following chapters. For now my goal is simply to orient the reader to Said's general concepts.

[6] See also Said's discussion of his critical reception in "*Orientalism* Reconsidered."

[7] Similarly, Zakia Pathak, Saswati Sengutpa, and Sharmila Purkayastha call it "monologic," lamenting that "the history that *Orientalism* helps recover from the white text is thus monologic; it does not help us to recuperate other narratives which interrupt the hegemony of the narrative of imperialism" (215).

[8] That is, JanMohamed says that symbolic texts "are aware of the inevitable necessity of using the native as a mediator of European desires" (66).

[9] Many critics have commented on the problems associated with reading Bhabha's work. Moore-Gilbert, for instance, asserts that "his characteristically teasing, evasive, even

quasi-mystical (or mystificatory) mode of expression seems designed to appeal primarily to the reader's intuition" (*Postcolonial* 115).

[10] Moore-Gilbert succinctly explains, "Bhabha's work shifts the focus of colonial discourse analysis from how western will and intention construct a public sphere which mediates colonial power. Instead, Bhabha emphasizes the unconscious sphere of colonial relations, and suggests that it is structured by complicitous kinds of psychic affect circulating between the coloniser and colonised." ("Writing India" 6). For an excellent discussion of Bhabha's body of work up to the late 1980s, see Robert Young's indispensable *White Mythologies*, pp. 141-56. For an equally excellent discussion of Bhabha's work through the 1990s, see Moore-Gilbert's *Postcolonial Theory*, pp. 114-151.

[11] See Seamus Deane's introduction to *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature* for a discussion of Field Day's activities, one of which is this reclassification of literatures previously homogenized under the heading "British literature."

[12] For a discussion of Ahmad's other reasons for distancing himself from postcolonial theory, see Moore-Gilbert 17-19.

Chapter 1

Almost, but not quite:
Mimicry, Essentialism, and the Hybrid Space of Wilkie Collins' *Armadale*

"The English novelist who enters my house (no foreign novelist will be admitted) must understand his art as the healthy-minded English reader understands it in our time. He must know that our purer modern taste, our higher modern morality, limits him to doing exactly two things for us, when he writes us a book. All we want of him is—occasionally to make us laugh; and invariably to make us comfortable."

--Armadale, p. 770

If it were the object of art to make one's audience uncomfortable, without letting them know why, no doubt Mr. Collins would be a consummate artist.

--The Saturday Review, 1866

"'Strange things have happened since you left us,'" British Lydia Gwilt tells African-West Indian/British Ozias Midwinter in the twelfth monthly installment of Wilkie Collins' *Armadale*.[1] Lydia's statement is almost uncannily apropos, for although Collins could not have known so when he wrote the installment, indeed they had.[2] In between the publication of the last number of Book II in August 1865, in which Midwinter leaves Thorpe Ambrose in order to squelch his desire for Lydia, and the publication of Chapter 7 of Book III in October 1865, in which he returns, having failed, colonial volatility in Jamaica had erupted and consumed the public imagination. The Morant Bay rebellion of October 1865 was often compared to the so-called Indian Mutiny, which had fascinated the British public seven years prior (1857-58). The two rebellions reinforced colonialist thinking about British superiority over other races and thus bolstered the nationalist climate of mid-Victorian England, but they also (to different extents) undermined the public certainty in the presumptions that governed colonial

ideology. These two events frame Collins' novel, and the anxieties they produced in the culture are evident in the pages of his text.

Postcolonial theorists such as Richard J. C. Young, Edward Said, and Abdul R. JanMohamed suggest that colonial ideology claims the right to colonize by constructing a clear demarcation between British (more specifically, English) culture and the cultures it considers Other. By mid-century, the study of other races was considered a legitimate academic and scientific endeavor, and, despite disagreements in approaches and guiding philosophies, researchers and scholars attempted to prove and propagate the idea that non-white races were inherently physically and culturally inferior to the British. Young discusses the pervasiveness of the "academic" study of race in the nineteenth century, explaining:

> In the nineteenth century racial theory, substantiated and "proved" by various forms of science such as comparative and historical philology, anatomy, anthropometry (including osteometry, craniology, craniometry, and pelvimetry), physiology, physiognomy, and phrenology, became in turn endemic not just to other forms of science, such as biology and natural history, to say nothing of palaeontology [sic], psychology, zoology and sexology, but was also used a general category of understanding that extended to theories of anthropology, archaeology, classics, ethnology geography, geology, folklore, history, language, law, literature and theology, and thus dispersed from almost every academic discipline to permeate definitions of culture and nation. (93)

"Scientific" or "academic" discourses posited a white Anglo-Saxon, Christian norm—

culturally and socially civilized, physically powerful, and morally and intellectually advanced—against a non-white (or sometimes white but non-English), non-Anglo-Saxon, non-Christian Other, who is deemed physically degraded, as well as morally, culturally, and intellectually "barbaric."

As discussed in my introductory chapter, Edward Said's *Orientalism* asserts that this type of classifying helped European culture to secure its definition of itself. Through various texts and in various genres, the British sought to construct and measure themselves favorably against the "mysterious" or "primitive" "Orient," which served as the Other. JanMohamed, further, suggests that this process of constructing an Other relies upon the "fetishization" of the Other; that is, "substituting natural or genetic categories for those that are socially or ideologically determined. All of the evil characteristics and habits with which the colonialist endows the native are thereby not presented as products of social and cultural difference but as characteristics inherent in the race—in the 'blood'—of the native" (67). According to George Stocking's *Victorian Anthropology* such polarized thinking led to the creation of a "race hierarchy"—in which ethnocentrically-defined essential and unchangeable racial characteristics secured each race's placement on a scale of "humanity." Non-British people (especially those with darker skin) occupied a much lower level in this hierarchy than did the British, and this placement was often used to justify colonial activity. "It was," Stocking explains, "both scientifically and morally respectable for civilized Europeans to take up the white man's burden," because the (usually) dark-skinned "savage," who was not only visibly different, but emotionally and culturally different as well, would benefit from contact with the

benevolent, civilized British race. The British govern, then, by right of their superior position in this fixed hierarchy, a position that is determined by their (superior) *difference* from the Other.

This vision of British right to rule is evident in any number of texts from the mid-Victorian era; simply scan the pages of Victorian newspapers and periodicals, and the nationalistic belief in the British civilizing mission and British racial and cultural preeminence is nearly impossible to miss. In his January 1857 essay for *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, for example, Robert Hogarth Patterson claims that "A great natural law is marked by the various settlements of the white race. . . . [I]t reigns as a dominant caste . . . . ruling over [the indigenous population] by dint of moral, physical, and intellectual superiority" (132). George Trevor's *Blackwood's* article in November 1857 claims that the British colonize not for "simple acquisition" but rather "to bestow, or to educate for, yet higher advantages . . . [of] civilisation and Christianity." The essay goes on to assert that effects of this civilizing mission are noticeable: "That it has not vastly improved [the "native subjects'"] condition, both morally and materially—are assertions never hazarded but by the most ignorant" (620-1). Embedded in popular periodical texts like these is a careful constructing of categories. British moral progress, physical superiority, and intellectual prowess are contrasted by inference to the moral degradation, physical weakness, and intellectual incompetence of the colonized people. The British and the colonized Other are played against each other, then, with the qualities of the "savage" throwing into relief the qualities of the "civilized." The resulting distinct categories of race are thus situated in an ethnocentric hierarchy that appears stable and

fixed, and colonial ideology rests neatly upon it.

The Indian Mutiny of 1857-58 and the Morant Bay Rebellion of 1865, however, throw the Victorian's conception of this "essential" hierarchy into question. The rebellions challenged not only the apparently fixed positions of British and Other in the colonial power structure, in which the British colonizer permanently rules the colonized Other, they also posed a more fundamental challenge—to the ethnocentrically-constructed racial hierarchy that determined that power structure. While some contemporary texts about the two rebellions are careful to uphold colonial ideology by denigrating the rebels and their races, by praising the British, and by asserting the strength of the Crown, others are rife with anxiety about the apparent failure of British strength and the potentially "savage" conduct of the British race. They are anxious, it seems, about the potential reversal of the colonial relationship that presents itself as stable and the breakdown of categories of difference upon which the relationship is ostensibly based.

*

The Indian Mutiny

The Indian Mutiny, also called the "Sepoy Mutiny" after the Indian troops in the British East India Company who instigated it, began in April 1857. What appears to have been the Mutiny's immediate cause was the introduction of the Enfield rifle into the service. To use it, the end of the ammunition cartridge had to be bitten off, but because the sepoys believed that the lubricator used on the cartridges was made from pigs' and cows' blood and that, therefore, having oral contact with it was sacrilegious and would force them to lose their caste, the rifle's introduction was an insult to both Muslims and

Hindus. They rebelled, mutinying against British officers at Meerut and marching to Delhi. The rebellion gained momentum when other sepoys joined them and Moghul emperor Bahadur Shah II was restored to power. The rebels seized Delhi, and for the next year, as rebellions erupted in regiments throughout the country, British troops attempted to contain the insurrection. Containment took over a year, and the Mutiny finally ended in July 1858.[3]

The Mutiny was violent, with attacks on British officers, massacres of British citizens in Delhi, Cawnpore, and other towns, and, perhaps most disturbing to the British, murders of innocent British women and children. Representations of supposed Indian atrocities practiced upon the British were prevalent in the British media. One of the most heavily reported events was the now-notorious massacre at Cawnpore. There Nana Sahib appeared to offer the British an opportunity for escape, but when they were escorted to boats ostensibly provided for their safe passage to Allahabad, they were massacred by Indian troops.[4] Several British women and children survived, only to be imprisoned in Cawnpore, where they were later "hacked to death and their bodies thrown down a well" (Brantlinger 201). This massacre figures in much of the literature that arose in response to the Mutiny: Charles Ball's *History of the Indian Mutiny* focuses much of its energy on Cawnpore, and later G. O. Trevelyan's "history" of the Mutiny betrays its biased focus in its title, *Cawnpore*. Of course, the story of Cawnpore was not the only story of the atrocities suffered by the British circulating during and after the Mutiny. Indians were rumored to have raped and tortured women, mutilated British soldiers, and even crucified Europeans who tried to suppress the rebellion ("East India House" 11). The *Times'*

graphically reported that "To burn or punch out the eye, or burn the bowels out, are matters of every day occurrence" ("Curse" 6). Writing for *Blackwood's*, Francis Bromlow more demurely refers to the atrocities only obliquely: "this is not the place to enter into any detail of [the atrocities]—it is bad enough to read them; to write an account of them would be impossible to me" (614).

The actions of the mutineers were attributed predominantly to the racial and cultural makeup of the Indian people. They were, in the British mind, prone to violence, treachery, and cruelty. Report after report of the Mutiny cast the Indian mutineer in direct opposition to the more civilized British ruler. In fact, the sentiment expressed by a *Times* writer, that "the whole history of the Indian rebellion brings out in bold relief the immeasurable superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race" seems to run through most accounts of the Mutiny ("British Heroism" 5). One report from the *Times*, for instance, explains that the "kindly and cordial" Englishman "forgot the lessons Oriental history had taught him. . . . that cruelty and caste are synonymous" and that the "native" is capable of "the darkest and foulest crimes" ("Indian Native Character" 12). Another *Times* report juxtaposes the "benevolent" and "humane" British with the "cunning" and "wild" Indian ("Indian Mutiny" 7), while an essay by G. C. Swayne for *Blackwood's* contrasts the Indian "bottomless pit of villainy" with the British "diamond-mine of human heroism" (595). As these texts draw attention to the innate violence of the Indian and the innate benevolence and heroism of the British, categories of 'civilized British' and 'savage Other' upon which the colonial power structure rests appear to be firmly in place.

The categories also appear to be firmly in place when contemporary texts discuss the also violent British response to the Mutiny. Swayne's text asserts British power and casts the Indian as a weak, almost unworthy opponent by posing an apparently rhetorical question: "How can any sane man doubt of the ultimate issue? We shall be stronger than ever in India" (595). Bromlow's assertions of British power are even more detailed: "The time is drawing near for us to go in; and when we do go in, [the rebels] know well enough what the consequences will be. . . . Tens of thousands of [the Mutiny's] most bigoted supporters will lose their lives; the king of Delhi . . . will infallibly be hung; and the city itself . . . will be utterly destroyed" (614). According to these, albeit sometimes overblown, promises of retribution, British strength will prevail, and the British will undoubtedly be validated as the rightful rulers.

Ethnocentric denigration of the Indians and proclamations of British superiority give voice to colonialism's guiding precepts. The rhetorical representations of the Other's inherent savagery and the British nation's inherent power and civility seem to situate British/Other within a clear racial hierarchy, in which the British are culturally and morally superior and thus the colonial relationship is justly and permanently in place. But despite these apparently untroubled colonialist assumptions, an undercurrent of anxiety runs through texts about the Mutiny. The colonial relationship, the texts also seem to say, might *not* be permanently fixed. The British were, after all, conquered by the Indian rebels on at least a few occasions, and the Mutiny did take over a year to put down. The almost obsessive attention to the violence done to the British, one could argue, is evidence of the British shock they were *susceptible* to such violence. After referring to

"atrocities" suffered by the British, for instance, Bromlow notes that "the rebels have fought much better than was expected" and that "though repulsed . . . they have faced Europeans with a certain degree of pluck for which no one gave them credit" (614). Clearly, Bromlow's text deemphasizes the (at least temporary) conquest of the British, but the reference to that compromised position is telling. Perhaps, the text implies, Britain might not permanently occupy a position of power in colonial relations.

Similarly, a letter to an Indian newspaper reprinted by the *Times* questions the British position of power abroad. The letter suggests that, if the British continue to employ Indians in civil service, they are "increasing the fire and reducing the water . . . we shall have all these horrors and murders again" ("Indian Mutiny" 7). Swayne echoes these concerns, worrying that, if the crown does not govern its territories carefully, "England may one day be undermined to her destruction." He cautions, "We have tried to govern India with the scales of justice without her sword . . . . [W]e have handed over the sword into the very hands we ought to have tied up in mischief. . . . After the suppression of the Mutiny . . . [t]he sword must guard its gain" (598). While this statement does imply that the British *can* rule effectively and forcefully, it also implies that the position of leadership can be lost without proper care.[5] All of these texts, then, seem to betray anxiety about the tenuous nature of colonialism's power structure.[6] As the British can at least potentially be conquered by the Other and as the position of leadership can at least be *threatened*, the power structure is not as stable as it seems.

Furthermore, the Indian Mutiny presented the Victorians with a challenge to a fundamental belief of colonial ideology: that the British were inherently superior to the

colonized races they ruled: that is, where the Other is savage, the British are civil, morally progressive, just, and fair, and they are, therefore, fit and undeniable rulers. But with the Indian Mutiny, the very supposition that the British are culturally and morally superior to the Indian comes into question, as British actions during the Mutiny indicate British *savagery*. Patrick Brantlinger notes that the British response to the Mutiny was harsh, with the British committing "atrocities of their own." Executions were carried out without trial, captured mutineers were shot out of the mouths of canons, Indian towns were looted, and innocent Indian people were massacred with the guilty (201). Lawrence James agrees with Brantlinger's assessment, adding that some generals responded by imposing martial law and punishing, often by death, anyone *suspected* of insurrection, regardless of age or gender. James depicts the British atrocities in even greater detail:

> In one village, where it was feared that three fugitives from Delhi, a doctor, his wife and child, had been murdered, eleven suspects were rounded up. . . . [E]ach was coated with pork fat and had pork fat thrust down his throat before being hanged. . . . [In other villages] condemned men were made to lick the blood from the floors under threat of a lashing and then Muslims were forced were forced to swallow pork and Hindus beef. After defilement and often more dead than alive, they were hung before parties of jeering soldiers. (251-2)

Reports of such acts assumed that they were in retribution for the "atrocities" practiced on the British, especially the alleged rape and torture of innocents, and news of soldiers' actions was often greeted with praise by the British public. Simultaneously, however, contrary reports were received. The acts presumably committed in the name of vengeance

sometimes occurred *before* the events that were claimed to have prompted them, if those events occurred at all (Brantlinger 201). Reports to the East India House showed that, in fact, most rumored Indian atrocities had never been committed. Officers stationed in India claimed that tales of alleged rape, torture, and mutilation remained unsubstantiated, and that reports of their occurrence had originated in England ("East India House" 11).

With (or even without) the knowledge that the violent British response might have been, in some cases, unwarranted, notions of civility and savagery become more complicated in the British mind. Amidst the clamoring for vengeance and the praise for British heroism so prevalent in the English press, a note of trepidation appears, as some writers urge the British not to become savage themselves.[7] Swayne argues that "As war is noble and justifiable under certain circumstances, it is lawful for man to destroy his neighbor . . . . But it is not lawful to give any of them one instant unnecessary pain" (596). The message in this argument is clear: executing rebels is noble because it is justified, and British citizens who impose this punishment are noble themselves. Torturing rebels, however, is much the opposite and compromises British civility. An anonymous poet in *Punch* similarly warns the British against behaving like the Indian is accused of behaving: "let not his [the Indian's] guilt thy manhood stain" (*Punch* 12 September 1857). These warnings, it seems to me, indicate cultural tension born of the awareness that the British are not innately more civil or moral than those they deem "savage." The British can behave savagely, and they did; their self-proclaimed superiority is thus in question. Categories in the racial hierarchy based on essential difference, then, begin to waver, and with them, so does the certainty in colonial ideology.

Victorian England in the late 1850s seems on one level to be easily nationalistic, untroubled by the guiding principles of colonial ideology. Reports of the Indian Mutiny serve to illustrate the certainty in British superiority, Indian inferiority, and the "correct" placement of each race in the ethnocentrically constructed hierarchy that motivated and justified colonialism. But simultaneously, as I have been arguing, the culture appears to be anxious about colonial ideology; texts about the Mutiny contain a degree of uncertainty about colonialism's precepts. These "divided" texts expose cultural uncertainty about the very definitions and categorizations upon which colonialism rests.

*

Morant Bay Rebellion

The Jamaican Morant Bay rebellion, only eight years after the Indian Mutiny, brought to the fore of public consciousness similar debates about colonialism and its ethnocentric justifications. By 1865, Jamaica was in a state of crisis. Severe drought, low wages, unemployment, and heavy taxation had contributed to an economic decline. The relationship between the governing British on the island and the subjugated African-Jamaican[8] population was strained. Adding to the volatile atmosphere was the fact that representation in the local government was determined by land holdings, which were largely owned by wealthy whites and on which poor African-Jamaican farmers were forced to pay rent or face eviction.[9] In October 1865, African-Jamaican Paul Bogle led a group of protesters to the Morant Bay courthouse, where they sought to secure the escape of a man they felt was being unjustly tried before the magistrate. Police sent to arrest Bogle and his followers in a nearby town were overpowered by the protesters, now a

growing crowd (at its largest, made up of several hundred people) that eventually rioted in Morant Bay. The town's courthouse was destroyed, eighteen people (mostly whites) were killed, and many others were wounded. The colonial government quickly suppressed the rebellion; martial law, declared by the British Governor, Edward Eyre, remained in effect for over a month. During that time, several hundred African-Jamaicans were executed or flogged, often without trial and sometimes upon little evidence of their involvement in the rebellion. Reports of the rebellion and its aftermath, which began to reach England in early November and continued to appear in the press throughout the following year, illustrate the apparent belief in the stable power structure of colonialism, which was itself determined by what was claimed to be British moral and cultural superiority to the Other. They also, however, illustrate uncertainty about colonialism and its foundations.

Rather than addressing actual economic and social conditions that might have caused discontent among African-Jamaicans, many journalists indulged in ethnocentric, nationalistic rhetoric that linked the cause, intent, and progress of the insurrection directly to the *race* of the insurgents. The *Times*, for instance, claims that the rebellion occurred because the African-Jamaican had resumed "the barbarous life and the fierce habits of his African ancestors" (13 November 1865). Another article agrees, stating that "it was Africa, hitherto dormant, that had broken out in their natures . . . . We have been trying now, the best part of a century, to wash the blackamoor white . . . . But he remains as black as ever, as thick-skinned as ever; his hair as woolly and his cranium as hard" (18 November 1865).[10] The intent of these "savages," according to many reports, was to

overthrow the British government, massacre the white population, and set up a black republic. *The Times* claimed that a "fanatical hatred of the white man" (13 November 1865) led to an attempt to "establish an exclusively black community, either by destroying the whites or driving them in terror from the island" (17 November 1865). Henry William Wilberforce adds that the insurrection was said to have been "an utterly unprovoked, long-standing, and deep-seated plot . . . . extending through the whole Negro population of Jamaica . . . to murder all the white . . . population, to seize upon their property, and . . . upon their wives and daughters" (355).

Just as reports of the Indian Mutiny had contained accounts of the victimization of whites, these reports of racially-motivated Jamaican rebels also contained sensationalized accounts of the atrocities suffered by the white victims. Wilberforce cites reports that whites were "massacred without provocation in cold blood, and with every circumstance of the 'most fiendish atrocity,' the murdered men being frightfully tortured and mutilated while still living, especially by the women" (365-6). *The British Quarterly Review* relates so-called "atrocities" in even more detail. According to the Governor Eyre,

> "The island curate . . . is said to have had his tongue cut out whist still alive, and attempt is said to have been made to skin him. One person . . . was ripped open and his entrails taken out. One gentleman . . is said to have been pushed into an outbuilding, which was then set on fire, and kept there till he was literally roasted alive. Many are said to have had their eyes scooped out; heads were cleft open and brains taken out . . . fingers were cut off and carried away as trophies. . . some bodies were half burnt, others horribly battered." (Allon and Brown 454)

Not surprisingly, images of African-Jamaican savagery and horror are often contrasted with images of British valor and strength. In one *Times* report, the African-Jamaican's "half knave, half fanatic . . . conspiracies in the desperate hope of winning power and revenge" are contrasted with the British "duty" and "zeal" to "protect the lives and property of its citizens" (17 November 1865, p.8, col b). In another, African-Jamaican "barbarism" is compared to British "civilized authority;" the idea that a "savage" race "could have ever conceived the possibility of defying British sovereignty in the West Indies" is laughable (4 November 1865, p. 9, col c). The civility and power of the British race is thus ostensibly asserted.

These newspaper and magazine reports of the insurrection present a view of events that clearly reflects colonialist doctrine. Insurgents are depicted as savage and barbaric, and the British race is depicted as noble, brave, and just. The ethnocentrically-determined placement of the races in the colonial power structure seems, once again, to be justified and stable. But within these reports, at the same time, challenges to that doctrine exist. As in the English press's reports of the Indian Mutiny, despite all promises of a speedy resolution of the conflict and a restoration to power of the "rightful" authority, the British are depicted as being in imminent danger. The detailed attention paid to the so-called atrocities suffered by British and to the danger facing them throughout the rebellion indicates at least an implicit awareness that British power could be contested. The apparent fixity of positions in the colonial power structure is questioned; the positions are unstable, even reversible.

Furthermore, as reports of the rebellion and its causes continued to filter in to

England, more fundamental challenges to colonial ideology emerge. In a 2000-page document, a Royal Commission, convened to investigate the rebellion, concluded that the insurrection was much more localized than was previously thought, and not the widespread plot to exterminate all whites that it was believed to have been. Instead, the Royal Commission explained, a local protest turned bloody when white volunteers fired upon a body of protesters as it approached the Morant Bay courthouse with what appeared to be loaded weapons (after inspection, these weapons were determined to be police station castoffs and not loaded). Seeing twenty men in their ranks wounded or killed, the protesters attacked the volunteers and the courthouse before spreading east over the island, attacking homes and shops along the way. While several whites were wounded or killed during the insurrection, so-called "frightful atrocities were never committed at all" ("Report" 455). There were no massacres of whites, no torturing of prisoners, no maiming of victims. Instead, when troops arrived, the rioters did not resist, but vanished, and the "rebellion" subsided completely within a week of its beginning ("Report" 452-9). The African-Jamaicans, it seems, were not in fact driven by their "savage" blood or their "fanatical hatred" of the whites. Nor did they *behave* particularly savagely during the events of the week. The *British* did.

Although the insurrection ended within a week, the British imposed martial law for over a month. During that time, British soldiers and officers claimed to have captured, shot, hung, and flogged "'every black man who cannot give an account of himself.'" One soldier explains, "'This is a picture of martial law. The soldiers enjoy it; the inhabitants have to dread it; if they run on their approach, they are shot for running away'" (qtd. in

"Report" 459). The British sacked black settlements, massacred inhabitants, and executed innocent victims as "examples" for the rebels. Journalist M. O'Connor Morris, for instance, reports:

> It arouses our indignation to find that . . . [a local officer] has hung one women—*although she had been recommended to mercy by the court martial which tried her*—because, he says, 'the atrocities perpetuated *by women* .. . decided me to confirm the sentence and to ignore the recommendation to mercy.' That is to say, he hung this woman, not because she individually had been convicted of perpetrating these atrocities, but because 'women' were supposed to have perpetrated them, and therefore it seems, he thought it desirable to hang her as a warning or punishment—what shall we say?—to those other women; the fact being that these atrocities, which the women were supposed to have perpetrated, had not been perpetrated at all. (455)

Similar charges were leveled against Governor Eyre for his treatment of George William Gordon, an African-Jamaican member of the House of Assembly and an outspoken critic of Eyre, whom Eyre accused of taking part in the riot. Even though Gordon was not even in the affected area when the fighting broke out, Governor Eyre had him arrested, and, after he was convicted, sent personal orders for his execution. As Tim Watson notes, Gordon's final letter to his wife, written just before his execution, posited his own righteous behavior against the barbarity that faced him at the hands of the British. In the letter, "he declared his allegiance to the Queen, demonstrated Christian forgiveness for his persecutors, and generally behaved himself like a gentleman" (23).[11] Gordon's

execution and the British officers' apparent zeal for punishing often innocent African-Jamaicans infuriated some of the British public. Seeking retribution for the innocent African-Jamaican victims, in fact, Thomas Huxley, Herbert Spencer, and John Stuart Mill, among others, sought to have Eyre prosecuted for murder. Although these voices were answered by other influential ones—Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin, and Collins' friend Charles Dickens[12] formed the Eyre Defense and Aid Fund—and although this prosecution never came to fruition, Eyre was removed from his post and recalled to England. As reports of British "savagery" during he Indian Mutiny had complicated notions of British superiority, so too did reports of the British actions during the Morant Bay rebellion. The British were not the inherent moral beings that ethnocentric definitions of race claimed they were. Instead, they were, it seems, more "barbarian" than the so-called primitive and violent African-Jamaican population that they suppressed.

Representations of the rebellion in Morant Bay, then, illustrate that the British were perhaps not the morally and civilly superior, just, and all-powerful rulers that ethnocentric colonialist discourse tried to claim they were. The representations undermine these claims by showing the British to be quite the opposite: vulnerable, uncivil, and immoral. The ethnocentric definitions, in other words, upon which colonialism rests, definitions that appear static and fixed, begin to break down. The British ruler can easily become a victim, a subject of non-British "rule;" the British can behave just as barbarically, if not more so, than the so-called primitive people they rule. As these definitions and categories of British/Other become blurred, so too does the ethnocentric ideology guiding colonialism. It seems more difficult to accept unquestioningly that the

British have a "right" to rule.

*

Armadale

Wilkie Collins' *Armadale* may not, at first glance, seem concerned with the ideology of colonialism, perhaps because the intricate plot so completely engages the reader's attention. So complex and lengthy is the plot, in fact, that a brief recapitulation of its main points may be helpful to contextualize this study. The story centers on the second generation of men who share the name Allan Armadale. In the first generation, the recounting of which is limited to the novel's Prologue, Allan Wrentmore assumes the name and inherits the fortune of Allan Armadale after the rightful Allan Armadale is disowned by his father. When Wrentmore takes possession of the Armadale estates in the West Indies, Allan Armadale arrives in disguise and under an assumed name. He befriends Wrentmore only to betray him by marrying Wrentmore's intended bride. Wrentmore, upon discovering Armadale's deceit, murders Armadale and escapes undetected. He then returns to the West Indies and marries a West Indian slave; their union produces a son, whom they christen Allan Armadale Jr. At the same time, the murdered Armadale's wife has also borne a son, conceived before Armadale's murder, and he, too, is christened Allan Armadale Jr. The remainder of the novel concerns these two Allan Armadales.

Wrentmore's son is horribly mistreated by his mother and her new husband (Wrentmore dies soon after his son's birth), and he runs away to escape their abuse, adopting the pseudonym Ozias Midwinter. During his travels, Midwinter becomes ill and

finds himself under the care of the other Allan Armadale Jr. Although he is shocked by their identical names, because he knows nothing of his father's crime, Midwinter assumes the matching names to be a matter of coincidence, maintains his false identity, and enters into a devoted friendship with Allan. After several months, Midwinter receives a letter, written by his father on his deathbed, telling him of his father's crime and warning him to avoid the man who shares his name. The letter promises that, if the two Allan Armadales meet, history will repeat itself: Midwinter, the son of the murderer, will repeat the father's crime. Midwinter is terrified at the thought that he might hurt his friend, and his fear is made even more pronounced when he and Allan, out for a moonlight sail, get "shipwrecked" on the very boat that witnessed the murder of Allan's father. There, Allan has a dream that Midwinter, upon hearing Allan describe it, considers a premonition: Allan sees himself and Midwinter in three different "scenes" that apparently culminate in Allan's death. Both Allan and his friend and advisor, the reverend Mr. Brock, however, assure Midwinter that the dream does not indicate the impending fate of the men. Mr. Brock, who knows Midwinter's entire history, especially helps to ease Midwinter's mind by assuring him that his love for Allan will keep him from doing the man harm. Midwinter, therefore, remains with Allan as Allan takes possession of his new estate, Thorpe Ambrose.

At Thorpe Ambrose, though, the scenes from the dream begin to come true. Midwinter is particularly disturbed by the actualization of the scenes, and he becomes even more profoundly distraught once he and Allan find themselves in love with the same woman: the impostor-governess Lydia Gwilt, who (unbeknownst to either Allan or

Midwinter) has come to Thorpe Ambrose with the intention of marrying and then killing Allan to gain his fortune. Midwinter, ever faithful to his friend and sure that this conflict of interest will lead to Allan's death at his hands, leaves town so that Allan may pursue Lydia. While Midwinter is gone, Allan becomes unsure of Lydia's past, inadvertently launches a scandal about her, and falls *out* of love with Lydia and *in* love with his young neighbor, Lydia's charge, Eleanor Milroy. In the hopes of winning Allan back, Lydia plays the part of the innocent victim, and, by the time Midwinter returns, Lydia is living as an martyred outcast—though she still secretly intends to carry out her plan to get Allan's money. Her plan changes, however, when she discovers Midwinter's secret identity; then she determines to marry Midwinter under his real name, secure Allan's death, and present herself as Allan's widow. Her scheme seems to work: she marries Midwinter, who was unable to suppress his desire for her, makes sure that Allan hires a villainous schemer as a hand on his ship, and, when word reaches England that Allan has been killed, she poses as his widow.

Allan, however, turns up alive, having escaped the murderous plot against him on board his ship, and Lydia must, therefore, launch a new plan to kill him before anyone finds out about her deception. With the help of the scheming Dr. Downward, she lures Allan to a sanitarium in London, where she intends to poison the air in his bedroom while he sleeps. Midwinter, devastated by what he has discovered to be Lydia's betrayal and now aware that Allan could be in danger, accompanies him, and, when the men retire to bed, Midwinter persuades Allan to switch bedrooms with him. As she administers the poison during the night, Lydia realizes that Midwinter is inside the room rather than

Allan. She is overcome with guilt and with the love she has come to feel for Midwinter, and she rescues him and locks herself in the room instead. Allan and Midwinter settle at Thorpe Ambrose after her death, Midwinter content with the knowledge that Allan's dream meant not that he would harm Allan, but that he would *save* him from harm.

Readers of *Armadale* are primarily and justifiably occupied in trying to untangle the novel's many mysteries. Questions of lineage (who *is* entitled to the Armadale name, after all?), free will/determinism (what *is* the meaning of Allan's dream?), and romance (who *will* marry whom?) divert attention from what seems to be the novel's deeply troubled representation of colonial ideology. As easy as it might be to overlook, however, an underlying concern of the novel is the credibility of the ethnocentrically-constructed racial hierarchy that justified colonialism. *Armadale* first appeared in serial form in 1864, with the events of the Indian Mutiny still a matter of public discussion.[13] Midway through its publication, the Morant Bay rebellion took place, giving renewed immediacy to the concerns raised by the Mutiny. By placing at its center the African-West Indian/British Ozias Midwinter, Collins' novel, like texts about the Indian Mutiny and the Jamaica rebellion, displays a profoundly conflicted cultural moment that is both certain and uncertain about colonial ideology. The text, in other words, both espouses ethnocentric tenets of colonialism and undermines them.[14]

Although Midwinter is not technically a "colonized" subject himself but the child produced from a relationship between a West Indian slave and a British citizen, he can nonetheless be said to textually represent the colonized. When Midwinter begins writing for a newspaper late in the novel, in fact, Lydia Gwilt makes a metaphorical association

between Midwinter and colonized West Indians when she refers to his employers as "slave owners" (668). A non-Englishman living within English culture and displaying a more than working knowledge of all things English (language, customs, manners, morals), yet still apparently essentially different from the English, Midwinter illustrates Bhabha's concept of mimicry. As detailed in my introductory chapter, according to Bhabha, "mimicry" is the process by which indigenous inhabitants of a colonized space copy the manners, customs, and ideals of a colonizing power, It is both a tool used by the colonizer to control the colonized *and* a threat to the colonizer.[15] As a device of control, mimicry empowers the colonizer; the colonized subjects, who mimic, attempt to approximate the behaviors of the colonizers, molding themselves into "doubles" of the colonizers. To do so, the colonized follow the dictates of the colonizing power, and, as a result, are controlled by the colonizing presence. Further, the very act of mimicry itself helps to enforce the colonizer's power by designating the colonized as "not-colonizer," as Other. Colonized subjects are, in other words, what Bhabha calls "almost the same, *but not quite*" (86); that is, they behave *like* the colonizer, but their obvious *difference* from the colonizer (made visible, ironically, by the mimicry which renders them *like* the colonizer) ensures the colonizer's continued control. While mimicry controls the subject by making the subject's behavior conform to the colonizer's imposed dictates, it also controls the subject by holding the colonized people at a distance, allowing the colonizer to continue to see them as Other. Yet, Bhabha goes on to note, mimicry can also *dis*empower the colonizer. After all, if the colonized subject mimics the colonizer *too well*, the lines between colonizer and colonized will dissolve, and the colonizer's power

will be displaced. The very basis upon which colonial control rests—that the colonizer's *difference* from the colonized, their self-proclaimed superiority over the colonized, makes the colonizer an unquestionable and rightful ruler—becomes destabilized. Mimics who appear in texts, then, are "double" figures. What's more, the presence of the mimic psychically unsettles the colonizing authority by presenting a non-authoritative vision of itself, disturbing, on an affective level, the mechanisms of power. They both testify to the success and stability of the colonizer's rule and serve as a subtle threat to it; they both metaphorically espouse colonial ideology and question it. Such is the case with Midwinter.

While the novel depicts Midwinter as speaking perfect English and displaying a profound knowledge of British social etiquette (for instance, he sets the table to perfection and forces Allan to call on his neighbors after Allan has insulted them), physical descriptions of Midwinter throughout the text render him undeniably Other. When he arrives, ill and destitute, in Somersetshire, the narration describes his appearance at length:

> His tawny complexion, his large bright brown eyes, and his black beard, gave him something of a foreign look. . . . His dusky hands were wiry and nervous, and were lividly discoloured in more places than one, by the scars of old wounds. The toes of one of his feet . . . grasped at the chair-rail through his stocking, with the sensitive muscular action which is only seen in those who have been accustomed to go barefoot. (67)

This description, which casts Midwinter as dark-skinned and hints at his "primitive" behavior (his assumed practice of going barefoot), sets up the kind of textual treatment he will receive throughout the novel. The novel continues to remind the reader that Midwinter is a racial Other with repeated references to his "tawny" complexion (97) or "swarthy, secret face" (105), his "black eyes" (248), and his "darkness" (246, 459). Discursive reminders also take the form of characters' reactions to him. Mrs. Armadale (Allan's mother), Dr. Hawbury, and Eleanor Milroy all respond negatively to Midwinter before they know much about him. Mrs. Armadale's "merciless distrust of the stranger—simply because he *was* a stranger" (72) might be said to speak for all of them.

Mr. Brock's response further illustrates Midwinter's racial difference and the negative judgment associated with it. As Allan's advisor and a long-time friend and confidante of Allan's mother, Mr. Brock stands as a moral and ethical guide through much of the novel. His reaction to Midwinter's appearance, therefore, seems especially damning. When the rector visits him as he begins to recover from his illness,

> Ozias Midwinter . . . was a startling object to contemplate, on first view of him. His shaven head, tied up in an old yellow silk handkerchief; his tawny, haggard cheeks, his bright brown eyes, preternaturally large and wild; his rough black beard; his long, supple, sinewy fingers, wasted by suffering, till they looked like claws—all tended to discompose the [viewer]. . . . When the first feeling of surprise had worn off, the impression that followed was not an agreeable one . . . The rector's healthy *Anglo-Saxon* flesh crept responsively at every casual

movement of [Midwinter's] supple *brown* fingers, and every passing distortion of [his] haggard *yellow* face. (73, emphasis added)

Although Mr. Brock ultimately changes his opinion of Midwinter, embracing him and believing in his moral goodness, at this point in the novel his reaction casts Midwinter as not only physically different *from* the British, but as emotionally repellent *to* the British as well.

In addition to the physical descriptions and characters' judgments used to cast Midwinter as Other, the text also uses Midwinter *himself*. Midwinter reminds the reader repeatedly that he is different and inferior, that a distinct hierarchical division exists between him and the British. Early in the novel, when he tells Mr. Brock the story of his life, his race seems to be at the forefront of his mind. He explains that as a child he was "an ill-conditioned brat, with my mother's negro blood in my face" (105). As his relationship with Allan grows, Midwinter continues to draw attention to his difference from his friend and often to what he considers his own "inferiority." When Midwinter realizes that he and Allan are both in love with Lydia Gwilt, he convinces Allan that Midwinter should leave the country house by once again recounting the story of his childhood. He paints a picture of himself as someone who is essentially different and more primitive than Allan:

"Night and day, sometimes for months together, I never had my head under a roof. For years and years, the life of a *wild animal*—perhaps I ought to say, the life of a *savage*—was the life I led, while you were at home and happy. I have the leaven of the vagabond—the *vagabond animal* or the vagabond man, I hardly know

> which—in me still. . . . [T]he comfort and luxury of our life here, at times, [is] a little too much for a man to whom comforts and luxuries come as strange things. I want nothing to put me right again but more air and exercise; fewer good breakfasts and dinners, my dear friend, than I get here. Let me go back to some of the hardships . . . Let me meet the wind and weather as I used to meet them when I was a boy . . . . Give me a week or two away, Allan . . . and I promise to return to Thorpe Ambrose, better company for you and your friends." (367, emphasis added)

By drawing parallels between himself and an animal or a "savage" and by claiming that a return to his "roots" will "put [him] right again," Midwinter fulfills expectations of the stereotypical Other. He is essentially different from the British and clearly deficient in comparison.[16]

Midwinter's self-proclaimed savagery and thus his apparent essential inferiority to the British are further emphasized by his belief in the evil portent of Allan's dream. Although he is devoted to Allan and cannot imagine doing him harm, he nonetheless believes that he *will* be an agent in Allan's death. Midwinter, it seems, believes that he is inherently violent by nature of his race. The text seems to agree. Although Midwinter appears mild and even-tempered, especially in his relationship with Allan, throughout much of the novel, in the last third of *Armadale*, Midwinter does in fact *seem* "savage," and this "savagery" is linked discursively to his race.[17] During the first and only argument that Allan and Midwinter have, not only does the second vision of the dream come true, (ostensibly "proving" that Midwinter will eventually harm Allan), but Midwinter, for the

first time, seems capable of physical violence toward the British. As he accuses Allan of hiring a spy to watch Lydia, his "hot Creole blood" (479) rises to the surface, and, in a "madness of . . . passion he stretched out his right hand . . . and shook it threateningly" (481). Allan's response to this behavior is telling, as it implies that Midwinter's essential nature is "savage": he says, "'I know your temper is a hot one. . . . But for all that, your violence quite takes me by surprise'" (480).[18]

The text, then, repeatedly casts Midwinter as distinctly Other. His mimicry (his language, social etiquette, decorum) renders him like the colonizer only to a certain extent; he is still clearly *not* the colonizer. One particularly noteworthy scene, in fact, illustrates just how far apart the British and the Other seem to be, how firm and stable the categories of difference apparently are. When Allan introduces Midwinter to Eleanor Milroy and her father, Midwinter seems to try to *intentionally* mimic British customs and behaviors to seem less Other, but his mimicry succeeds only in making the distance between himself and the norm greater, making him seem *more* different and deficient. That day, Midwinter feels particularly low, superstitious about the curse concerning his betrayal of Allan. To hide it, he decides to "rival, in Allan's presence, the gaiety and good spirits of Allan himself" (256)—or, in other words of course, to mimic him. From the beginning, though, his attempt renders him not more like Allan, but distressingly less so. His mimicry of Allan's gregariousness and light-heartedness first "astonishe[s] Allan, then amuse[s] him" (265), and it causes the servants to "think that their master's strange friend had gone mad" (265). Midwinter's mimicry, in the text's words, becomes a "*coarse masquerade* of boldness" (265, emphasis added).

As the day progresses, Midwinter's "masquerade" becomes steadily more grotesque. "His artificial spirits," we are told, "lashed continuously into higher and higher effervescence since the morning, . . . mounting hysterically beyond his control" (266) until they disintegrate into mania during the display of Major Milroy's model of the Strasbourg clock. Lisa M. Zeitz and Peter Thoms note that the original for the model was a tourist attraction for Victorians: "Natural history, astronomy, the monarchies of the ancient world, the three fates, the four stages of human life, the sacramental history of Creation, Resurrection, and the Last Judgment—all (and more) were represented through automatons (or 'puppetry'), models, and paintings on the twenty-five-foot by sixty-foot structure" (496). Major Milroy's clock is an imperfect replication of this original, and, by the time it misfires, Midwinter's mimicry fools no one:

> The fever of Midwinter's false spirits flamed out into sheer delirium as the performance of the puppets came to an end. His paroxysms of laughter followed each other with such convulsive violence, that Miss Milroy started back from him in alarm, and even the patient major turned on him with a look which said plainly, Leave the room! Allan . . . seized Midwinter by the arm, and dragged him out by main force into the garden.
>
> "Good heavens! what has come to you!" he exclaimed, shrinking back from the tortured face before him . . .
>
> For the moment, Midwinter was incapable of answering. The hysterical paroxysm was passing from one extreme to the other. He leaned against a tree, sobbing and gasping for breath. . . . "I'm mad and miserable, Allan." (271)

When he tries to dissolve the borders between British/Other, Midwinter is led to emotional collapse. That Midwinter's collapse should coincide with the misfiring of the clock is particularly noteworthy, because, as Zeitz and Thoms comment, the original clock depicted for Victorians "the orderly, predictable, rational mechanism of the world" (497). The *mis*firing of the Major's clock metaphorically implies that the world is not functioning predictably or "properly." Midwinter's emotional breakdown, then—which takes place because he attempts to appear something he is not—accompanies the metaphorical breakdown of divinely-ordained social order.

In the novel's discursive construction of Midwinter, I have been arguing, the ethnocentrically-defined categories of British ruler and colonized Other remain intact. Midwinter is distinguishably Other not only because of his physical appearance, but because of his behavior: he is "primitive," he is "savage," and he is rendered, through his mimicry, profoundly *different* from and inferior to the colonizer. This representation, in other words, much like the responses to the Indian Mutiny and the Morant Bay rebellion, seems to display unquestioning allegiance to the ethnocentric guiding principles of colonialism.

But, also like the responses to the two rebellions, this text is simultaneously *unsure* of those principles. Midwinter's textual representation, like Bhabha's mimic, is double-edged. He is not *only* unthreatening because of his difference from/inferiority to the British, he not *only* "justifies" colonial ideology through that difference; he also undermines the very assumptions upon which colonial ideology rests. *Armadale* suggests that colonialism's power structure is not as fixed as it might appear. The British are, in

the first place, vulnerable to physical threat; the potential exists for their forcible removal from a position of power. Although Allan's dream does *not* come true, but instead its ultimate explanation suggests that Midwinter's role in the three visions is as Allan's protector,[19] the very threat of harm questions the so-called fixity of the power structure. The colonized subject, the text seems to imply, *can possibly* rebel, rising up from a position of apparently content subjugation to overpower the colonizer and reverse the ruler/ruled hierarchy. The fact that this does not actually happen matters little; the posing of the *possibility* is challenge enough.

Furthermore, and perhaps more fundamentally challenging, Midwinter undermines the notion that the British are entitled to their position in that power structure by nature of their cultural and moral superiority over the colonized Other. In fact, Midwinter, the character whom the text carefully casts as Other, is *the* civilized and moral center of the novel.[20] Although, as I suggested earlier, the text seemed to imply that he has a "savage" nature, Midwinter, in actuality, spends most of the novel worrying that he *will* commit violence and betray Allan but never comes close to doing so of his own accord. He is terrified by the prospect of becoming morally bankrupt like his father. Furthermore, he is disgusted when he witnesses unethical or uncivil behavior displayed by those around him: he is infuriated when Allan hires a spy, for instance. Midwinter's behavior renders him not morally inferior to the British, but morally elite. Indeed, Allan, good-hearted though he is, seems morally incompetent and intellectually vacant in comparison. Lydia, in fact, often compares Allan unfavorably to Midwinter. In one instance, she contrasts "loud and red and clumsy" Allan against "lovable Midwinter,

so . . . quiet, with such a gentleness in his voice when he spoke, and such tenderness in his eyes" (590). Although Lydia herself is not a moral guidepost through much of the novel, her dislike of Allan seems increasingly justified as the novel progresses and Allan becomes more and more superficial. He is, in the end, unable to discuss anything but Eleanor Milroy, his plans for her "fashionable" life as his wife, and his yacht. In a reversal of the racial categorizations that tended to cast non-British races as childlike, Lydia complains, "To say that he was like a child, is a libel on all children who are not born idiots" (599). He is constantly in need of Midwinter's guidance, whether about falling in love, hiring a crew for his yacht, managing his estate, or behaving in a socially-acceptable way toward his neighbors. Significantly, when Allan tries to act *without* Midwinter's help, he falls into social disgrace (as when he offends his neighbors, insults the lawyer Mr. Darch, or tries to elope with Eleanor) or mortal danger (as when he romantically pursues Lydia, who seeks to inherit his fortune, or when he hires the Cuban "ruffian" Manual to man his yacht; Manual, of course, tries to murder him).

Perhaps, then, Midwinter can be said to embody Bhabha's scenario of the perfected mimic who undermines the colonial power structure. He appropriates not only the colonizer's behavior, but also the colonizer's place in the hierarchy, a position of superiority granted to the British, supposedly, *because* of that behavior. He challenges the notion that the British are morally superior and, thus, the ethnocentric definitions that help to create the hierarchy in the first place. But there is more to Midwinter's mimicry; he is also the very essence of mimicry itself— "almost the same, *but not quite*" in Bhabha's terms—and the challenge he poses to ethnocentrically-grounded colonialism is

even more profound: Midwinter undermines the ethnocentrically-constructed lines of differentiation between colonizer and colonized, because he is a textual representation of what Young calls a "hybrid."[21] Half-British and half African-West Indian, Midwinter literally negates the essentialist categories of British and Other. He is, as Young says all hybrids are, "difference and sameness in an apparently impossible simultaneity" (26).

Bhabha, like Young, discusses the doubleness of hybridity and its potential for contesting the essentialism that permits colonialism. For Bhabha, the hybrid space "turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds for intervention" ("Signs" 112). This "Third Space," which is "*neither one . . . nor the Other . . . but something else besides*," an "in-between" space, allows for an escape from the "politics of polarity" ("Commitment" 28, 38-39). In this space, definitions of British/Other are contested and shown to "have no primordial unity or fixity" ("Commitment" 37); rather, knowledge of both British and Other must be re-constructed to account for the ambivalence in their so-called essential natures. Midwinter, then, can be said to occupy this "Third Space," making possible the questioning of the ethnocentric essentialism that translates into the imposition of power over and subjugation of a colonized people: ethnocentric definitions that present themselves as fixed and stable, that help to situate distinct races in a hierarchy of superiority/inferiority, and that justify colonialism completely break down. Where there is no difference, there can be no rule.

Young argues that the Victorian novel is often "concerned with meeting and incorporating the culture of the [O]ther, . . . with forms of cross-cultural contact interaction . . . with the state of being what Hanif Kureishi calls 'an in between' or [what]

Kipling [calls] 'the monstrous hybridism of East and West" (3). Robert Crooks, in his discussion of *The Moonstone,* seems to agree, suggesting that Victorian fiction was often overtly or implicitly concerned with "the transgression of boundaries" (215). In presenting readers with a hybrid who seems to illustrate definitions of Otherness thrust upon of the colonized, yet who simultaneously refuses to "fit" into those definitions, *Armadale* speaks to such concerns. Ultimately, *Armadale* not only challenges the ideas that the British are powerful rulers and that they are morally superior to the Other; it can also be said to represent the impossibility of constructing fixed, stable categories of difference, categories that perpetuate the ideology of colonial conquest.

*

D. A. Miller attributes the success of a sensation novel to its "ability to rattle what the French would call, with anatomical precision, our *cage*" (146). Perhaps *Armadale*'s ability to do just that is what made it such a success in mid-1860s England. Collins' work was widely-read and often reviewed,[22] and readers seem to have shared the opinion that his novels were "tense." Speaking of another of Collins' novels, *The Woman in White*, George Meredith, in fact, wrote to Collins that "The tension . . . is not exactly pleasant, though cleverly produced. One wearies of it" (qtd. in Page 79). The same can be said of *Armadale*. After reading *Armadale*, a contemporary reviewer stated, "If it were the object of art to make one's audience uncomfortable, without letting them know why, no doubt Mr. Collins would be a consummate artist" ("Armadale" *Saturday Review*, 16 June 1866).

At the base of this tension, I have been arguing, is not only the discomfort of

suspense but an anxiety about colonial relations. In *Armadale*, the claim of inherent differences between British and Other that situated the races in an ethnocentric hierarchy and "justified" colonialism is questioned through the presence of a hybrid. If we read Collins' text as reflecting what Thomas calls the "cultural stresses and contradictions" surrounding its production, then the text's playing out of this colonial phenomenon might be read as reflecting British fears, prompted by the rebellions of colonized subjects abroad, about the instability of the British national identity that was so heavily invested in colonialist agendas. This identity, it seems, is implicitly threatened by one whom the British had cast as Other, who exemplifies a rearticulation of definitions of both the Other and the British.

Perhaps the tension is bearable, though, because eventually it is resolved. The colonized Other may pose a implicit threat to the world of *Armadale,* but ultimately that threat is erased, and British nationalism is reinforced. Any threat that Midwinter might have posed physically or metaphysically is erased by the last three chapters of the novel. When Midwinter believes that Allan will be harmed in his sleep at the sanitarium, he switches rooms with his friend, choosing to risk his own life instead. The text implies with this move that the Other is less worthy of life that the British, that the Other should willingly sacrifice himself for his British "ruler." Furthermore, after Lydia saves him and kills herself, Midwinter is blissfully content and joyful at the prospect of serving as Allan's companion for life. He says, "I once believed [the dream] was sent to rouse your distrust of the friendless man whom you had taken as a brother to your heart. I now *know* that it came to you as a timely warning to take him closer still. . . . while we live, brother,

your love and mine will never be divided again" (815). Midwinter's statement suggests that the relationship can remain as it was, only stronger, never to be threatened by external forces. But given the dynamic of the relationship in the past—Midwinter grateful for Allan's friendship and serving him in any way he could, even referring to himself as a "dog" and Allan as a "master"— Midwinter's statement establishes an unequal power structure. In the last three chapters of the novel, the hierarchy that positions the British as the ruler and the colonized as the ruled is reasserted, assuming once again its "natural" order.

But the end result is not all that matters. It is also important to remember that the text's questioning itself points to a significant cultural moment—a moment of confrontation between what U. C. Knoepflmacher terms "a lawful order in which identities are fixed and an anarchic lawlessness in which these social identities can be erased and destroyed" (357), a moment of confrontation between notions of British elitism and fears about British vulnerability, between British opposition to Otherness and anxiety about the Otherness of Britain itself. The return to the "natural" order at the close of the novel almost makes us forget that the anxiety about the instability of national identity ever existed at all. Almost. But not quite.

Notes

[1] Part numbers and dates are taken from J. Don Vann's *Victorian Novels in Serial.* All page numbers, however, refer to the Oxford University Press edition issued in 1989. This edition is itself based on the one-volume edition issued by Smith, Elder in 1869.

[2] The events in Jamaica described in this chapter occurred almost simultaneously with the publication of this monthly part. As Collins tended to write parts approximately three months before they were published (Peters, *King* 272), the part was probably written before the rebellion or its aftermath occurred. For detailed information on serial publication, see Vann. For discussion of the serialization of Wilkie Collins' later novels, see for example Graham Law's "Wilkie in the Weeklies: The Serialization of Collins's Late Novels."

[3] For a detailed, though somewhat biased, account of the Mutiny, see Lawrence James' *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India.* For the Mutiny as represented in literature, see Patrick Brantlinger's *Rule of Darkness.*

[4] Whether Nana Sahib ordered the massacre or simply did not nothing to stop it is unclear, but the event earned him notoriety in the British popular press. The *Times* labeled him a "famous monster," for instance ("British Heroism" 5). Brantlinger points out that Nana Sahib was called "the Demon of Cawnpore" and emerges as the epitome of the treacherous Indian villain in Victorian representations of the Mutiny (201-10).

[5] James agrees that the Mutiny prompted fears about the potential destruction of British power abroad. He notes that the Mutiny taught the British that the government was not universally "well loved" and that they must be "vigilant" against assaults on their power

(294-95).

[6] In fact, the power structure in India did change after the Mutiny, though, for the Indian people, one form of British colonial rule was simply replaced by another. As James explains, the East India Company forfeited its rule of India, and governance was undertaken by the Queen (291-94).

[7] Though we reach different conclusions, Jaya Mehta, in "English Romance; Indian Violence," agrees that British behavior during the Mutiny problematized the notion that the British were the socially and morally superior race. Mehta concludes that this problematizing is linked to the unjust confiscation of property in the colonized territory.

[8] Although both white and non-white inhabitants of Jamaica were technically considered "British," I differentiate between them by calling the white population "British" and the non-white population descended directly from African slaves "African-Jamaican." In reference to Midwinter, I use the more general term African-West Indian. These terms are modifications of Tim Watson's "Afro-Jamaican," and I use them to differentiate members of these groups from "mixed-race" or "mulatto" British subjects who, by right of British connections gained through birth or marriage, enjoyed more financial and social privileges. I call African-Jamaicans and African-West Indians "subjugated" because, although they were, in 1858, not technically a "colonized" people but rather subjects of the British government, they were still very clearly under white control. Jamaica had become a British territory when Cromwell defeated the occupying Spanish army there in 1655. The Spanish had eliminated the indigenous inhabitants of the island, and the British populated the island with its own citizens. When the British sugar industry began to grow,

however, a labor crisis ensured, and slave labor was imported from Africa to solve it. The Emancipation Act of 1834 freed the slaves after a period of apprenticeship, ending in 1838, at which time, they became British subjects. A representative government was set up, such that a British governor oversaw a House of Assembly made up of local representatives elected on the basis of land ownership. As, however, most land was owned by whites, the power of often poor African-Jamaicans was severely limited. For more detailed accounts of the history of Jamaica, see Thomas C. Holt's *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832-1938* and Gad Heuman's *The Killing Time: The Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica.*

[9] This type of eviction was common, according to *The Dublin Review*, and it was intended to keep Africans financially dependent on whites by "prevent[ing] labourers from profiting by the bread-fruits, cocoa-nuts, and other trees of slow growth, which they plant around their dwellings" (385).

[10] Other journalists supposed that the precipitating cause of the outbreak was the declining Jamaican economy, but that this decline was the fault not of unfair legislation or mismanagement by the British government, but of the "insolent" black race. A commentator from *All the Year Round* calls the African "naturally . . . insolent" (174), and *The Times* reported on 21 November 1865 that wages in Jamaica were low, contributing to the economic decline, because the black population was lazy. (The notion of the freed black slave who was reluctant to work was, of course, popularized by Thomas Carlyle's now-famous diatribe "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question.") The sentiment that the black race was the cause of economic hardship is echoed by James

H. L. Archer in *Fraser's Magazine*. Archer blames the depression on the fact that "we ha[ve] been obtaining the aid, for industrial purposes, of an inferior race. . . A proof . . . of the true value of the negro is to be found in the fact that, since the abolition of slavery, *we do not look for free labour in the markets of Africa*, but at a greatly increased expense, have sought it in remote Asia, and found it more profitable to do so" (164, emphasis in original). Archer goes on to claim that the black peasantry's reluctance to work was only part of the problem in Jamaica's economic depression. The other problem was that the "black, who, from the numerical superiority of his race, has it in his power to return members to the [Legislative] Assembly in such an excessive disproportion as [is] likely to produce the startling anomaly of the *inferior* servile race becoming in the course of a generation the *possible legislators* for the superior. . . . The preponderance of an inert race holding a false political position . . . scares away capital" (168, emphasis in original).

[11] Watson's article appears in the electronic publication *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies*. Citations therefore refer to paragraph numbers rather than page numbers.

[12] In a letter to William Woodley Frederick in November 1865, Dickens defends Eyre's actions and displays his own ethnocentric thinking:

> That platform-sympathy with the black—or the native, or the devil—afar off, and that platform indifference to our own countrymen at enormous odds in the midst of bloodshed and savagery, makes me stark wild. Only the other day, there was a meeting of jawbones and asses at Manchester, to censure the Jamaica Governor for his manner of putting down the insurrection. So we are badgered about . . . the

> Hottentots, as if they were identical with men in clean shirts at Camberwell, and were to be bound by pen and ink accordingly . . . . But for the blacks in Jamaica being over impatient and before their time, the whites might have been exterminated. (qtd. in House, Storey, and Tillotson 115-16)

Collins remained quiet on the subject of the Eyre controversy.

[13] Brantlinger notes that texts about the Mutiny were published well into the 1890s (202).

[14] John R. Reed and Jaya Mehta conclude that Collins' texts are complex because they contain double-edged references to colonialism. Reed's pinnacle article was the first to suggest a colonialist reading of Collins' *The Moonstone*, for instance, which has led to studies like Mehta's. He claims that "the gem they all [the characters]—for one reason or another—covet is stolen property, that it rightly belongs to men they view as thieves. . . . Actually, the Indian priests are heroic figures, while the representatives of Western Culture are plunderers" (289). Mehta's argument, similarly, centers on the idea of colonialist "theft," but her postcolonial reading of the famous Koh-i-noor diamond's surrender to Queen Victoria illustrates the subtle challenges to colonialism that can be interpreted in the midst of apparent conquest. She notes that Queen Victoria's advisor, governor-general Dalhousie, believed that the diamond stood as a symbol of Britain's conquest of India and thus of its military power and national superiority. The hand-over, however, rather than confirming British prowess, undercut it. The Maharaja Dalip Singh, who handed over the diamond to Queen Victoria in a lavish ceremony, seemed to undermine the idea that he was servant to Victoria's crown. According to Mehta, he "seduced Victoria with what Dalhousie called '[t]hose beautiful eyes, with which [he] has

taken captive the court' into letting him hold the diamond once again, whereupon he presented it to her anew as if it were a personal gift." His words make clear that he is aware of the symbolism of this gesture: "I should like to take it in my power, myself, to place it in her hands now that I am a man. I was only a child when I surrendered it to Her Majesty by the Treaty, but now I am old enough to understand" (615). This moment, according to Mehta, is "a brilliant act of subaltern resistance, in which the Maharaja-of-nowhere voided the diamond of its symbolic status as an emblem of conquest . . . recasting himself as a free agent and Victoria's peer, and 'tak[ing] captive the court in his stead" (615-16). Reminding Collins' readers this event in the Preface to *The Moonstone*, Mehta suggests, "re-awakens colonial anxieties. . . . intimat[ing] that the Koh-i-noor . . . is not prize but plunder" (616). By extension, the text might also intimate that not only the Koh-i-noor in particular, but also colonial wealth in general, was not earned but stolen by the British.

While Mehta's analysis focuses on *The Moonstone*, it can also, I suggest, apply to *Armadale*. The novel seems to metaphorically question the taking of wealth from indigenous peoples through its incredibly complex plot, which has often been criticized by reviewers and scholars. A contemporary reviewer in *The Saturday Review*, for instance, called it "a lurid labyrinth of improbabilities" (qtd. in Page 151). Over 100 years later, Winifred Hughes seemed to agree, calling it "one of the most overplotted novels in English literature" (155), and Peter Thoms concurs, suggesting that "the density of plot is apt to overwhelm the reader" (115-6). Jenny Bourne Taylor, however, suggests a possible explanation for the tangled plot: "In *Armadale*, there are plots, and plots within plots,

which in turn become the breeding ground for further plots, all proliferating around the name 'Allan Armadale'—a name without an identity, a blank space standing for property that has no real owner" (152). For Taylor, the complexity of the plot is closely linked to questions of rightful ownership. Catherine Peters agrees, noting that "who, in each generation, is rightfully entitled to the name 'Allan Armadale' becomes so confused in the mind of the most attentive reader . . . that the whole matter of names is called into question . . . [as is] the arbitrary nature of possession" ("Introduction" xviii). Interestingly, neither of these scholars explicitly deals with the postcolonial implications of this confusion. The fact that the name and its economic entitlements *could* in fact belong not to the British Allan Armadale, but to the hybrid Ozias Midwinter, the character whom the text so carefully casts as racially Other, suggests that what is being questioned is not only the "arbitrary nature of possession" but also the nature of *colonialist* possession.

[15] Jenny Sharp agrees that the mimic "is a contradictory figure who simultaneously reinforces colonial authority and disturbs it," but she suggests that Bhabha, in his claim that the mimic can reverse the colonial power structure, disregards too easily "other sites of colonial contact where Western civilization was simultaneously being written" (137).

[16] Midwinter's marginality is also linked to class issues, as his racial Otherness is sometimes inseparable from what Richard Young calls "racialized class differentiation" (95). Young notes that in the mid 1860s it was not uncommon to regard members of the lower classes as racially different from members of the upper ones. Scholars like Tim Watson and Catherine Hall add that questions about essential racial characteristics

became interwoven with questions of essential class characteristics as the debates surrounding the Reform Bill of 1867 tried to determine which "type" of man was "fit" to gain the franchise. (Interestingly, both Hall and Watson propose that the Morant Bay rebellion crystallized this debate.) *Armadale* seems to exemplify this tendency to conflate race with class, for instance, when Midwinter claims that he is not a "fit companion" for Allan because of his working class background. He explains "'I have been a tradesman's drudge; I have swept out the shop and put up the shutters; I have carried parcels through the street, and waited for my master's money at his customers' doors. . . . I've worn a footboy's livery, and waited at table. I've been a common sailor's cook, and a starving fisherman's jack-of-all-trades. What has a gentleman in your position in common with a man in mine?'" (158-9).

[17] Interestingly, the textual moments in which Midwinter seems most "savage" are published beginning in November 1865, immediately following the Morant Bay rebellion. According to Collins' letters, Collins wrote the numbers for publication about three months prior to their publication date. A letter to his mother illustrates this self imposed schedule. He says, "The number is done *at last*, and I must go on tomorrow and begin the next, or lose one of my three months of advance, which I want to get if I can help it" (qtd. in Baker and Clark 1:258). Despite his best attempts, however, Collins meticulous revision and editing often kept him writing somewhat closer to the deadline than he would have liked. He finished the final number, for instance, only six weeks before it was published. Upon finishing the serialization, Collins wrote exuberantly to his mother, "I have done!!! It has been a tremendous job . . . . But done it is—and done well, though I

say it that shouldn't!" (qtd. in Baker and Clark 2:274). See also Peters' *The King of Inventors* for information on Collins' writing schedule. While it is impossible to say for certain whether or not Collins' depiction of Midwinter was influenced by the events in Jamaica, the character undeniably undergoes a change at this point in the novel. It is, therefore, possible to suggest a correlation between the sudden cultural attention to what seemed at first to be Jamaican savagery and Midwinter's newly violent behavior in the novel.

[18] Nor is the threat Midwinter poses directed only at Allan. In the chapters published after the Morant Bay rebellion, Lydia is also subject to what appears to be Midwinter's volatile nature. She notes that he is sometimes "angry and wild and unapproachable" (668), and, when she finally betrays him by claiming to be Allan's wife, his desire to do physical harm seems undeniable: "he sprang forward from the wall, with a cry that rang through the house. The frenzy of a maddened man flashed at her from his glassy eyes, and clutched at her in his threatening hands" (758).

[19] As I discuss in the conclusion to this chapter, I am of course aware of the ethnocentric conclusion that might be drawn from this resolution. Nevertheless, I would argue that the *possibility* of Midwinter's causing Allan harm prevents a straightforward reading of the resolution's implications.

[20] Catherine Peters notes that Midwinter is at the center of the novel, and she suggests that he and Lydia are the two most interesting characters in all of *Armadale*. She criticizes the ending of the novel because "one of the two most interesting characters is dead, and the other seems still emotionally crippled" ("Introduction" xii).

[21] The presence of such a character is not surprising given the topicality of subject. Nineteenth-century capitalist expansion, Young explains, led to "increased anxiety about racial difference and the racial amalgamation that was apparent as an effect of colonialism and enforced migration" (4). This concern is evidenced by the heated discussion concerning the offspring of interracial sexual unions. Young notes that according the *Oxford English Dictionary* the word "hybrid" had been coined in the seventeenth century but came into common use predominantly in the nineteenth. At this time, debate raged as to whether different races were different species (polygenesis theory) or variations of one species (monogenesis theory). If the former, their union was thought to be "unnatural" and therefore to produce infertile offspring or offspring that would, after a few generations, "revert" to one species or another. If the latter, their "natural" union would produce fertile offspring of a "new" race. Between these two poles, however, was a middle ground that attempted to settle the dispute by appealing to the notion of proximate vs. distinct species variations. That is, variations within the species that are only slightly different (proximate)—for example the Dutch and English varieties of the species--could engage in a "natural" sexual union that would produce fertile offspring. These "allied" species were considered similar enough that their union would not be an affront to nature. On the other hand, unions between "distinct" variations—variations with a species that were supposedly inherently and undeniably different—say, the African and British variations, for instance—would produce infertile offspring, or offspring that would degenerate (9-16). For further discussion of polygenetic and monogenetic theories in the nineteenth century, see Stocking.

[22] Peters notes that while *Armadale* was not as popular as Collins' earlier novel, *The Woman in White*, it did have a consistently large readership ("Introduction" xi). It was published in America in *Harper's Monthly Magazine* at the same time that it appeared in *The Cornhill*, and it was so successful in America that it saved the magazine from closing (*King* 268). In England, Mudie's circulating library was forced to stock more copies of the two-volume version (1866) than originally planned (*King* 272).

Chapter 2

Mary Kingsley's Mimic-Text: *Travels in West Africa*

One by one I took my old ideas derived from books and thoughts based on imperfect knowledge and weighed them against the real life around me, and found them either worthless or wanting.

--*Travels in West Africa, p. 6*

Now polygamy is, like most other subjects, a difficult thing to form an opinion on, if, before forming that opinion, you go and make a study of the facts and bearings of the case. It is therefore advisable to follow the usual method employed by the majority of people. Just take a prejudice of your own, and fix it up with the so-called opinions of people who go in for that sort of prejudice too. This method is absolutely essential to the forming of an opinion on the subject of polygamy among African tribes, that will be acceptable in enlightened circles.

--*Travels in West Africa, p. 212*

In 1893, Mary Henrietta Kingsley (1862-1900) was, for the first time in her thirty years, free from domestic responsibilities. She had spent her life caring for her family, but, as her parents had died the previous year and her Cambridge-educated brother had embarked on a trip to Burma, she was left "'with five or six months which were not heavily forestalled'" (ix). Overcome with a "'dreadful gloom'" and yearning for some occupation, she turned to Africa. Although, as Elizabeth Claridge explains, Kingsley claimed much later to have gone to West African "to die" (xii), in 1893 her stated purpose for travelling there was to study. A self-taught amateur ethnologist and naturalist who had gained all of her knowledge through hand-me-down books brought home by her father and brother, Kingsley longed to exercise her mind and to experience first-hand the world about which she had read. Her desire to study "native religion and law, and to collect zoological specimens, fresh-water fish in particular" (ix) led her on her first

tentative expedition to West Africa. Upon her return to England in January of 1894, she presented the specimens she had collected to Alfred C. Günther, her mentor at the British Museum, and his enthusiastic response so invigorated Kingsley that she returned to West Africa eleven months later. This second trip took her to parts of Africa never before explored, and it provides the basis for *Travels in West Africa: Congo Français, Corisco, and Cameroons* (1897) (xiv).

Kingsley chose to visit West Africa and not some other foreign land, at least in part, because it had always intrigued her. This fact is not surprising, given that the continent and its inhabitants were often the objects of public fascination throughout the century. By the time Kingsley set off for the Africa's west coast, Africa had long been considered an 'infernal' region; with its dense jungles, its uncharted interior, its climate and landscape so different from Britain's (and so deadly to the English constitution), Africa presented to Europeans a dark mirror image of their very "civilized" world. Throughout the nineteenth century, explorers and missionaries had helped to create this image by providing the British public with tales of adventure and danger set in an African countryside that seemed to befuddle and prove harmful to even the most venerable of their ranks. Early accounts of explorers who died from the climate or from disease in their quest to map the intricate waterways of the interior continent fascinated the British public,[1] and in 1841, the disastrous Niger Expedition—which had set out to "initiate the introduction of Christianity and 'legitimate commerce' to West Africa," but which lost 41 of its members to malaria—seemed to signal the inherent dangers of the continent (Brantlinger 176).[2] By mid-century, the controversy surrounding the quest for the source

of the Nile, culminating in the accidental death or suicide of John Speke hours before he was to debate Sir Richard Burton on the subject, had become a riveting public saga, indicating again the difficulties of interpreting Africa's foreign landscape (Frank 30). Tales of Africa throughout the century, then, created what might be called a discourse of the landscape—a discourse that creates an image of a mysteriously and dangerously foreign place that is the antithesis of the British (known and knowable) physical world.

Later in the century, as the interior of African began to be more accessible to explorers and traders (thanks in part to the use of quinine as a protectant against malaria), a heightened interest in colonial expansion was born. By this time, explorer and missionary narratives had convinced the British public not only that Africa was a physically dangerous place, but also that is was a morally and culturally degenerate one as well. Dr. David Livingstone, a missionary valorized by the British public long before (and long after) his famous disappearance in 1870, his subsequent discovery by Henry Morton Stanley in 1871, and his death, "emaciated and wasted in a remote Central African village," in 1873 (Frank 31), was one of several popularizers of the notion that Africans were to be considered degraded savages (Livingstone 177). He insisted that their only hope for salvation (both from slavery and from "centuries of barbarism") was contact with the "civilized" British race (175, 34).[3] Other explorers popularized even more ethnocentric ideas. Burton, for instance, claimed that Africans were inferior to both Europeans and the Asiatics, plagued by "unimprovable . . . stagnation of mind, indolence of body, moral deficiency, superstition, and childish passion" (Burton, *Lake Regions*

2:326). These "negro instincts," according to Burton, make them fit only for manual labor (Burton, *Two Trips* 311).

Such ethnocentric views were ostensibly validated by scientific doctrine of the late nineteenth century, which viewed non-British races as "knowable" objects of study. Ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology sought to (metaphorically or literally) dissect other races, categorizing them and placing them within a British context. Such objectification of other races, as well as the positioning of those races within the British-defined racial hierarchy, identified them as deficient and positioned the British as cultural superiors. Theories of evolution as well contributed to the formation of ethnocentric assumptions about the superiority/inferiority of races. Burton, in fact, was a member of the Anthropological Society, a guiding principle of which was the belief in the essential differences (and thus an essentialist hierarchy) between distinct races. Following the theory of its president, James Hunt, and ethnologists like Robert Knox, members of the Anthropological Society believed that the African and the European were distinct races. The African race was lower, in the words of Josiah C. Nott and George R. Gliddon's *Types of Mankind* (the textbook at the base of the Anthropological Society's doctrine), "in the social scale Providence has assigned to each type of man" (49).

Darwinians endorsed an alternate view of the proximity of races, but, with the application of their theories to physical anthropology and ethnology, ultimately an equally racist one: although all races shared a common evolutionary origin, distinct physical, emotional, moral, and intellectual differences existed between "the highest men of the highest races and the lowest savages" (Darwin 55). Darwin himself gave scientific

justification for the stratification of races by popularizing the idea that, when these races meet, the more civilized race naturally supplants the less civilized one. "With savages," he says in *The Descent of Man*, "the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated . . . . [A] nation which produced during a lengthened period the greatest number of highly intellectual, energetic, brave, patriotic and benevolent men, would generally prevail over less favored nations" (117, 124).[4] Represented in "scientific" discourse that claimed objective "truth," these images of superiority and inferiority were incredibly powerful in promulgating ethnocentric assumptions about race. Despite differences in theory, one "truth" was "scientifically" proven time and again in the nineteenth century: the African is constructed as mentally and culturally inferior to the European.

As numerous scholars have argued, ethnocentric notions about other cultures (and other cultures' countries) served as a base for, and continued to legitimatize, colonialism in the British mind.[5] Not only could colonialism be justified on an economic level—it was supposedly good for the economy[6]—it was also morally justified: by nature of their respective races, the British were meant to rule, and the Africans were meant to *be* ruled. In colonialist discourse, the British considered their country a superior living environment and themselves a superior race, the most civilized, culturally, morally, and intellectually elite nation on earth. Their domination of what nineteenth-century lawyer E. V. Dicey called "less masterful races" was their manifest destiny (299), and the Africans, in British eyes, uncivilized, morally, culturally, and intellectually degraded, could only benefit from contact with this more socially-evolved power. Damage done to the conquered land or

people was glossed over, and the British presence in Africa was supposedly both undisputed and indisputable within colonialist ideology.

Yet colonialism, despite the fact that it was apparently legitimate on ethnocentric and economic bases, *was* disputed, as much a source of anxiety as certainty. As the "Scramble" for possession of African land, resources, and people throughout the 1870s and 1880s attested to the economic value of Africa (as it was an area sought after not just by Britain, but by other European nations as well), it also brought the British face to face with fears about their economic and military prowess and made them question the benefit of colonial expansion. As Robin Gilmour explains:

> Africa had become an issue in European power-politics. . . . Far from being a triumphalist notion, in consequence, there is much truth in the paradox that British [colonialism] as an idea was born looking over its shoulder, the creature of anxiety rather than of confidence—anxiety about economic decline brought on by the slump of 1873, about industrial challenge from America and Germany as a European power, about the intentions and vast potential of Russia, about safeguarding the sea and overland routes to India, about competing spheres of influence in Africa. (182)

Anxieties about the right of manifest destiny, as well, troubled ideals of colonialism. Gladstone, for instance, questioned colonialism's "moral" basis, asserting that annexing new territories was "rarely effected except by means that are more or less questionable, and that tend to compromise British character" (151).[7] Even while this statement reinforces the belief in Britain's moral excellence (disappointed as it is in any deviation

from that standard), it also indicates at least an undercurrent of anxiety about the espoused hierarchy of superior British and inferior Other. Not only might the British not be as morally-superior to other races as they would like to believe themselves, but also, perhaps, other races are not *so* inferior that they don't deserve at least a modicum of respect. Ethnocentric assumptions about race that legitimized colonialism, in other words, were also questionable.

Mary Kingsley, then, travels to West Africa with these competing constructions of colonialism in her consciousness.[8] When she returns, she produces a text that adds its voice to the plethora of other texts that create and recreate the public consciousness concerning West Africa, and hers feeds into that consciousness in a complex way. *Travels in West Africa* is travel writing with a "scientific" focus;[9] it depicts West Africa's land and people in great ethnological detail. Like other scientific texts that present their findings as "true," Kingsley's narrative claims factual accuracy. It also, however, sets out a complicated discursive structure that both challenges and reinforces the colonialist ideology of late Victorian England. The text *does* espouse nationalist and racist feeling, embodied in the textual constructions of a frighteningly Other Africa and a less socially-developed, comic, or threatening African, that sometimes read like what Salome Nnoromele calls "racist propaganda taken out of a popular magazine" (13). But, at the same time, the text will not allow itself to fit in neatly with the colonialist propaganda of Victorian Britain. It ultimately resists easy categorization through its use of what I will call rhetorical undercutting: virtually every time that Kingsley[10] makes a statement that

seems to be situated firmly within the rhetoric of colonialism, cultural elitism, and European domination, the text doubles back on itself and undercuts its own point.

Rhetorical ambiguities in Kingsley's text are often said to result from a clash between Kingsley's "feminine" voice and the "masculine" discourse of colonialism. Sara Mills, for instance, explains that the presence of multiple voices in Kingsley's text represents the difficulty of positioning a female narrator within the traditionally male-identified realm of colonialist discourse. According to Mills:

> Since men were assumed to possess such characteristics as activity, energy, independence, and intellectual prowess to be used in public life and the wide world, their travel and any writing based on these travels were fully in harmony with society's expectations. The situation was quite different from women for whom travel meant leaving the postulated "female" sphere, a sphere limited to the interior realm and domestic life. Women travellers would thus most likely have felt a conflict between their need to fulfill cultural expectations . . . and their deliberate entrance, even escape, into a world of danger and difficulty, a world of travel to faraway places. Women's travel narratives reflect these tensions, tensions missing in men's narratives. (*Discourses* 91)[11]

Kingsley's text reflects these tensions in its use of masculine narrative strategies (the narrator as adventuring hero, for instance) undercut by feminine ones (the narrator who is concerned with proper behavior and self-presentation).

Alison Blunt and Katherine R. Lawrence note similar tensions. Blunt explains that Kingsley had to adopt the voices appropriate to the male-identified realms of science,

trade, and exploration in order to gain authority both on the colonial "frontier" and in her text. These voices, however, are always "undercut by her self-conscious sense of propriety constructed as feminine" ("Mapping" 60). This undercutting is visible, for example, in her constant deferral to "authorities" and in her denigration of her own skills. Lawrence, on the other hand, associates the rhetorical inconsistencies with Kingsley's attempt to situate herself within the field of travel and travel writing, traditionally constructed as male. The resulting text, she says, is, on one hand, one that attempts to "escape the system of exploitation that underwrites male narratives" (by presenting for instance, instead of narratives of conquest expected in male travel writing, visions of reciprocity and cultural communication), and, on the other hand, one that is "complicitous in the pattern of British [colonial] domination" (108).[12]

While these analyses certainly help to explain rhetorical inconsistencies in Kingsley's text, they all rely on biographical information to make their cases: Mary Kingsley the woman writing a text within male discourses.[13] How do we account for the inconsistencies, we might ask, when we allow the text to speak for itself? Such a reading, it seems to me, reveals that the *Travels* depicts the late nineteenth-century's divided consciousness about colonialism. Its rhetorical doubleness is a manifestation of the simultaneous cultural belief in and anxiety about colonialism and its attendant ethnocentric discourses.

The discursive technique of doubleness can be likened to Homi Bhabha's theory of mimicry. According to Bhabha, mimics were created as a result of British colonial occupation. As the British colonized, mimicry became both a means by which the

colonizer could control the indigenous inhabitants of a colonized space *and* a potential site of chaos in that space. Colonized subjects are forced to mimic the physical appearance, behaviors, and language of a conquering power to get along, so to speak, within surroundings that is no longer "theirs"—to avoid persecution, to blend in, to survive the change to a new mode of life. Mimicry, then, seems to be a means for the European to retain control, to deny the possibility of revolt. With the colonized subject firmly upholding the laws of the (European) land through mimicry, the European social structure, in which whiteness equals the right to rule, remains in place. Europeans, furthermore, can remain in power by designating mimics as Other. Mimicking renders the colonized subject undeniably "not-European" and keeps the lines between colonizer/colonized drawn.

At the same time, however, mimicry carries with it an implied threat and a potential for capsizing the social structure. If a mimic succeeds in copying the look, behaviors, and language of the colonizer—becoming, in Bhabha's words, "almost the same, but not quite" (86)—the lines between colonizer/colonized begin to dissolve, and the hierarchy of superior/inferior begins to shift. This shift challenges the notion that Europeans are rightful rulers, as the categories for designating rulers/ruled become blurred. Further, if a mimic copies the look, behaviors, and language of the colonizer but does not buy into the conquering ideology and submit to being ruled, then that mimic can potentially overturn the hierarchy entirely, using his or her newly acquired language, behavior, and appearance to infiltrate and dismantle the social structure and ideology that casts the African in a subservient position to the European. Mimicry, then, is a potential

threat in colonial relations as much as it is a tool for the colonizer to gain and maintain power. Textually, therefore, mimics embody both of these potentials—they are images of colonizing control even while they betray colonial anxiety.[14]

Like mimics created by British colonialism, texts created within colonial discourse can be double figures, creating, reinforcing, and disseminating Eurocentric assumptions, *even while* they challenge those assumptions.[15] Although in some ways an exceedingly colonialist text, then, created by and upholding colonial ideals, the *Travels* is also, in an abstract sense, a *mimic text*, and its rhetorical doubleness exemplifies that tenuous position. It both embraces the Eurocentric agenda of Victorian Britain and undermines it. It is both an instrument of colonial control, propagating and maintaining images of a disturbing, exotic, and dangerous land and people, and a challenge to that control, undercutting through a variety of strategies the very assertions it makes.

From the outset, the text espouses colonialist assumptions and then uses humor and irony to deny them. The opening chapters, for instance, sketch rhetorical images of a West Africa that is completely foreign to England and unfriendly to European visitors, and concurrently render those images dismissable. Overt or implied warnings against the dangers of West Africa, which create or fulfill already existing expectations about the "exotic" locale, are undermined by humor the moment they are uttered. Take as an example this warning about the risks involved in traveling to West Africa, which the narrator relates having received even before she travels there:

> I inquired of all my friends ...what they knew of West Africa. . . . A percentage said, "Oh you can't possibly go there; that's where Sierra Leone is, the white

> man's grave, you know." . . . . One lady . . . kindly remembered a case of a gentleman who had resided some years at Fernando Po, but when he returned an aged wreck of forty he shook so violently with ague as to dislodge a chandelier, thereby destroying a valuable tea-service and flattening the silver teapot in its midst. . . . I next turned my attention to cross examining the doctors. "Deadliest spot on earth," they said cheerfully. (2)

While the text's reproduction of myths about West Africa, on one hand, create an image of a foreign place that is somehow abhorrent or dangerous to the European, the humorous treatment of the expected dangers, on the other hand, destablizes those myths, allowing the reader to take them less than seriously.

The same type of rhetorical treatment occurs, further, when the text deals with what appears to be more solid fact. The doctors' initially glossed-over warnings are later apparently proven true with evidence when, on a tour of the coast city of Accra, Kingsley learns just how "deadly" the continent can be:

> [My guide] took me across well-kept grass to two newly dug graves, each covered with wooden hoods in a most business-like way. . . . He said nothing, but waved his hand with a "take-your-choice,-they-are-both-quite-ready" style. "Why?" I queried laconically. "Oh! We always keep two graves ready dug for Europeans. We have to bury very quickly here, you know," he answered. . . . So I said, "It's exceedingly wrong to do a thing like that, you only frighten people to death. You can't want new-dug graves daily. There are not enough white men in the whole place to keep the institution up." "We do," he replied, "at any rate this season.

> Why the other day, we had two white men to bury before twelve o'clock, and at four, another dropped in on a steamer."
>
> "At 4:30," said a companion, an exceedingly accurate member of the staff, "how you fellows *do* exaggerate!" Subsequent knowledge of the Gold Coast has convinced me fully that the extra funeral being placed half-an-hour sooner than it occurred is the usual percentage of exaggeration you will be able to find in stories relating to the local mortality. And at Accra, after I left it, and all along the Gold Coast, came one of those deadly epidemic outbursts sweeping away more than half the white population in a few weeks. (32)

These speakers seem to suggest a familiar problem, one found throughout travel literature: that the climate is particularly deadly to the *white* population, as Europeans apparently lack the physical makeup to resist disease. Readers thus encounter a warning that these dangers to Europeans, based here on both the weather and the physical differences between Africans and Europeans, are real. The text, however, does not allow a reader to rest easily in this assumption, as it again carefully undercuts what it espouses by disarming the reader's fear with the use of humor. The exaggerated stories through which Kingsley is warned, and in turn warns the reader, make one laugh more than tremble, thus implying that the warnings them*selves* are more absurd than valuable.

Additionally, when Kingsley remembers her reaction to the warnings she received, she implies that her fear resulted from her lack of first-hand knowledge of the continent. Given her claim, "I did not know the Coast, and the Coast did not know me, and we mutually terrified each other" (5), the reader may assume that Kingsley's fear

dissipated when she experienced the continent first-hand and that, therefore, the warnings she seems to be passing on to her reader are merely humorous examples of baseless trepidation. Moreover, Kingsley herself is always one step removed from those threats to the physical health of Europeans that *do* seem to prove real; what she presents as "fact" can therefore be read ironically, because they are at least partly conjecture. Her second-hand report of the epidemic in Accra can be interpreted as such, given the fact that she does not, because she cannot, give an eyewitness account of the white population's devastation.

Jocular warnings about the dangers of Africa are not limited to discussion of disease. Not only is the climate supposedly unfriendly, the text seems to warn, but the landscape itself, as well as the animals and insects found in it, are similarly unfriendly. While asserting these "truths," though, the text again simultaneously devalues them through humor. As Kingsley discusses the risks of traveling through a mangrove swamp, for instance, her first warning to the reader is to beware the crocodile, which, she explains, is not a lethargic animal "drifting down in deep water, or lying asleep with its jaws open on a sand-bank in the sun" about which the traveler in search of exotic Africa can "write home about . . . [in order to] frighten your relations on your behalf" (88). Rather, the crocodile is a real danger: "when you are away among the swamps in a small dug-out canoe, and that crocodile and his relations are awake . . . you may not be able to write home about him—and you get frightened on your own behalf" (88). Real though the danger may be, however, it is not so real or so deadly as to make its rendering devoid of

humor. The effect of this mixed message is to produce *and* destabilize notions of a dangerous and frightening world.

The troubles of the mangrove swamp, of course, do not end with crocodiles, and as Kingsley describes them, a different rhetorical strategy for simultaneously presenting and undermining constructions of a perilous Africa comes into view. An equally disturbing thought to that of an antagonistic crocodile is getting stranded in the swamp when the tide goes out. As the narrator describes it, a swamp usually passable by canoe can suddenly dry up, leaving the traveler stuck in the mud with no viable means of escape: "[Y]ou cannot get out and drag your canoe across the stretches of mud that separate you from [the main river], because the mud is of too unstable a nature and too deep, and sinking into it means staying in it, at any rate until some geologist of the remote future may come across you, in a fossilised state" (89). As in her treatment of the crocodile, here the narrator's jokes help to undercut the alleged seriousness of the situation; the ensuing catalogue of horrors in the mangrove swamp, however, is extensive:

> There are the crocodiles, more of them than any one wants; there are quantities of flies, particularly the big silent mangrove-fly which lays an egg in you under the skin; the egg becomes a maggot and stays there until it feels fit to enter into external life. There are "slimy things that crawl with legs upon a slimy sea," and a quantity of hopping mud-fish, and crabs, and a certain mollusk, and in the water various kinds of cat-fish. . . . in the wet season there is no silence night or day in

> West Africa, but that roar of the descending deluge of rain that is more monotonous and more gloomy than any silence can be. (92)

As she enumerates the minor discomforts and major dilemmas of traveling the swamp-land, Kingsley continues to paint an unsettling picture of Africa, one that her readers might find in accordance with the rumors, myths, and propaganda that had represented Africa as the "dark continent" in the first place.

The text, however, also obscures a definitive reading of this apparently disturbing picture, this time not only by interjecting humor, but also by including alternate passages that depict a deep affection for the continent. Detailed descriptions of its horrors have their counterpart in detailed descriptions of its beauty. The rivers and swamps, although treacherous and ugly in the passage quoted above, are, at other times, breathtaking. Traveling by boat in the moonlight, for instance, Kingsley takes great pleasure in the landscape:[16]

> The great black, winding river [had] . . . a pathway in its midst of frosted silver where the moonlight struck it: on each side the ink-black mangrove walls, and above them the band of star and moonlit heavens that the walls of mangrove allowed one to see. . . . [At times] I found the mangrove wall thinner, and standing up, looked through the network of their roots and stems on to what seemed like plains, acres upon acres in extent, of polished silver—more specimens of those awful slime lagoons, one of which . . . had so nearly collected me. (338)

Similarly, Kingsley waxes poetic when she spends a night in the Cameroon mountains:

> I went to my comfortable room, but could not turn in, so fascinating was the warmth and beauty down here; and as I sat on the verandah overlooking Victoria and the sea, in the dim soft light of the stars, with the fire-flies round me, and the lights of Victoria away below, and heard the soft rush of the Lukola River, and the sound of the sea-surf on the rocks, and the tom-tomming and singing of the natives, all matching and mingling together, "Why did I come to Africa?" thought I. Why! who would not come to its twin brother hell itself for all the beauty and charm of it. (608)

Such poetic attention to the beauty and allure of the continent serve to undermine its reputation (propagated in nineteenth-century colonialist discourse and in Kingsley's text itself) as an "infernal" region. Furthermore, Kingsley's narrator reinforces the idea that the continent is worthy of praise and affection by noting that travelers other than herself have not only enjoyed a temporary sojourn on the West coast, but have also preferred West Africa to England. In the preface, she explains that many other Europeans love Africa as she does:

> [I]f you were to take many of the men [in Africa] who most energetically assert that they wish they were home in England, . . . and if you were to bring them home and let them stay there a little while, I am pretty sure that . . . these same men, in terms varying with individual cases, will be found sneaking back apologetically to the Coast. (11)

But the text's discursive strategies are again complex, as such descriptions of beauty and allure, which combat descriptions of horror, are themselves undercut by

competing textual nuances. Even while the narrator praises the beauty of the swamp, her praise is undermined with an undercurrent of trepidation: the swamp looks beautiful, after all, only in the moonlight, and the "awful slime lagoons" that had been threatening in the daylight are never far from her (or the reader's) mind. Similarly, although the narrator delights in the ambiance of the Camaroon mountains, the text's subtle positioning of Africa in parallel with Hell, its "twin brother," serves to undermine the notion that Africa is as lovely and welcoming as its poetic treatment might make a reader believe. And although she and other travelers might have a deep affinity for the West Coast, the narrator *apologizes* for and thereby qualifies this love of the landscape. "You . . . must make allowances for my love of this sort of country," she explains, ". . . Your superior culture-instincts may militate against your enjoying West Africa" (xxi). Tinged with irony though it may be, Kingsley's request for understanding and patience from those who are culturally "superior" implies that only people who are somehow culturally deficient or odd would appreciate Africa. The text can not be interpreted, then, as standing firmly on either side of the question of Africa's beauty and charm; it presents images of Africa that are *both* horrifying and attractive, often in the same textual moment.

The continuous vacillation between representations of Africa as dangerous, threatening, and abhorrent to Europeans, and representations of it as beautiful, alluring, and the object of exaggerated myth is one way that the text is, in an abstract sense, a mimic-text. Like the mimic who is simultaneously a reinforcement of colonial rule and a challenge to colonial subjugation, the text is similarly double. It fears the continent and loves it, warns against it and lures visitors toward it. It represents colonialist doctrine with

an undercurrent of dissension. The text will simply not allow the formation of solid assumptions about the continent.

The text's abstract mimicry, its rhetorical strategy of undercutting, disconcerting as it is, continues when the narrative deals with the *inhabitants* of the continent as well. Much as it seems to Other and demean the continent through negative rhetoric while it also defends the continent against such rhetorical treatment, the text seems to do the same to the indigenous populations of the continent. As stated earlier, ethnocentric assumptions about race (which relegated the African to an inferior social position and made the British, by manifest destiny, the rightful rulers of the globe) fueled colonialism, and Kingsley's text is rhetorically split between promulgating and challenging these colonialist discourses.[17]

So often does the text seem to relegate the African to a position of cultural and social primitive, scholars like Nnoromele and Dea Birkett have accused Kingsley of racism.[18] In Nnoromele's "Mary Kingsley and West Africa: Race, Gender, and Colonial Discourse," Kingsley is deemed a "racist who promoted the theory of African inferiority and Otherness and European superiority" (24). Birkett seems to concur, though more gently stating that "the assumptions of national superiority of European over non-European societies and culture. . . pervaded her writing, and her own line of argument could carry these same ethnocentric value judgments" (3).[19] Indeed, the text often does seem devoted to denigrating the African. In ironic juxtaposition to her use of humor to *challenge* colonialist rhetoric about the dangers of the continent itself, for instance,

Kingsley uses comedy to *denigrate* the Africans she meets or observes. In the following, typical passage, physical stereotypes lead quickly and easily into behavioral ones:

> In every direction natives are walking at a brisk pace, their naked feet making no sound on the springy turf of the streets, carrying on their heads huge burdens which are usually crowned by the hat of the bearer. . . . As the native inhabitants of Sierra Leone pay no attention whatever to where they are going, either in this world or the next, the confusion and noise are out of all proportion to the size of the town; and when, as frequently happens, a section of actively perambulating burden-bearers charge recklessly into a sedentary section, the members of which have dismounted their loads and squatted themselves down beside them, right in the middle of the fair way, to have a friendly yell with some acquaintances, the row becomes terrific. (17)

This description creates an image of the "primitive" African—unclothed, balancing parcels on his or her head, lacking decorum in a public place, "squatting" rather than sitting—in an undeniably jocose tone that casts the "native inhabitant" as a clown.

When Kingsley quotes *in dialect* the African speakers she meets, Africans are again constructed as humorously primitive. For instance, one member of her party, whom she calls a "distinguished sportsman" for his ability to catch game, is quoted as describing his gaming practice thus: "'You go shoot thing with gun. Berra well—buy you no get him thing for sure. No sah. Dem gun make nize. Berrah well. You fren hear dem nize and come look him, and you hab to go share what you done kill. Or bad man hear him nize, and he come look him, and you no fit to get share—you fit to get kill yusself. Chii! chii!

traps be best!'" (61). While Kingsley gives lip service to praising the "distinguished sportsman" she also belittles him, mockingly representing (phonetically) his attempt at the English language. This rhetorical move reminds the reader of the African's laughable distance from the British (and therefore preferable) norm.

While making the African the butt of a joke is one way to denigrate him/her, at other times the text is ostensibly more straightforward in its tactics. Some tribes, for instance, are said to suffer from a "remarkable . . . ignorance regarding methods of working iron" (64), and others have a "mental condition [that] seems very near the ... great border-line that separates man from the anthropoid apes" (458). Still other tribes are depicted not only as mentally inferior, but also as "savage." The Fan, for instance, who will be discussed in detail later, are at points in the text described as "wild wicked-looking" (248) "murdering savages" who will "eat their fellow friendly tribesfolk, [and] keep a little something belonging to them as a memento" (274).

In addition, the text rhetorically derides Africans by equating them with animals. In describing the African's detestation of the smell of "civet cats," for instance, Kingsley explains, "It is very quaint the intense aversion the Africans have to this scent, and the grimaces and spitting that goes on when they come across it; their aversion is shared by the elephants. I once saw an elephant [detect the odor] . . . and fly off into the forest with an Oh lor! burning-some-brown-paper! pocket-handkerchief-please expression all over him" (160). In noting the shared characteristic of the African and the elephant, the text positions the African on an animalistic level. Later, the text resumes this practice even more insidiously. Reading a description of the Ajumba tribe and its physical

surroundings, the reader finds, amid a mini-lecture on the naming of shrubs and the appearance of the forest, the following out-of-place statement: "I also learn that in their language ebony and a monkey have one name" (238). This statement is embedded in the middle of a chapter filled to bursting with anthropological and scientific data, and the connection implied between the indigenous inhabitant with black skin—invoked by the mention of the color ebony—and the monkey, which of course is in evolutionary terms considered to be a "primitive" version of the human, is therefore taken to be more of the same.[20] Couched in the language of science and hidden within details collected from so-called detached observation, the statement correlates to the types of discussions in which Victorians were enmeshed—various "scientific" debates about the proximity of species (animal or human) to one another, about evolutionary "progress" toward civilization, about culturally-designated ratings of superiority and inferiority based on racial characteristics. In all of these discussions, the African is relegated, time and again, to the status of inferior Other to a "scientifically-proven-superior" British norm.

Kingsley's text also seems well situated within "scientifically-based" colonialist discourses of race when it casts Africans as harmless objects of the European gaze. They are Kingsley's "raw material" (3)— "genial natives" (51) or "sweet, unsophisticated children of nature" (164) with "quaint" and "amusing" customs (70) and "pretty brown children" (235). Moreover, African individuals with whom Kingsley *does* interact (as opposed to those she simply observes) are rhetorically represented as caricatures. When Kingsley introduces her traveling companions, for instance, she explains:

> One of them is a gentlemanly looking man, who wears a gray shirt; another looks like a genial Irishman who has accidentally got black, very black; he is distinguished by wearing a singlet; another is a thin, elderly man, notably silent; and the remaining one is a strapping, big fellow, as black as a wolf's mouth, of gigantic muscular development, and wearing quantities of fetish charms hung about him. . . . I will refer to them by their characteristic points, for their honourable names are awfully alike when you do hear them, and . . . rarely used in conversation. (232)

The names Kingsley assigns these men—"Gray Shirt," "Singlet," "Silent," and "Pagan"—are based upon physical appearance or superficial behavioral patterns rather than personality, and they reduce the individuals to one-dimensional half-beings.[21] Renaming them, it seems, "christening" them with European names that deny their culture, so to speak, is the only way for Kingsley to "understand" them. She must put them in terms understandable to the European, fitting them within a scheme that is knowable and acceptable within ethnocentric British ideology. In so doing, she denies their humanity.[22]

Embedded in demeaning constructions of race, moreover, are illustrations of the colonialist ideal of manifest destiny. In one particularly telling instance, Kingsley's walk through the countryside is disturbed by the sound of someone beckoning to her. She relates the event in her shorthand style:

> Hear shouts coming from a clump of banana on my left. Know they are directed at me, but it does not do to attend to shouts always. Expect it is *only some native*

> *with an awful knowledge of English . . . therefore accelerate pace.* More shouts, and louder...and out of the banana clump comes a big, plump, pleasant-looking gentleman . . . . *White people must be attended to, so advance carefully towards him...apologising humbly for intruding his domain.* (145, emphasis added)

This passage clearly sets up an ethnocentric hierarchy, as Kingsley ignores the shouts when she believes they originate from "some native" but becomes attentive and respectful when she sees the color of the shouter's skin. Her subsequent apology to the white man positions her text in line with the colonialist agenda. She is apparently blind to the implications of her walk—intrusive though it is on at least a theoretical level (another European invading another small piece of the continent)—because she is blind to the idea that Britain's presence in Africa (colonialist "invasion" that it is) is questionable in itself. Kingsley seems impervious to the fact that she, and all Europeans, are intruding not upon the *white man's* "domain," but upon the domain of the African, the very people she would have chosen to ignore. Both the clearly-drawn hierarchy in the passage and the unexamined assumption embedded in Kingsley's apology seem to speak loudly about the depth of the text's antipathy and indifference toward the African and its belief in Britain's divine right to be present in Africa.

But just as the text challenges, with subtle phrasing and contradictory information, the discourse that sketches a frightening and dangerous Africa, it also challenges what seems to be its unqualified support of racist, colonialist notions. While these passages seem inherently racist, dismissive, and Eurocentric, when they are viewed in the context

of other passages that overtly contradict them or that are themselves difficult to classify, the text becomes, in turn, difficult to place within the colonialist agenda.

Kingsley's apparent obliviousness to the questionability of the British presence in Africa, for instance, which had seemed so in-line with ethnocentric attitudes touting the right of manifest destiny, is challenged by the fact that Kingsley at other textual moments seems well aware and very critical of the British imposition on Africa. While she does believe in *trading* with Africa, she forcefully opposes the Crown Colony system of government that not only does *business* with Africa, but also imposes colonial rule—bringing with it European social structures and governance—and attempts to force European ideals on the African. The former, she claims, helps the indigenous populations of the continent (itself, of course, an ethnocentric idea), but the latter stunts and destroys them. "The worst enemy to the existence of the African tribe, is the one who comes to it and says:--Now you must civilise, and come to school, and leave off all those awful goings-on of yours, and settle down quietly" (403), she claims. And although Kingsley goes on to assert that trade has helped maintain and build the population of some African tribes, she admits that attempting to "civilize" them can have disastrous ramifications: "[T]he West Coast African is here with us by the million . . . . Save for an occasional habit of going raving or melancholy mad when educated for the ministry, and dying when he, and more particularly she, is shut up in the broiling hot, corrugated iron school-room with too many clothes on, and too much head work to do, he survives" (679). She is, at this contradictory textual moment, *critical* of, not oblivious to, the implications of British colonialism. Thus, the apparently transparent support for colonialism that seemed to be

illustrated earlier must be read more complexly. The text in fact troubles notions it seems to endorse.

The same type of complex reading is required when approaching the text's constructions of race. Overtly or subtly ethnocentric passages like the ones noted above exist alongside passages that are much more difficult to categorize as racist (or, for that matter, as anti-racist). Instead, they vacillate between upholding and challenging the discourses of race that legitimized colonialism. In one significant passage, for instance, the reader finds what appears to be a series of statements that are at odds with the textual constructions of the African as primitive, child-like, and savage. The passage asserts, "[Y]ou must recognise that these Africans have often a remarkable mental acuteness and a large share of common sense; that there is nothing really 'child-like' in their form of mind at all. Observe them further and you will find they are not a flighty-minded, mystical set of people in the least" (439). The passage thus far seems to upset the notion that the African is the European's cultural and intellectual inferior.[23] As it continues, though, its discourse becomes more complicated, as it seems to resort back to its ethnocentrism:

> [T]hey are notably deficient in the mechanical arts: they have never made, unless under white direction and instruction, a single fourteenth-rate piece of cloth, pottery, a tool or machine, house, road, bridge, picture or statue; . . . a written language of their own construction they none of them possess. . . . When you fully realize this acuteness on one hand and this mechanical incapacity on the other which exist in the people you are studying, you can go ahead. (439)

The last sentence of this passage illustrates the difficulty of defining the text's attitude toward the ethnocentric doctrine it had seemed to espouse so definitively. The text represents the African as *both* mentally acute and as mentally-deficient objects of European study. It once again fluctuates between positive and negative rhetoric, first challenging ethnocentric assumptions, then doubling back to reinforce them, and then giving voice to its own double view.

This type of discursive strategy occurs again when Kingsley appears to argue with the notion that the African race is an underdeveloped version of the British race. As the text defends the African from this insult, it simultaneously levels its own insults. Kingsley rejects the theory that the African's "'mental development is arrested, and thenceforth he grows backwards instead of forwards'" (672). To do so, however, she calls to her aid the doctrine of distinct species (a la Hunt, Knox, and the Anthropological Society), itself a racist idea reinforcing the notion that the African is different from and deficient to the European. She asserts,

> Now it is nervous work contradicting these statements, but with all due respect to the makers of them I must do so, and I have the comfort of knowing that many men with a larger personal experience of the African than these authorities have, agree with me . . . *we utterly disclaim holding the opinion that the African is a man and a brother. A man he is, but not of the same species.* (672-3, emphasis added)

By using one ethnocentric principle to contradict another, the text reinforces the demeaning attitude it had rhetorically begun to contradict.

Similarly, the text continuously dismantles and reasserts stereotypical myths regarding the Fan, the "wild wicked-looking" (248) tribe of "murdering savages" (274) mentioned earlier. Kingsley never claims that the Fan are anything other than what they are claimed to be in ethnocentric myth—violent, savage, treacherous—yet she does manage to undercut exactly those notions. While she apparently accepts (and thereby reinforces) the notion that they are "murdering savages," for instance, she also suggests subtly that they may not be: "[I feel sure that] for good solid murderous rascality several of my old Fan acquaintances . . . would take a lot of beating; and yet, one and all, they had behaved well to me" (294). She calls them, repeatedly, "my friends the Fans" (307, 328), and she thus allows her personal experience to hint to the reader that perhaps the discourse that casts the Fan as dangerous Others who are ultimately deadly is overblown.

The rhetorical structure of a lengthy passage in which Kingsley discusses the Fan's physical and mental characteristics exemplifies the text's vacillation between reinforcing and challenging the ethnocentric discourse that constructs them. First of all, the text carries on the ethnocentric work "studying" other races in its objectification of the Fan and its classification of the tribe based on its physical characteristics:

> They are on the whole a fine race, particularly those in the mountain districts of the Sierra del Cristal, where one continually sees magnificent specimens of human beings, both male and female. Their colour is light bronze, many of the men have beards, and albinoes are rare among them. The average height in the mountain districts is five feet six to five feet eight, the difference in stature between men

and women not being great. Their countenances are very bright and expressive, and if once you have been among them, you can never mistake a Fan. (329)

But when the text enters a discussion of their mental characteristics, it hops repeatedly back and forth between language that dismisses stereotypical and incorrect information about the Fan and language that reinforces those same stereotypes. The Fan, Kingsley explains, are "full of fire, temper, intelligence, and go; very teachable, rather difficult to manage, quick to take offence and utterly indifferent to human life" (329). In this sentence alone, the text manages to cast the Fan as inferior and somewhat dangerous to the European, but still assert their worth: they need to be taught and managed, much like unruly children, but they are intelligent; their tendency to rise to anger and violence quickly can just as easily be understood as passion and drive. Thus Kingsley embeds a counter-construction into an apparently more ethnocentric construction of the Fan, so that it is impossible to read the sentence as definitively praising or denigrating, racist or dismissive of racism.

A simultaneous challenge to and reinforcement of colonialist constructions of the Fan occurs again when Kingsley states that her dealings with them were always tentative, despite the fact that, in her experience, they did not deserve the bad reputation they had acquired.

I ought to say that other people, *who should know him better than I*, say he is a treacherous, thievish, murderous cannibal. I never found him treacherous; *but then I never trusted him*, remembering one of the aphorisms of my great teacher

Captain Boler of Bonny, "It's not safe to go among bush tribes." (329, emphasis added)

This passage, with its assertion of first-hand experience, contests the notion that the Fan are the "treacherous, thievish, murderous cannibal[s]" that others claim them to be at the same time that it relegates them back into that demeaning category. By implying that Kingsley simply does not know them well enough to understand them—"others" know them better and more thoroughly—and by allowing this apparent "knowledge" to carry enough weight to force Kingsley to continue to distrust them despite what appear to be their good characters, the text reinforces the stereotypical construction it had seemed to challenge. Concurrently, though, Kingsley's personal assertion of their moral worth (even though it is challenged in the same breath) implies that the stereotypical construction of the Fan is not necessarily the only story.

Later, as Kingsley doles out advice on handling the Fan, she again challenges stereotypical assumptions while simultaneously reinforcing them: "It is not advisable to play with [the Fan], or to attempt to eradicate them . . . and never, never shoot too soon," she asserts, reaffirming the construction of the Fan as dangerous and threatening—a tribe to defend oneself against. 'Keep your distance,' the text seems to say, 'and when you can't, be ready to shoot.' The implication of the Fan's violent and antagonistic nature is difficult to miss. As the passage continues, though, the text again vacillates: it both undermines the negative textual construction of the Fan's nature and reinforces it: "I have never had to shoot, and hope never to have to; because in such a situation, one white alone with no troops to back him means a clean finish" (330). Her personal experience,

once again, is at odds with the myth surrounding the Fan; she herself has never had to resort to physical violence, even though she has had extended interactions with the Fan. This confession helps to contradict the idea that the Fan will attack and kill anyone who enters their sights, even though the warning that follows it (against facing an African tribe alone) ultimately swallows it up.[24] The text is, once again, rhetorically double.

This doubleness, the text's abstract mimicry, constructs indigenous inhabitants of Africa both as in-line with colonialist doctrine and as a challenge to that doctrine. They are objects of study, cultural and intellectual primitives, and evolutionary throwbacks to an earlier era, *as well as* moral, intellectual equals who are undeserving of the disrespectful (literal or rhetorical) treatment they endure. The text's abstract mimicry—its simultaneous assertion and denial of all of these contradictory points—unsettles any attempt at definitive interpretation of the text's ideological stance, and it thus reveals the nineteenth-century's split consciousness about colonialism.

*

Kingsley's text, which I have dubbed a mimic-text after its abstract correlation with the colonial mimic's doubleness (its concurrent assertion and undermining of colonialist discourses of control), itself contains representations of "actual" colonial mimics. In discussing these textual figures, *Travels in West Africa* continues to challenge and reinforce colonialist ideology with rhetorical undercutting. Reiterating Bhabha's theory once again, mimics are representational embodiments of a threat to colonial control, as mimicry can potentially trouble and overturn the social structure that it was supposed to endorse. *Travels* illustrates the inherent threat of the mimic in descriptions

like the one in the following passage, in which a non-mimicking African is compared with an overtly mimicking one:

> To the casual visitor at Sierra Leone, the Mohammedan is a mere passing sensation. You neither feel a burning desire to laugh with, or at him, as in the case of the country folks, nor do you wish to punch his head, and split his coat up his back—things you yearn to do to that perfect flower of Sierra Leone culture, who yells your bald name across the street at you, condescendingly informs you that you can go and get letters that are waiting for you, while he smokes his cigar and lolls in the shade, or in some similar way displays his second-hand rubbishy white culture. (19)

The Mohammedan is a representation of a "good" colonized subject: part of the landscape, so to speak, and as such, the object of "casual" European observation and speculation. He is "courteous"—or, in other words, one can assume, unobtrusive and obedient. The Sierra Leonian, unlike the Mohommedan, is a mimic: rather than unquestioningly perform what the text implies is his "duty"— fetching the mail, for instance—the Sierra Leonian smokes cigars and rests in the shade in what the text deems an infuriating exhibition of his attempt at "white culture." *Mimicking* white behavior disallows *serving* the white population, as the mimic places himself on the same social level as the European. Thus, the lines of colonizer/colonized, ruler/subject—the hierarchical lines that determine the social structure upon which European control depends—begin to dissolve. Such a threat to the social structure is, in this instance, rhetorically contained by reestablishing the "rightful" social hierarchy: promises of

physical violence to such "insolence" re-establish the colonizer in a physically more-powerful position over the African; and casting the mimic as socially inferior to both the British *and* the non-mimicking native[25] places the mimic in the lowest possible position in the social structure he/she had seemingly tried to overturn.

Although the "danger" of the mimic is not always as overtly represented as it is in the case of the Sierra Leonian, mimics throughout the *Travels* are similarly contained by a discursive reestablishment of the social hierarchy. This containment is effected at other instances in the text, however, not through threats of violence or through unfavorable comparison, but by drawing attention to moments at which mimicry *fails*.

Mimics who mimic poorly, for instance, are easily identifiable as not-English and therefore help to maintain a firmly colonialist social structure. In one scene, for instance, the comic description of ineffective mimicry relegates the mimic to the status of unthreatening Other. The narrator paints the following picture:

> I got into a 'rickshaw . . . pulled in front by two government negroes and pushed behind by another pair, all neatly attired in white jackets and knee breeches, and crimson cummberbunds yards long, bound round their middles. Now it is an ingrained characteristic of the uneducated negro, that he cannot keep on a neat and complete garment of any kind. It does not matter what that garment may be; so long as it is whole, off it comes. But as soon as the garment becomes a series of holes, held together by filaments of rag, he keeps it upon him in a manner that is marvelous, and you need have no further anxiety on its behalf. Therefore it was but natural that the cummerbunds, being new, should come off their wearers

several times in the course of our two mile trip, and as they wound riskily round the legs of their running wearers, we had to make halts while one of the cummerbund was affixed to a tree-trunk and the other end to the man, who rapidly wound himself up in it again with a skill that spoke of constant practice.

European culture simply does not "fit" here. The jackets and breeches are clearly in the way, and the attempt to function successfully with them is comically rendered. This mimicry-done-poorly does not make the mimic *more* like the British, but less so, and mimicry's implied threat is thus undermined. Mimicry is *not* threatening, the text seems to say, but laughable in its inevitable failure.

Similarly, in a later scene, mimics demonstrate their distance from a European ideal by misappropriating white culture. Stumbling across a remote village near the Ogowe River, Kingsley describes the inhabitants: "The people were evidently exceedingly poor; clothes they had very little of. The two head men had on old French military coats in rags; but they were quite satisfied with their appearance, and evidently felt through them in touch with European culture, for they lectured to the others on the habits and customs of the white man with great self-confidence and superiority" (176). Native inhabitants, in other words, have adopted the "look" of European culture because they seem to have internalized the notion that mimicking it raises them to the same "superior" level. The text, however, renders the mimics (and this belief itself) unthreatening, even comical, by drawing attention to the imperfection of their mimicry. Their coats are "in rags," after all, and the mimics' satisfaction with second-hand and tattered versions of European clothing designates them as *non*-European despite their

certainty they are knowledgeable enough about European culture to lecture on it. Rhetorical attention to moments at which mimicry is transparent—where the façade is easily seen through—undermines any inherent threat in mimicry itself; the hierarchical social lines that demarcate colonizer/colonized, ruler/ruled, mimicked/mimic remain in place.

Faced with mimics who are more proficient in their "art," the text nonetheless continues to draw attention to mimicry's failure, and it thereby contains the danger implied by mimicking subjects. Two more "successful" mimics are an unnamed factory agent, who is described as "an exceedingly dirty, good-looking, civil-spoken man [with] perfect English, though as pure blooded an African that ever walked" (304), and another agent, Mr. Glass, who is described as "an exceedingly neat, well-educated M'pongwe gentleman [with] irreproachable English garments, and with irreproachable, but slightly *floreate*, English language" (305). In both cases, the text implies the threat of mimicry—its potential to disrupt the hierarchical social structure in place in the Western consciousness—by pointing out that mimicry can be done well: the unnamed agent uses perfect English, Mr. Glass' is irreproachable. Embedded in the same sentences, however, are phrases that undermine the so-called perfection and thus undermine the threat. The unnamed agent can not hide that he is "exceedingly dirty," nor can Mr. Glass' irreproachable English cover his "slightly floreate" style. Their, at least momentarily, failed mimicry reveals that these men are *not* on the same social level as the British, but that they are, in the end, still very far away from that ideal.

Later, when the text's most perfect mimic, Prince Makaga, surfaces, the same rhetorical technique is used to control the threat his presence implies. While observing the activity in an African village, Kingsley unexpectedly hears "a well-modulated evidently educated voice saying, in most perfect English: 'Most diverting spectacle madam, is it not?'" (340). Kingsley's "shock" at hearing the proper and well-spoken words becomes even more profound when she sees their speaker:

> I turned round and saw . . . what appeared to me to be an English gentleman who had from some misfortune gone black all over and lost his trousers and had been compelled to replace them with a highly ornamental table-cloth. The rest of his wardrobe was in exquisite condition, with the usual white jean coat, white shirt and collar, very neat tie, and felt hat affected by white gentlemen out here. Taking a large and powerful cigar from his lips with one hand, he raised his hat gracefully with the other and said:
>
> "Pray excuse me, madam." (340)

Prince Makaga presents a striking picture, and Kingsley is clearly impressed by him.[26] As their conversation continues, on such "English" topics as the decorum involved in smoking, the respective merits of the National Gallery and St. George's Hall, and the perils of being in Africa without one's card-carrying case, Kingsley seems unable to contain her fascination for him. Even after learning that other Africans believe the Prince, a M'pongwe man, to have been "spoilt by going to Europe" (340), Kingsley continues to praise him. "Prince Makaga," she contends, "had a fine polish on him without the obvious conceit usually found in men who have been home" (341).[27]

Prince Makaga represents a potentially threatening figure within colonialist ideology. He mimics, after all, well enough to have apparently visited and felt comfortable in Europe—acting out a kind of reverse invasion, so to speak. The text, therefore, must render him (and his mimicry) non-threatening, and it does so, once again, by pointing out where mimicry falls short of its goal. Prince Makaga may have perfect English, he may be fascinating in conversation, but the "ornamental table cloth" that he wears instead of acceptable English trousers is one indication of his difference from the European ideal. Another indication, more subtle, is in Kingsley's proclamation that he has a "fine *polish*" (emphasis added). This statement, while ostensibly praising the prince, implies that the physical and charismatic presence to which Kingsley is drawn is little more than an ornamental façade. And under that façade, the reader is reminded, is the fact that he is "*from some misfortune* . . . black all over" (340, emphasis added). The racist ideology apparent in this statement—that it is the Prince's misfortune to be of African descent—repositions the Prince on the social hierarchy "below" the British. No matter how well he has learned to mimic, he will never *be* anything other than a mimic, not-English, always recognizable in the inevitable moments when mimicry fails.

Emphasizing mimicry's failure also rhetorically undercuts and contains the threat implied by the deliberately-practiced mimicry of Obanjo/Captain Johnson. Kingsley hires Obanjo, or, as he prefers to be called "Captain Johnson," to help her maneuver through the Rembwe River. From the first moment she meets him, Obanjo/Captain Johnson seems to her to have two sides to his character—the more European "reckless, rollicking skipper [with the] Hallo-my-Hearty atmosphere," and the wild and rugged African whom

she would want to have with her if she were to "engage in a wild and awful career up a West African river." (335). His doubleness, she says, is expressed in his appearance:

> He wore . . . a huge sombrero hat, a spotless singlet, and a suit of clean, well-got-up dungaree, and an uncommonly picturesque, powerful figure he cut in them, with his finely moulded, well-knit form and good-looking face, full of expression always, but always with the keen small eyes in it watching the effect his genial smiles and hearty laugh produced. The eyes were the eyes of Obanjo, the rest of the face the property of Captain Johnson. I do not mean to say that they were the eyes of a bad bold man, but you had not to look twice at them to see they belonged to a man courageous in the African manner, full of energy and resource, keenly intelligent and self-reliant, and all that sort of thing. (335)

Obanjo/Captain Johnson's mimicry seems deliberate, refined, and refin*able*—his "African" eyes, which contain glimpses of his resourceful and intelligent African "nature," carefully study the effect that his "European" exterior (his behavior) has upon people—and it thus represents a potential threat to the colonizing power.[28]

This threat, like the threat posed by other mimics, is undermined by emphasizing the points at which Obanjo/Captain Johnson's practiced-but-still-transparent mimicry fails. To begin with, no matter how well Obanjo/Captain Johnson speaks English, no matter how genial and "skipper-ish" he seems, Kingsley textually enacts and re-enacts on a microcosmic level the power relationship of colonialism: the white European in control of the native African. Kingsley never lets the reader forget that Obanjo/Captain Johnson is *not* English, but rather a "servant" in her employ. She depicts him in constant action

(fixing the canoe, navigating through treacherous water, directing the other servants, for instance), and most of that action directly benefits her, his employer. Further, Kingsley also draws attention to the fact that Obanjo/Captain Johnson's mimicry fails to render him believably British by refusing to call him by his (preferred) English name. She addresses him directly only by his African name, and when she speaks *about* him, she either uses his African name ("Obanjo . . . had set about constructing a new and large trading canoe" [341], for instance) or mocks his use of an English one. In a particularly telling moment, the reader finds this statement: "Bana Island is nothing to Bana Bank, which supports Obanjo's—I beg his pardon, Captain Johnson's statement that "half dem dar 'fernal Corisco Bay Islands lib under water" (405). The text sets the conspicuous use of Obanjo/Captain Johnson's English name against the condescension of quoting of his speech in dialect; thus at the very moment that it appears to recognize Obanjo/Captain Johnson's "British-ness," it actually highlights the distance between his *desire* and *attempt* to be considered European and the un-achievability of that goal.

This distance becomes even more pronounced when the traveling party visits Obanjo/Captain Johnson's village. In his "native" environment, the text seems to say, Obanjo/Captain Johnson's mimicry fails altogether, as he "reverts" back to a primitive state:

> One village in particular did we have a lively time at. Obanjo had a wife and home there, likewise a large herd of goats, some of which he was desirous of taking down with us to sell at Gaboon. . . . I being very lazy, did not go ashore, but watched the pantomime from the bamboo staging. The whole flock of goats enter

> at right end of stage, and tear violently across the scene, disappearing at left. Two minutes elapse. Obanjo and his gallant crew enter at right end hand of stage, leg it like lamplighters across front, and disappear at left. Fearful pow-wow behind the scenes. Five minutes elapse. Enter goats at right as before, followed by Obanjo and company as before, and so on *da capo*. . . . It was a spirited performance, I assure you. (340)

The text's rendering of the "pantomime" reminds the reader that, despite its deliberateness, Obanjo/Captain Johnson's mimicry is mere pretension to an ideal that is unachievable, far removed from the African "nature." The threat of mimicry is thus again undermined and contained.[29]

The rhetorical treatment of each of these mimics, then, serves to remind the reader, first, of the impending threat of the mimic. The text implies that mimics could potentially trouble the lines between colonizer/colonized, they could "learn" their guises too well, they could be an ideologically-created threat to an ideologically-created social structure. But then again, the text also asserts, mimicry is never thoroughly convincing, and, as such, what might initially seem a threat is in fact no threat at all. In the end, the text seems to voice a colonialist belief in the strength, infallibility, and inevitability of the ruling hierarchy upon which colonialism rests at the exact moment that it questions just that hierarchy. The text's abstract mimicry, in other words, is again evident in its textual representation and containment of colonial mimics. It is, once again, double, maintaining both points and threatening any desire for a definitive reading.

*

Kingsley's travelogue, then, is essentially double, presenting discursive constructs that both reinforce and resist dominant colonial ideologies, refusing to rest comfortably on other side of any cultural debate, any ideological construction. This discursive ambiguity, I have been arguing, results from the fact that it is what we might call a *mimic-text.* It is a chameleon: neither a colonialist text with an anti-colonialist undercurrent, nor an anti-colonialist text that occasionally slips back into colonialist discourse to espouse ethnocentric assumptions, but, rather, *all* of these texts at once, never resting long enough in any position to give that position priority status.

This fact should not surprise us. Texts, after all, are readable as "snapshots" capturing the cultural climate of a historical moment. Why should we expect them to present with a unified picture (even a unified picture with an undercurrent of dissent beneath it) when the moments they capture are themselves split, fragmentary, competing? The fact that we cannot find a concrete stance to grab hold of for more than a few pages at a time in the *Travels* does not devalue the work; on the contrary, the text is most noteworthy *because* of this denial of interpretation. In its doubleness, its abstract mimicry, the text powerfully represents the depth of the late nineteenth-century's divided consciousness about colonialism. It is a textual artifact from that most complex cultural moment, a moment that was simultaneously certain and uncertain of its past, its present, and its future.

Notes

[1] Both David Livinstone and Henry Morton Stanley published nearly-instant bestsellers with their chronicles of African exploration. Livinstone's *Missionary Travels* sold 70,000 copies, for example, and Stanley's *In Darkest Africa* sold 150,000 copies in England alone. Other bestsellers, like Samuel White Baker's *The Albert N'Yanza* (1866), Richard Burton's *Lake Regions of Central Africa* (1860), John Speke's *Discovery of the Sources of the Nile* (1864), and Joseph Thomson's *To the Central African Lakes and Back* (1881), also helped to fuel public interest in the exploration of the continent.

[2] See also Frank, p. 29.

[3] For a biographical and cultural study of Livingstone's complex views and actions, see Jeal.

[4] This type of comment appears repeatedly throughout *Descent of Man*; see especially Chapter 3, "Comparison of Mental Powers of Man and the Lower Animals" and Chapter 7, "On the Races of Man."

[5] See for example Said; Gilmour, pp. 180-88; Brantlinger, pp. 173-97; Blunt, *Travel* pp. 23-25; and Blunt and Rose, pp. 1-25. Additionally, Blunt and Rose claim that the study of geography (map making, in particular) was similarly implicated in furthering the colonialist agenda. They explain that map making:

> legitimized colonization, enhanced the possibilities for surveillance, and facilitated colonial rule by helping to distance those exercising power from its consequences. The rhetorical strategies of mapping reveal the far reaching

implications of colonial maps to include "the reinscription, enclosure and hierarchization of space, which provide an analogue for the acquisition, management and reinforcement of colonial power." (9-10)

[6] As I discuss below, whether or not colonialism was good for economy is questionable, as fears of recession and England's over-extension of resources plagued the late Victorians (see Gilmour, p. 180-4). Kingsley seemed to have believed colonialist discourse's propaganda, however. In a lecture on trade, Kingsley's critique of the crown colony system of government (also discussed later) is positioned alongside her belief in colonial trade's benefit to the country:

> A colony drains from the mother country yearly thousands of the most able and energetic of her children, leaving behind them their aged or incapable relations; whereas the holding of the West African markets drains a few hundred men only—only too often for ever; but the trade they carry on and develop enables thousands of men and women and children to remain safe n England in comfort and pleasure, owing to the wages and profits arising from the manufacture and profit of articles used in that trade. (Lecture to Geographical Society of Liverpool 1896, qtd. in Gwynn 125)

[7] Later, Herbert Spencer echoes Gladstone's sentiment, deriding the colonialist agenda that subjugated other races in no less an abominable way than did the slave trade. See for example "Imperialism and Slavery" (1902).

[8] That Kingsley was aware of these constructions is hardly unquestionable. She cites Livingstone and Burton among her heroes, in fact, and she was an avid reader whose social circle included intellectuals, scientists, and explorers who often discussed such topics. For further discussion of Kingsley's life, see Frank, Gwynn, and Birkett.

[9] The ambiguity of the text's position within "scientific" circles given the gender of its author was profound, but the scientific nature of her endeavor was never in question to Kingsley herself. She vocally refutes the charge that she visited Africa as a "traveler," insisting instead, "I make no pretensions to being a traveler; I am in ethnologist" ("Miss Kingsley's Travels in West Africa" Response to *Athenaeum*'s Review, 278) As Frank explains, she travels to West Africa to study "fish and fetish" only after immersing herself in and mastering the study of ethnology (she had already mastered ichthyology), and her text reflects her scientific expertise. In addition, the "worth" of her scientific endeavor is proven by the fact that many of the specimens she brought back to England had never been seen before, and three new species of fish were named for her (24-35, 230-31).

[10] When I use Kingsley's name, I am not implying a connection to Kingsley the person/author, but rather I am referring to the textual construction of the narrator. As such, I will use the terms "Kingsley" and "the narrator" interchangeably throughout the text.

[11] See Mills' "Discourses of Difference" for a similar treatment of this idea.

[12] McEwan also notes the multivocal quality of Kingsley's text. McKewan's contention, however, is that it results from the conflict between feminine duty (as Kingsley claimed

to have traveled out of duty, to continue her father's work) and un-feminine self-gratification (evident in the pleasure Kingsley took in travel).

[13] Blunt and Mills both assert that the biographical content of Kingsley's text does not interest them. They claim instead to be interested not in the author, but, using Michel Foucault's term, in "author positionality." As their analyses both use Kingsley's gender and upbringing as a basis for exploration, however, their studies are least partly biographical.

[14] The double-edged threatening quality of mimicry is implied by Kingsley's discussion of African fetish. One particularly noteworthy God, she explains, with almost an uncanny use of Bhabha's language, is "Tando, the Hater . . . He is terribly malicious, human in shape, and though *not quite white*, is decidedly lighter in complexion . . . . There is absolutely no trick too mean or venomous for Tando" (521, emphasis added). Tando is clearly a threatening figure, but tellingly, he is not dangerous only to the European. Tando is dangerous, first and foremost, to the African. The presence of light-skinned Tando in the African world—psychic or material—could speak, in some ways, to the anxiety Africans may have felt about Europeans. At the same time, the inclusion of the reference in Kingsley's text might speak to the anxiety Europeans may have felt about African not-quite white mimics. The malicious God, whose not-quite-whiteness could represent, from the European perspective, the possibility of an insurgence from within the mimicking black population, and, from the African perspective, the possibility of persecution and displacement by the white population, is terrifying from all vantage points.

[15] See, for example, Mills' *Discourses of Difference* for further discussion of this idea. Mills notes that what appeared to be a "tool of colonialism" was also ideologically fragmented, readable for what lies beneath the apparent "truth" it ostensibly presents (49-55).

[16] Pratt and Blunt ("Mapping" and *Travel*) discuss this passage and other of Kingsley's landscape descriptions in order to identify ways in which Kingsley's writing falls inside or outside of the generally male-identified tradition of travel writing. Pratt argues that Kingsley is prevented by her gender from adopting the "Monarch-of-all-I-Survey" trope used by male travel writers, in which an explorer identifies, quantifies, valorizes, and claims a spot (usually a large lake or mountain) on the globe. Kingsley's text, instead, is located outside of this discursive structure: her "discoveries" are often of places deemed "unworthy" by male explorers (swamps were her favorite place to explore), and they are often couched in terms that are feminized. Rather than "conquer" the landscape, she travels *through* it, describing her experience with feminized images and language.

Blunt argues with this notion, asserting that "Pratt assumes [that Kingsley's descriptions illustrate her] feminization and reinforce notions of Kingsley as an eccentric individual" (*Travel* 99). Blunt instead looks more closely at the complexities of the narration, noting that Kingsley's text locates her both outside of *and* inside of masculine discursive realms. Kingsley spends as much time on mountains as she does in swamps, after all, and as much time objectifying and categorizing the landscape as being part of it.

For further discussion of the gendered nature of travel writing, see Lawrence.

[17] Early makes a similar point, explaining that while Kingsley's text is "framed by a racist superstructure," the argument underneath undermines hierarchies of race and troubles notions of apparent objective representation ("Spectacle" 224). According to Early, this undermining was necessary for Kingsley to make room for herself in the field of scientific study. (For additional discussion on Kingsley's position within this field, see Early's "Unescorted in Africa.") See also Lawrence, who explains that although Kingsley is not "free from polygenecist, racist assumptions about the difference between Africans and Europeans . . . [she] pokes fun at the project of European mastery" by focusing on the relativity of cultural values (136-7).

[18] There are, of course, alternate views. Stevenson, for instance, claims that Kingsley is not racist but sympathetic to the African, because the African presented "a mirror image of [her] own plight as [a woman] in an imperial society" (8).

[19] Even given this accusation, both Nnoromele and Birkett illustrate rhetorical inconsistencies in Kingsley's work. Nnoromele remarks on Kingsley's criticism of the Crown Colony system (which I discuss below), and Birkett explains that Kingsley upsets the notion that the African should be "studied" to benefit the European when she proposes to write a book depicting her "travels in England for the benefit of the African" (113). This statement illustrates the dissolution of the self/Other dichotomy, as Kingsley implies that the European can be seen as the African's Other, just as Europeans view Africans in that way. Nevertheless, Birkett and Nnoromele do not excuse what they consider to be the overall ethnocentricity of the *Travels*. Alternate voices within the text

that trouble a reading of Kingsley as blatantly racist are, in Nnoromele's words, "isolated elements" that do not adequately combat the racist sentiment (282).

[20] The idea that the African is a less-evolved human being is also apparent in the text's comment later that it is "a wonder we have so many traces of early man as we have, when one sees here in Africa how one tribe sweeps out another tribe . . . leaving nothing, after the lapse of a century to show it ever existed" (400). As I discuss later, though, this belief is troubled at other points in the text.

[21] For further discussion of Kingsley's use of caricature to define these men, see Birkett, p. 43.

[22] Mills notes a similar point, but not in relation to these characters. Instead, while demonstrating that knowledge produced within colonialism touted as "scientific" was never objective but implicated in affirming or contesting colonialism, she asserts: "Within this type of knowledge, specimens are named by Europeans and extracted from their environment. . . . They are transformed from chaos into an order that is European" ("Knowledge" 35).

[23] This type of statement appears throughout Kingsley's published articles. In "The Liquor Traffic," for instance, she says, "It is hateful to me to see the West African native himself after all the kindness, all the chivalry, all the help and hospitality given me so freely with no hope of reward, painted unjustly as a mere drunken child by the anti-liquor party, or as a flighty-minded fiend by the superficial observer" (560). Similarly, in her response to the *Athenaeum*'s review of the *Travels*, Kingsley is quoted as saying "The

African's rhetoric, his manners, his honesty—taken in their higher developments—do not require of his advocate the plea that they are very good for an African. In these things he will pass muster with any other race" ("Miss Kingsley's Travels in West Africa" 279).

[24] The text's treatment of the cannibalism myth works much the same way. In an explanation of the Fans' cannibalism, Kingsley confuses the issue to the point of making it nearly opaque.

> The Fan is not a cannibal from sacrificial motives like the Negro. He does it in his common sense way. Man's flesh, he says, is good to eat, very good, and he wishes you would try it. Oh dear no, he never eats it himself, but the next door town does .... [But] He has no slaves, no prisoners of war, no cemeteries, so you must draw your own conclusions. No, my friend, I will not tell you any cannibal stories. (331-2)

By the end of this passage, it is nearly impossible to tell whether or not the text confirms the cannibalism myth or implies that it is completely false. The fact that such a question arises, though, is an answer in itself. The text challenges the myth even while it refuses to dismiss it altogether.

[25] This type of comparison, which renders the mimic a "lower" version of the non-mimicking native can also occur more subtly at times. In one telling scene, Kingsley describes a tribe that does *not* mimic white culture:

> [The mystery surrounding the Bubi] has arisen from their exclusiveness, and their total lack of enthusiasm in trade matters. . . . A little rum, a few beads, and

> finish—then he will turn the rest of his attention to catching porcupines, or the beautiful little gazelles . . . . And what time he may have on his hand after this, he spends in building houses and making himself hats . . . . Cloth he does not want; he utterly fails to see what good the stuff is, for he abhors clothes . . . . [Y]ou come across the Bubi ostentatiously unclothed . . . . The Spanish authorities insist that the natives who come into town should have something on, and so they array themselves in a bit of cotton cloth, which before they are out of sight of the town, on their homeward way, they strip off and stuff into their baskets, showing in this, as well as in all other particulars, how uninfluencible by white culture they are. (56-7)

The Bubi (indigenous inhabitants of Fernando Po) refuse to mimic, and, although their attitude toward white culture is treated condescendingly and a little haughtily by the text, it nonetheless does not fall victim to the ridicule and threats of violence suffered textually by Africans who *do* attempt to mimic. The native who remains distant from white culture, it seems, is more respectable than one who attempts to "rise" to the level of the European.

This is not to say, of course, that non-mimicking natives are necessarily "respected" by the text. Humorous textual treatment, after all, keeps the non-mimicking native relegated to the position of comic Other. Furthermore, shortly after the section of narrative quoted above, Kingsley's text subtly alerts the reader that the native who does not mimic is *not* much more worthy of respect than the mimic. The text explains that some Bubi *do* attempt to assimilate into white culture by taking jobs among whites, only

to abandon their pursuits. At first, they "submit to clothes and rapidly pick up the ways of a house or store" (62), but almost as soon as this happens, they change their minds and "vanish." If sought after, occasionally the Bubi "will be found in his or her particular village—clothesless, comfortable, utterly unconcerned, and unaware that he or she has lost anything by leaving [the city] and civilization. It is this conduct that gains for the Bubi the reputation of being a bigger idiot than he really is" (62). The implication is clear: white culture equals civilization, Bubi culture equals incivility/barbarism/primitive life, and one who *chooses* the latter is dismissed as ignorant. The text's attitude toward mimicry vs. non-mimicry, then, is double-edged. The mimic is threatening, subject to violence or ridicule; the non-mimic is more respectable, but ultimately subject to only marginally less persecution. The text, it seems, approves of neither.

[26] Nnoromele disagrees, citing Kingsley's "combative tone" in this scene as evidence of her racist attitude toward Africans (150).

[27] Of course, Kingsley's apparent preference for Makaga over any of the other mimics she has met thus far could also be a matter of class. The fact that Makaga is a prince might be a large reason that she is so complimentary to him. At the same time, though, his successful mimicry is equally important.

[28] Frank has a different view of Obanjo's doubleness, claiming that it reflects his position as a "transitional figure, an African guide back to white civilization on the coast" (182).

[29] For an alternate reading of this scene, see Nnoromele. The chasing of the goats, she claims, would have reminded readers of a scene in Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. The scene in

the *Travels* can therefore be read as Kingsley's "attempt to reinscribe in the external space of the colony the cultural space of England" (146).

Chapter 3

Pretty Miss Neville: Challenge and Reconciliation in the "Symbolic" Novel

"Why, this is absolutely delicious food for a three-volume novel. I declare I'll write one, and call it 'The Mystery of Mulkapore,' or 'Miss Neville's Secret.' What a small place the word is after all!" [Mrs. Vane] continued with a comprehensive wave of her fan. "Fancy losing a young lady among the bogs of Ireland, and finding her at our Indian banquet!"

"Ireland is not all bog," expostulated Maurice seriously.

--Pretty Miss Neville, p. 215

The general feeling one experiences while reading Bithia Mary Croker's Irish novel *Pretty Miss Neville* is a sense that one is enjoying, quite simply, a *good read.* The novel is a romp—adventure tale meets domestic romance—complete with ugly ducklings who become beautiful swans, leading men who capture first the imagination and then the esteem of both the leading lady and the reader, runaway brides, distant locales, shipwrecks, gossip, broken engagements, tiger hunts, concealed identities, and, not surprisingly, marriage.[1] Split between settings in Ireland and India, though, and featuring characters who represent factions in a contentious colonial relationship, the deceptively plot-driven novel offers readers something more than an engaging page turner. At the heart of the novel is the colonial engagement between England and Ireland, an engagement hundreds of years old, yet ongoing and ever present in the cultural consciousness of the British Victorian world.

Bithia Mary Croker (1849-1921) was born and raised in Kilgefin parish, County Roscommon, Ireland.[2] She produced her first novel in 1882, and, between that date and her death in 1921, she produced over 40 more. Although Croker's work was in high

demand during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, few readers today are familiar with it; in order to help situate my argument, therefore, I begin with a short summary of *Pretty Miss Neville*. *Pretty Miss Neville* is the story of the orphan Nora O'Neill, who is also the novel's narrator. Raised by her grandfather Beresford on the Irish family estate, Gallow, Nora is, at the start of the novel, a gawky 11-year old tomboy who delights in horseback riding and playing practical jokes on her half-British cousin Maurice Beresford, a summer visitor at Gallow. Although Nora and Maurice despise each other—he thinks her unruly and impetuous, she thinks him snobbish and uptight—their grandfather, in order to secure Nora's financial future, forces Maurice to agree to marry her when she turns 20. Nora's grandfather orders her to accept Maurice's unexpected proposal, but neither he nor Maurice tells her that grandfather Beresford has in fact forced him to offer it. Several years later, after Nora has matured into a beautiful young woman and Maurice has joined the military in Indian, grandfather Beresford dies, and Nora learns that Maurice had agreed to marry her on his grandfather's orders. Devastated and humiliated, she flees to India to live with a long-lost aunt and uncle in the Anglo-Indian encampment at Mulkapore, leaving Maurice a letter that frees him from his obligation to both Grandfather Beresford and herself. She then "disappears" completely by adopting the surname of her aunt and uncle and becoming Nora Neville. Eventually, Maurice, now an officer and a hero on the Indian subcontinent, comes to visit Mulkapore and realizes that "pretty Miss Neville" is his missing cousin and fiancé Nora. He had never stopped searching for her, and he had refused to accept her termination of their engagement; in fact, he had fallen in love with her during the first few years of their engagement, and he

still hoped to marry her if he could ever find her. Although Nora is, by that time, engaged to the middle-aged, arrogant Sir Percival, Maurice's hope ultimately comes to fruition. After Nora finds Sir Percival carrying on an illicit affair with the equally-arrogant Mrs. St. Ubes, she extricates herself from her engagement (which she had been trying to terminate since Maurice had arrived in Mulkapore and she had begun to develop an attraction to him), and she and Maurice become engaged again, this time by choice.

Croker's novel emerges from a culture deeply interested in the colonial struggle between England and Ireland.[3] As Magnus Magnusson explains, Ireland has been colonized and recolonized since the Middle Ages, and, from the 1500s, this conquest has been carried out by the English. Beginning in the 1541 with the decree proclaiming Henry VIII king of Ireland and continuing in earnest with Elizabeth's reign and with James I's policy of Plantation during the 1600s, the English government expelled large numbers of indigenous Irish from their homes, confiscated huge tracts of land, and offered that land to English settlers. These settlers relocated to Ireland, especially to the north, and became the unofficial ruling class of the country. As such, they set about coercing, sometimes by force, the indigenous Irish into submitting to the laws and adopting the culture (including the religion) of the English crown (Magnusson 13-18). Scholars such as R. F. Foster and Vera Kreilkamp have noted, however, that while this imposition of cultural values was underway throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many English and Irish people living in Ireland came to see themselves as parts of one Irish nation. Kreilkamp explains that English colonizers of Ireland (the so-called "Anglo-Irish") occupied a different position from other English colonizers. Whereas English colonials in Africa, for

instance, would return to England after their tour of duty, no less English for having left their homeland, English colonials who traveled to Ireland *settled* in Ireland permanently. They began to see themselves *as* Irish and ultimately identified more with their new country than with their old one (14).

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, many of these "new" and "native" Irish shared a common belief that Ireland should *not* be ruled by England. Despite the Act of Union of 1801, many of them resisted the incorporation of Ireland into Great Britain, and the dissolution of the Irish parliament, which would allow the British parliament at Westminster to govern Irish concerns. Many inhabitants of Ireland wanted their country to remain a distinct entity from England, governed by its own people (R. F. Foster 83-90, Magnusson 62-6).[4] The nineteenth century, then, not surprisingly, was filled with colonial tension born of the Act of Union. Irish nationalists found themselves pitted against both the predominantly English parliament at Westminster *and* Irish Unionists in their own country. The Unionists, living largely in the predominantly Protestant county of Ulster, maintained English loyalties, partly because the Act of Union financially benefited the Ulster-based textile industry and partly because the status of the ruling class (of which they were often members) was dependent on English support. Nonetheless, after the Great Famine of 1845-48, during which the Irish perceived England to be dragging its feet in offering aid,[5] a large number of Irish became increasingly convinced of British indifference to their plight and/or increasingly certain that the Irish would be better off on their own. As a result, various nationalist groups—the Young Irelanders, the Fenians, the

Land League, and the Home Rulers—campaigned for Irish rights under or complete liberation from English rule with greater or lesser degrees of violent agitation.[6]

The colonial relationship is at the heart of many nineteenth-century British texts (fiction or non-fiction), whether those texts are about Ireland, India, Africa, or any of the other colonized spaces under British rule.[7] As discussed in my introductory chapter, Abdul JanMohamed notes that texts about colonialism seek to perpetuate colonial ideology by positing binary oppositions between the colonizer and the colonized. By insisting on the essential differences between colonizer/colonized that designate them as superior or inferior cultures, respectively, colonial texts suggest the appropriateness and fixity of the colonial power structure. In so doing, these texts implicitly or explicitly justify colonialism to the colonizing nation: "If such literature can demonstrate the barbarism of the native is irrevocable, or at least very deeply ingrained, then the European's attempt to civilize him can continue indefinitely, the exploitation of his resources can proceed without hindrance, and the European can persist in enjoying a position of moral superiority" (62).

For JanMohamed, colonialist texts are either "imaginary" or "symbolic," depending on the extent to which they perpetuate colonial ideology's precepts. Imaginary texts focus on "a nondialectical, fixed opposition between the self and the native" (65). The colonized subject is presented as *essentially* and *unquestionably* different from and deficient to the colonizer, who is, in turn, presented as *essentially* and *unquestionably* in a state of superiority and leadership. Positions in the colonial power structure are presented as appropriate and unchanging. For JanMohamed, imaginary texts are marked by their

"adamant refusal to admit the possibility of syncretism, of a rapprochement" between colonizer and colonized (65), because admitting such a possibility would suggest the instability of the power structure and threaten the continued domination of the colonized culture. On the other hand, symbolic texts can imagine a more dialectical relationship between colonizer and colonized: "They are willing to examine the individual and cultural differences between Europeans and natives and to reflect on the efficacy of European values, assumptions, and habits in contrast to those of the indigenous cultures" (66). Symbolic texts, with greater or lesser degrees of success, attempt to challenge and ultimately escape the essentialism that produces and perpetuates a racial power structure, opting instead to try to "understand and appreciate a racial or cultural alterity" (74). They seek to represent a world in which difference can co-exist peacefully.[8]

JanMohamed applies his terminology to "colonialist literature," by which he means literature written by the colonizer, and certainly the English press in the second half of the nineteenth century produced its share of what JanMohamed would call "imaginary" texts. Anglocentric[9] propaganda posits essential differences between the English and the Irish, and such positing allowed the English to situate themselves as 'rightful' rulers over the colonized culture. While the English were presented as civilized, just, and socially elite, the Irish were presented as the exact opposite. As L. Perry Curtis has noted in his oft-quoted treatises on anti-Irish stereotyping in Victorian England, *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England* and *Apes and Angles: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*, English Victorian texts focused obsessively on "Irish unfitness for self-government, Irish incompetence in business and

domestic economy, Irish deficiency in intellectual power, Irish obtuseness in scientific matters . . . [as well as on the prevalence of] the proverbial Irish faults of violence, indolence, and intemperance" (*Anglo-Saxons* 13, *Apes* 96).[10] Curtis explains that, especially after mid-century, when Irish resistance to English rule grew more violent, the Irish were depicted as "childish, emotionally unstable, ignorant, indolent, superstitious, primitive or semi-civilized, dirty, vengeful, and violent" (*Anglo-Saxons* 53). They were also, according to Curtis, "simianized," or depicted with ape-like features. In Curtis' view, this racial denigration was made possible by on-going "scientific" discussions, especially in the discourses of anthropology and ethnology, that relegated non-English people to a lower (less culturally, physically, and socially advanced) position than the English in a hierarchy of races, and closer to apes than to (English) humans.[11]

While Curtis argues that Anglocentric propaganda assumed that so-called Irish inferiority was based on biological inheritance, R.F. Foster notes that this propaganda illustrates a conflation of race and culture. For Foster, the idea of a racially homogenous Irish people is an impossibility because of the history of conquest and resettlement that defined the country; it has always been nearly impossible to decipher who is "really" Irish, if anyone is.[12] Thus, though anti-Irish propaganda takes the form of "racial" stereotyping, it "may relate more to resentment of the Irish attack on property and the Union, and also resentment against Irish resentment of the Union" (193) than to a belief in the biological and evolutionary inferiority of the Irish people. In either case, however, "imaginary" texts representing the Irish tacitly seek to justify colonial rule, positioning

the English as 'justified' rulers over an inferior people. In Forster's words, "Certainly, the attitude was colonial; the Irish were weaker brethren" (194).

"Imaginary" texts about the Irish filled contemporary newspapers and periodicals. An 1862 essay in *Punch*, for instance, displays the racial/cultural denigration that that helped to perpetuate colonial thought:

> A creature manifestly between the Gorilla and the Negro is to be met with in some of the lowest districts of London and Liverpool by adventurous explorers. It belongs in fact to a tribe of Irish savages: the lowest species of the Irish Yahoo. When conversing with its kind it talks a sort of gibberish. It is, moreover, a climbing animal, and may sometimes be seen ascending a ladder laden with a load of bricks. . . . The somewhat superior ability of the Irish Yahoo to utter articulate sounds, may suffice to prove that it is a development, and not, as some imagine, a degeneration of the Gorilla. ("Irish Yahoo" 165)

This passage rhetorically links the Irish to a 'primitive' form of humanity in an evolutionary hierarchy, depicting them as savage and animal-like. It suggests that, given this evolutionary degradation, the Irish are inferior to the English, and thus fit subjects for rule. Similarly, *Punch*'s cartoon "Irish Frankenstein" depicts the stereotypically violent nature of the Irish and suggests that the Irish need to be controlled by their 'creator.' The cartoon's caption calls the Irish "hideous, blood-stained, bestial, ruthless in [their] rage, implacable in [their] revengefulness, [and] cynical in their contemptuous challenge of . . . authority" (234-5). Even though the cartoon's title does metaphorically 'blame' the English for 'creating' these behavioral 'deficiencies,' the cartoon nonetheless depicts the

Irish as fit (though rebellious) objects for British conquest. The savage Irish, it seems to imply, need to brought into line and made to behave by their English rulers.

In addition, a *Times* report on violence in Ireland from 1869 ("On the Irish Character") draws ostensibly racial barriers between the English and Irish, and thereby suggests the appropriateness of English rule. The report warns against concluding that "whole nation" is given to "barbarism," "evil passions," and "irrevocabl[e] hostil[ity] to British rule," because such a conclusion ignores the fact that the Irishman is "by nature brave, generous, and kindly, capable of much self-sacrifice and agonizing devotion, and vivacious and lighthearted to a proverb." Although the text admonishes those who would judge a "whole nation" for the actions of a few, it simultaneously insists upon the 'natural' disposition of the Irish, implying the existence of essential differences between Irish and English. The text goes on to suggest that, although a "considerable portion of the Irish people look upon English law generally as their natural enemy, and they regard the relation between themselves and England as a chronic state of war," the British must "create in the Irish character a respect for law." Resistance to English rule, apparently, is the result of a character defect, an absence of respect for authority. The Irish, by nature of their flawed national character, are rightfully subjugated by their British leaders. Both parties are thus rhetorically situated in a colonial power structure that is constructed as permanent and justified.

While JanMohamed's scheme applies to literature produced by the colonizer, however, it can also apply to Croker's novel, written though it is from *within* a colonized space. While, as JanMohamed's suggests, literature written *by* the colonizer helped to

justify colonialism *to* the colonizer, Croker's novel, produced by the colonized, *challenges* colonialism, presenting an alternative vision of the colonial engagement. By resisting racial denigration of the Irish, denaturalizing the act of colonization, discursively reenacting England's conquest of Ireland, and textually undermining British power in India, *Pretty Miss Neville* suggests that the respective inferiority and superiority of 'native' and 'colonizer' are not essential, 'true,' biologically-determined characteristics, and that England's colonial position is not fixed, but changeable. But, although the novel's challenges to colonial ideology might suggest that the novel is an inverse "imaginary" text—discursively destroying the colonial power structure only to rebuild it in reverse, with the Irish denigrating and subjugating the English—it is, in the end, a "symbolic" text. Rather than reverse but perpetuate the ideals of colonialism to favor the Irish, Croker's novel ultimately offers a vision of cultural reconciliation. Despite its challenges to colonial authority, then, *Pretty Miss Neville* implies, finally, the possibility for a peaceful resolution of the English-Irish colonial conflict.

*

Croker's novel is set between 1870 and 1879, a fairly peaceful period in the Irish struggle for rights and recognition. In 1870, Isaac Butt founded the Home Rule Association as a response to the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. While the Irish Republican Brotherhood, or Fenians, as its members were called, relied on violence to further the cause of Irish nationalism, Home Rulers sought political reform through constitutional means. The Home Rule Association fostered the creation of the Home Rule party, led by the charismatic Charles Stuart Parnell, and, through the 1870s,

Home Rulers in parliament attempted to peacefully secure political reforms for the Irish. While the novel's action begins and ends in a period of non-violent pursuit of what Gladstone called "'justice for Ireland,'" (Magnusson 97), however, it was written in the early 1880s, when the pursuit again turned violent. In 1879, Fenian Michael Davitt founded the Irish National Land League, and, from 1879 until 1882, the League waged an agrarian "Land War" aimed at reclaiming land seized from the Irish during colonization (Magnusson 101). Davitt's battle cry has a decidedly nationalist element to it: "The land of Ireland belongs to the people of Ireland, to be held and cultivated for the sustenance of those whom God declared to be inhabitants thereof. . . . Those who cultivate it . . . have a higher claim to its absolute possession than those who make it an article of barter, to be used or disposed of for profit or pleasure" (qtd. in Magnusson 101-2). According to Magnusson, this nationalist argument "harnessed the ancient passions of the dispossessed Irish, the landless Irish, against the Establishment" (102). The Land Leaguers pursued their goal with violent agitation and boycotts against landowners until, by 1881, the government responded by passing two Land Acts. As Elizabeth Grubgeld explains, these acts "radically transformed the social, economic, and political structure of Ireland, effectively ending the centuries-old system of dominance by a few" (402). The composition of Croker's novel, then, was concurrent with this agitation and transfer of power, but the temporal disjunction between the novel's composition and its setting, not to mention its romantic plot, allows the text to appear apolitical; it is published at a time of political unrest but it is mum on the subject. Nevertheless, although direct political references are absent from the novel, Nora's narration provides a discreet challenge to

English colonial ideology. More specifically, using Nora as a mouthpiece, the "symbolic" text challenges the notions that the Irish are racially/culturally inferior to the English and that positions within the colonial power structure are necessarily irreversible.

Pretty Miss Neville undermines the notion that the Irish are uncivilized "natives," less developed in the evolutionary hierarchy of races than the English and thus fit subjects of English rule. Anglocentric insults that imply this 'inferior' status appear in the novel only to be challenged. Nora, for instance, is openly slighted by an English couple who derisively calls her a "'new variety of the natives,'" and she is, more than once, likened to an ape. In one instance, her childhood friend Rody taunts her about her appearance by telling her that she has "'legs like sticks, and arms like a monkey's'" (7). In another, Maurice avows that he could never fall in love with her, exclaiming "contemptuously," "'I would just as soon fall in love with a chimpanzee or a Red Indian'" (41).[13] Though both Rody's and Maurice's insults have Anglocentric connotations, Maurice's can be said to carry more weight than Rody's, because Maurice represents the English colonizer at this stage of the novel. Although Maurice's lineage is foggy at best (the reader is told only that he is half-Irish and half-British, the son of Grandfather Beresford's stepbrother), he is, in the first section of the novel, cast as an English representative on Irish soil. He is textually rendered as embracing English activities (he tries to teach the children cricket and rounders, for instance) and harboring English loyalties (in a scene that will be discussed in detail later, he is said to "shak[e] the dust of his loyal English feet" [16]). Furthermore, he distances himself from any affiliation with the Irish. He demonstrates his difference from the Irish people by mocking Nora's "pure Milesian accent" and by asking

her, "'where is *your* Irish hospitality?'" (36, emphasis added); and he tries to disavow his Irish heritage (and responsibilities) by asking grandfather Beresford to give Gallow to Nora. Clearly, then, early in the novel, Maurice represents the English more than he does the Irish. His insulting statement about Nora, therefore, comes from a representative English colonizer, and his denigration of the Irish "native" has connotations beyond its immediate context. It places Nora in a low position in an evolutionary hierarchy of races and thus inferior to and justifiably ruled by the English.

The narration, however, undermines these Anglocentric comments as soon as, or soon after, they are uttered. Nora is deeply wounded by hearing herself referred to as a "'new variety of the natives,'" for example, but instead of submitting resignedly the notion that she is inferior to the English and metaphorically assuming her 'rightful' place in the Anglocentric power structure, Nora rebels by out-riding the English couple that insults her at the fox hunt. After the hunt is over and she is surrounded by well-wishers, she searches the crowd "triumphantly," hoping that they see her now that she is "quite the mistress of the position, the heroine of the hour" (49). This scene effectively undercuts the English couple's belittling comment by reversing the power dynamic between 'native' and 'colonizer.' It places the 'native' in a more powerful position than the 'colonizers,' and it silences the 'colonizers,' who never reappear in the text. In this way, Nora's narration troubles one of colonialism's guiding precepts—that the Irish, by nature of their inferior status in the racial hierarchy, are in a fixed and unchanging position as colonized subject in the colonial power structure.

Nora's likening to a monkey, with all the ethnocentric associations of that insult, is similarly overturned. Even as a child, Nora challenges the idea that she is culturally and socially inferior to the British. When Maurice exclaims that he would prefer a chimpanzee to Nora, implying that Nora is even less appealing and, by extension, lower on the continuum of social evolution, Nora responds not by arguing with him, but by quoting Charles Dickens' *Oliver Twist*, replying melodramatically, "'Oh, my heart on fire!'" (41). The exchange that follows begins to trouble the assertion that Nora is less socially and culturally developed than her English companion.

> "*What* did you say?" demanded Maurice, stopping short and surveying me with grave astonishment. "What is that pretty new expression of yours?"
>
> "It is not mine, and you need not look so shocked; it's in *Oliver Twist*," I replied with a triumphant toss of my pigtail.
>
> "Pickpockets' slang," returned Maurice with a shrug of the shoulders, "and all very well for the Artful Dodger, but scarcely—"
>
> "I say, here *is* a yawner," interrupted Rody, who had been walking on ahead [and has spotted a deep open drain]. "I shall go round . . ."
>
> "And so shall I," I added emphatically.

Maurice's response betrays some psychic discomfort at Nora's ability to quote verbatim a prized English author. Perhaps, we could argue, Maurice is bothered by Nora's apparently threatening mimicry—by her ability to use the words of the colonizer to *fight* the colonizer. He tries to denigrate her, to keep her in her 'place' by claiming that such language is inappropriate, but he is effectively silenced by Rody's interruption and Nora's

speedy departure. Whether or not Nora is a mimic, though, her response to Maurice's insult implies that she quite literate and thus more culturally-evolved than Maurice would perhaps like to believe. Anglocentric categorizations of the Irish are thus called into question.

Furthermore, Maurice and Rody's Anglocentric insults are challenged by Nora's physical and cultural maturation. After spending six months of her early teens in Dublin with Mrs. West, Rody's Irish grandmother, Nora has become a sophisticated and beautiful young woman:

> [I]n Dublin, . . . I had the benefit of singing lessons, and French and drawing classes . . . . My wardrobe was modernized. My manners softened and toned down, thanks to Mrs. West's friendly advice and playful hints. I no longer whistled as I went about the house, nor sat with my elbows always on the table, nor burst into a room, as if I was pursued by a mad dog.
>
> I acquired a taste for reading; had made acquaintance of Sir Walter Scott, Tennyson, and many other delightful people, and returned to Gallow vastly improved in mind and body. I found myself treated with a considerable accession of respect by the entire household. . . . [M]y manners were more assured and self-possessed. . . . I inwardly chuckled, when I mentally compared the awful dowdy figure I had [been] . . . to the vision of elegance, that I now . . . presented. (72-3)

While it is worth noting that Nora does count gaining an appreciation of Tennyson, the quintessential English Victorian poet, among her accomplishments, it is also significant that the text does not imply that Nora's transformation is the result of *solely English*

influence or guidance. Not only does Scott rank on the same cultural level as Tennyson in this passage, but more importantly, Nora's transformation is accomplished with the help of the culturally sophisticated Mrs. West—an *Irish* benefactor. And, as if her physical and intellectual maturation at the hands of Mrs. West were not enough to contradict the Anglocentric statement that had intimated her inferior evolutionary status, the text contradicts it definitively by disproving it from two *English* perspectives, one a stranger's and one Maurice's. Mrs. Fortesque-Roper, an English woman who shares Nora's cabin on the *Hindostan*, the steamship carrying her to India, is the first person in the novel to notice Nora's beauty. The conversation between the two women contains a clear rebuttal of the insult Nora suffered earlier:

> "Well, your aunt and uncle won't have the pleasure of your company for long! . . . Of course you know that you are a very pretty girl?"
>
> "I know nothing of the sort," I answered, colouring, "and I don't think you ought to turn me into ridicule; you are making fun of me. . . . I have been told that I was ugly as long as I can remember anything; as a little girl I was simply hideous."
>
> "Very possibly . . . but now that you are a *big* girl, you are the very reverse You are uncommonly pretty!"
>
> . . . Leaning forward, and looking into my face with calm critical scrutiny, she said: "Your eyes alone are a fortune to you, putting your dear little mouth and nose out of the question. You are a case of the ugly duckling my dear. I have no

doubt that once you were a detestable little duckling, but *now* you are a magnificent swan." (114-15)

It is impossible to miss the objectification in this passage—the English gaze turned upon the Irish object, who is scrutinized and judged according to English standards. But even so, the praise of Nora, spoken as it is by an English citizen, directly contrasts the earlier insults that Nora endures. Maurice, on the other hand, undermines his *own* Anglocentric insult. When Maurice and Nora first discuss their engagement, Nora questions him about his comment, and he replies "'Oh, that was only a joke, you know,' reddening" (63). And, when Nora and Maurice meet again in India, Maurice's Anglocentric slur is reversed completely. Maurice, now in love with Nora, tells her that "'Darwin declares a blush to be the most human of all emotions. Who ever saw a dog, a cat, or a monkey blush? Your blushes proclaim that you belong to the most superior order of humanity'" (251). Through these textual moves, the text capsizes the Anglocentric insults that Nora had suffered, thus implicitly challenging their implications. The Irish are not "primitive" or "savage," they are not "inferior" in the evolutionary hierarchy; they are, instead, as culturally, intellectually, and physically advanced as the English. The English "right" to claim a position of superiority in the colonial power structure, therefore, is implicitly challenged.

Croker's "symbolic" novel further challenges the colonial power structure by illustrating the reversibility of the positions of colonizer and colonized. In Nora's narration, the colonizing gaze, which watches and judges the Irish, is turned back on the English, inverting the positions of English viewer/Irish viewed. As Nora and her English guide, Colonel Keith, pass through England on their way to India, for instance, Nora

effects a sort of reverse colonization; she is the "invader" and the English people and country are her objects of study. Colonel Keith receives a good bit of her attention, and her descriptions vary from validation to ridicule, good-natured though that ridicule may appear to be. He is, in Nora's view, a jolly, overweight, military man whose verbosity is laughable: "[M]y new friend . . . was volubly relating his family history for the past five-and-twenty years, telling me all about his wife and his daughter, and his son in the staff corps, and his own 'off-reckonings,' occasionally interrupting himself to point out something remarkable" (98), she explains. Later, when she and Colonel Keith are rescued by the *Hindostan* after their shipwreck, Colonel Keith's appearance on deck renders him even more of a clown: "Colonel Keith, in the captain's clothes, was really quite *too* funny. Trousers halfway up to his knees, a most painfully tight pea-jacket, much too short in the sleeves, and showing a goodly space of bare wrist. He also displayed a considerable portion of bare legs, which concluded in socks and gorgeous carpet slippers" (105). In describing and making laughable the English colonel, Nora turns the gaze of the colonizer back on itself, becoming the gazer instead of the gazed upon and suggesting the changeability of these positions.[14]

Nora's description of England has the same effect. Her recounting of experience reads as part-diary, part anthropological study, as she remembers:

> As we jolted along the docks, I looked forth and saw big drays thundering past, crowds of gentlemen, workmen, navvies, and sailors, hurrying to and fro, and heard the ceaseless, deafening roar or traffic. . . . I alighted in Water Street and passed through an open doorway, and made my way up to Waller's office on the

second floor. On the stairs I was met by several young men, hurrying down in various degrees of haste. It was very evident that in this part of the world time was money. (96)

Once in Liverpool proper, with Colonel Keith as her guide, she is struck by the flurry of activity and the difference between this busy, affluent culture and the Irish culture she had left behind:

> My attention . . . was divided. My ears were given to Colonel Keith, my eyes to the many new and marvellous sights. The life and activity everywhere struck me forcibly; no one dawdled; every one appeared to have an object in view as they hurried briskly by.
>
> The crowds and crowds of men, evidently very busy men, amazed me, as did also the immense and ceaseless traffic of trams and omnibuses as we walked up Lord Street, Church Street, and Bold Street. Before certain windows I lingered, awestruck and dumb; not only was there more energy and vitality, but there was quite as much variety and fashion, as in dear old dirty Dublin. (99)

Although Nora's gaze does not overtly criticize its objects, instead offering what seems to be a favorable judgment of England, the English and England itself, nevertheless, are *novelties*, objects of an "invader's" gaze. My point, then, is not necessarily *how* Nora judges the English culture (though that is of course important and will be discussed in greater detail below), but *that* she does so. She reverses the colonizing gaze and suggests that the colonizing nation can be as much an object of scrutiny as the colonized. Positions of colonizer/colonized, then, can be seen not as 'natural' manifestations of

superior/inferior racial characteristics, but as artificial manifestations of a changeable power structure.

The artificiality of colonialism's power structure is also challenged when the text makes direct historical references to the bloody Irish/English past, and later when it metaphorically reenacts the act of colonization itself. Historical references denaturalize the English position as ruler of Ireland, for instance, when Nora and Maurice visit Patsey White. Visiting the old man is one of Nora's favorite pastimes because of Patsey's penchant for telling adventure stories—stories that often deal with Irish history. On the day that Maurice accompanies her on a visit, Nora explains that Patsey's stories "varied from 'Vinegar Hill' to the Siege of Troy'; with a few marvellous anecdotes of the Beresford family, thrown in as a slight interlude between the two epochs" (16). Of interest here is the reference to Vinegar Hill, because it alludes to two Irish rebellions against English control. The more recent referent is an Australian rebellion that took place in 1804. Led primarily by Irish convicts (mostly political exiles), 400 Irish prisoners took control of the New South Wales convict station. The following day, the Australian militia had to intervene, and a clash took place at Vinegar Hill. After unsuccessful attempts at negotiation, the militia opened fire, leaving fifteen people dead and many wounded. The leader of the rebellion was caught, and, along with eight other convicts, was immediately hanged. [15] The other possible reference point, and perhaps the more important one in this context, is a crucial moment in Irish/English history: the infamous Rebellion of 1798, when the Irish people rebelled openly against English occupation and rule that was to be sanctioned and formalized by the Act of Union. Sites of conflict

erupted throughout the country, and most were easily silenced by the military. Wexford, however, experienced a larger uprising than many other places and thus did not fall to government intervention as easily. The rebels were eventually defeated at Vinegar Hill about one month after the rebellion began.[16] Patsey's references to rebellion, even defeated rebellion, serve as reminders that English control has not been won without intense struggle, that the English position in Ireland is not an unquestionable "fact" but a contestable and perhaps temporary power arrangement. Maurice seems deeply troubled by these implied notions. Nora explains:

> Maurice did not appreciate our friend Patsey; he called him 'a seditious old ruffian'; . . . [he] told Patsey he 'was a bloodthirsty old rebel who deserved to have his neck stretched'; told us [Nora and her friends] 'we ought to be ashamed of ourselves and our taste for low company'; and flung out of the cottage in a towering passion. . . . [When Nora finds him, he] had completely shaken the dust of Patsey's dwelling off his loyal English feet" (16-17).

Maurice, perhaps, is disturbed by the idea that English rule of Ireland is not as certain and unquestionable as it might appear. The English are not 'natural' leaders, but leaders who have seized control of a nation that has been, and still is, critical of their presence. Their position had been challenged in the past and could be challenged again.

Later, the text further problematizes and denaturalizes England's rule of Ireland. Positioning Miss Fluker as a metaphorical colonizer, the narration subtly proposes that the English are not 'natural' leaders who have gained control of Ireland simply by nature of their so-called 'superiority' over the Irish, but rather that they have gained control

through deliberate conquest, victimizing an innocent population along the way. Unlike Nora's depictions of Colonel Keith and of England, which tended toward praise even while illustrating the reversal of the objectifying gaze, Nora's depiction of her "English governess" (12) is more venomous. Another object of Nora's Irish gaze, but this time not a praiseworthy object, Miss Fluker is described as physically unattractive, exceedingly lazy, and unqualified for her post. According to Nora,

> She was a thin, upright, angular lady (whose age baffled all speculation, with an opaque complexion, pale, furtive, greenish eyes, and quantities of dull-looking sandy hair; a well-cut nose, and large white teeth, resembling the keys of a piano, were her strong points. Very thin lips and an exceedingly retreating forehead detracted considerably from her appearance . . . [O]ur French was a farce—ditto our sums. With great difficulty I advanced as far as the rule of three in arithmetic, and there I stuck fast, for the very good reason that my governess did the same. At two o'clock we were set free . . . . Miss Fluker would spend hours on the sofa, deeply absorbed in a novel, and according to the time of year, and as her delicate appetite suggested, we would place beside her a plate of apples, roasted chestnuts, strawberries, or plums, so that she was enabled to feed body and mind at one and the same time. (28-9).

Miss Fluker is the image of the unlikable, harsh, stern, school mistress, and, more importantly, Nora's distaste for her is rhetorically linked to Miss Fluker's cultural/racial affiliation. Not only does Nora mention it in her governess' first introduction ("my English governess"), but she also disdainfully describes Miss Fluker's love of tea, a

stereotypically English passion. "I never knew such a woman for tea," Nora says. "[T]ea aroused her from her slumbers, tea awaited her at breakfast, tea was served at five o'clock, and various illegitimate cups of tea might be soon going upstairs at all sorts of odd hours" (74). Miss Fluker's excessive tea intake (an exaggerated representation of an English stereotype) contributes to her image of laziness, and it places her within traditional expectations of English behavior—behavior that is both laughable and condemnable.

Miss Fluker's behavior, furthermore, can be viewed through the lens of Bhabha's mimicry. In Ireland, Miss Fluker is at first in an awkward position. She represents the colonizer—the English—but lives in a subservient position as a governess in an Irish household. Miss Fluker therefore becomes a kind of mimic.[17] Nora explains:

> [S]he had two faces, and two distinct characters from our point of view. Downstairs, with grandfather and with the world at large, she was an angel. Upstairs, along with us, she was exactly the reverse. Downstairs, she was the anxious hard-working instructress, whose pupils' advancement was her only aim and care, most tenderly solicitous about grandfather's health and appetite, hanging on his words, however gruff, and flattering him in a manner that was palpable even to our not very sensitive perception. . . . Upstairs our governess was at no pains to conceal her ungovernable temper, nor her all-consuming laziness and incapacity. (28-9)

She adopts the behaviors expected of a metaphorically colonized subject; she conducts herself exactly as an "acceptable" governess, and she interacts with her "rulers" in such a

way as to secure praise and just treatment. But underneath this obedient façade is a rebellious nature and a desire to seize control. The colonized mimic, from the very beginning here, wants to displace the colonizer, to become a colonizer herself. When Nora's grandfather dies, Miss Fluker sheds her mimicry and begins what can be termed her 'colonization' in earnest. She literally takes over the household, even going so far as to assume grandfather's seat at the table. Nora links this move to Miss Fluker's pursuit of power by explaining that her governess had "promoted herself to [grandfather's] seat at the table," which, when empty, served as a reminder of the "'poor old master'" of the house (69). As she assumes his position at the table, this subtle phrasing implies, Miss Fluker seeks to assume his authority, relocating the power from an Irish "master" to an English one.

This assumption of control is evident, furthermore, in Miss Fluker's treatment of Nora. When Nora returns from her transforming visit to Mrs. West (which she takes just after her grandfather's death), having gained experience, confidence, and a will to make her own choices, Miss Fluker takes pains to reign in her behavior:

> Miss Fluker by no means approved of her grub . . . bursting into a butterfly. She repressed my new ideas by every means in her power; lectured me sharply . . . . consigned my best dress and buttoned boots to the limbo of a wardrobe in her own room, and did her best to make me look as uncouth and countrified as ever. (73)

Although Nora "rebel[s] stoutly" (73), she is powerless against Miss Fluker.[18] Grandfather Beresford's death has afforded her governess more power than she had previously enjoyed, because his will made it impossible for Nora to release Miss Fluker

from her post. The English governess is contracted to remain in Ireland until Nora turns 20 and is thus in complete control. Her position of increased power manifests itself in a kind of dictatorial rule: "her violent temper, her indolence, her meanness, and her greediness were only too patent to the whole household" (73).

In the months following Nora's return from Dublin, Miss Fluker escalates her campaign for power and metaphorically succeeds in a full scale colonization. Through her relationship with the widower Mr. French, Nora's guardian, she infiltrates Irish society and wrecks havoc on the Irish people. To some extent, Mr. French's textual characterization positions him as the quintessential Irish 'native.' Not only does he live at Gallow, but he is committed to resurrecting the Irish language, thought by some to represent the essence of the Irish nation, lost under English rule.[19] Miss Fluker gains his favor by feigning interest in his endeavor: "She put off her usual dictatorial, overbearing expression . . . . Mr. French—credulous Mr. French—would produce a blue backed treatise on the defunct Irish tongue, and hand it over to his fair friend, who would receive it with almost religious reverence, and commence to discuss the subject with well-feigned enthusiasm" (76). After several months, Miss Fluker appears before Nora, "with visible triumph in her gait and aspect" (78), having finally conquered Mr. French by securing a marriage proposal. Given the textual positioning of Miss Fluker as an English colonizer and Mr. French as an Irishman dedicated to maintaining a sense of the Irish 'people' by preserving their language, Miss Fluker's "triumph" has clear metaphorical implications. By using Mr. French's interest in the Irish language against him, so to speak, Miss Fluker wins a major battle in her metaphorical conquest of the Irish land and people.

Ultimately, Miss Fluker's conquest has far-reaching effects. It changes the face of Gallow and directs the course of Nora's life. After Mr. French "succumb[s]" (78) to Miss Fluker, Miss Fluker announces her intention to close Gallow. She will dismiss the servants, and Nora will be expected to live with her and Mr. French after the wedding. This announcement shatters Nora and enrages the servants, all of whom have lived most or all of their lives on Gallow's grounds. The metaphorical colonizer, then, has forced upon the colonized a new, alien world. Furthermore, Miss Fluker is not satisfied to simply colonize the *land*, she also seeks to fully control—to *socially* colonize—its inhabitants. While Miss Fluker's treatment of Nora before her engagement can be seen to represent this social colonization in its fledgling stage, the colonial relationship is displayed in all its destructiveness only after Miss Fluker 'conquers' Mr. French. At that time, Miss Fluker imposes her will on Nora until the young woman is humbled and helpless. The precipitating event in Nora's defeat occurs when Miss Fluker forces Nora to reveal her opinion of the impending marriage. Nora has been resolutely silent on the subject, until Miss Fluker's bullying becomes too much to bear. After Miss Fluker threatens, "'I *will* be obeyed, and not defied by you, you great, gawky, impertinent girl!'" (83), Nora finally tells her that she and all the townspeople think that Mr. French has made a dreadful mistake. Miss Fluker is furious, and she lashes back by revealing that Maurice has agreed to marry Nora only because grandfather Beresford forced his hand. Nora is crushed, and the language that describes the rest of the encounter rings of military defeat. Referring to herself and Miss Fluker as "two combatants" (84), Nora admits that Miss Fluker has finally vanquished her: "I felt completely stunned. . . . morally

overwhelmed. . . . I made one grand supreme effort, and pushing back my chair, rushed precipitately out of the room, leaving Miss Fluker completely the mistress of the field—sitting behind the tea-urn" (83).

The discursively colonized subject, powerless under English colonial rule, must escape. Nora knows she can no longer remain in Ireland; she has to leave the country in order to escape Miss Fluker, whom she now fears. She recounts the days following the 'battle' and leading up to her secret departure:

> [Miss Fluker] pursued me with more than Corsican vengeance, and my life was becoming unbearable. She worried me and bullied me from morning till night. I worked myself, or rather she worked me, into such a nervous state that her very step overhead or on the stairs made me tremble, while her sudden entrance into a room caused me to start violently. . . . [S]he was more my mistress than ever. She had *carte blanche* from my guardian to keep me in order, and to curb my spirit—a task she undertook with extraordinary zeal. Here was a case in which duty and inclination for once walked hand in hand. . . . I endured in silence, submitting myself to my pastors and masters with, had they but known how to read the signs, ominous obedience. (89)

Although, in running away, Nora does rebel—thus her reference to her "ominous obedience"—she flees because her home situation has become untenable, because, in fact, she can "'no longer look upon it as [her] home'" (93). The English conquest, in other words, is responsible for changing the Irish social world and displacing the 'native' Irish from their homeland. By depicting English colonization in this way, the text directs

the reader's sympathy toward the Irish and reminds the reader that English rule in Ireland is the result of an act of conquest, an act that had detrimental effects on the Irish people. The English are cast not as saviors who beneficently aid the Irish in leading a civilized existence, but as morally-bankrupt invaders who cause upheaval within and disintegration of the Irish world.

Nora's 'escape' from Ireland concludes what can loosely be called the first section of the novel. In this section, colonialism's precepts are discursively challenged: Anglocentric assumptions about the Irish are undermined, the fixity of positions within the colonial hierarchy is troubled, the 'naturalness' of positions within and the beneficiality of the colonial engagement are questioned. A critical eye is thus turned on colonialism as the colonized subject 'speaks' from within the colonial space. In the second section of the novel, the action moves from one colonized space to another. This move from Ireland to India brings with it new 'forms' of colonialism and new forms of challenge.

*

Nora does not escape colonization altogether when she escapes from Ireland. As the setting of the novel shifts from Ireland to India, Nora has, it seems, escaped the battle with Miss Fluker only to lose the colonial war; for, when she arrives in India, she is amalgamated into a culture that implicitly disavows its affiliation with England, but which is, nonetheless, representative of England's colonizing mission. Nora's integration into the so-called "Anglo-Indian" culture in the second half of *Pretty Miss Neville* can therefore be seen as a kind of discursive colonization. As I will argue, though, the novel

remains a "symbolic" text critical of colonial ideology. Although Nora ostensibly becomes a part of the British nation when she settles in India, her narration continues to challenge the appropriateness and fixity of positions within colonial hierarchies.

Nora's integration into Anglo-Indian culture metaphorically represents the subsuming of the Irish into the British nation. At the start of her trip, Nora is an outsider, and she admits to being confused by Anglo-Indian customs and language. She remembers her bewilderment, for instance, upon hearing Colonel Keith, an expert on all-things-English, easily adopt Anglo-Indian "language" when he comes in contact with other Anglo-Indians:

> [Colonel Keith] presented me with Mr. Campbell . . . . who was stationed at Mulkapore. He and Colonel Keith were evidently old acquaintances, and talked an immensity of Indian "gup" across me as I sat between them, an amused and bewildered listener. I could not make out half of what they meant. For instance, Colonel Keith observed that "one of the Juke's girls was going to married, and it was really Pucka this time." What did *that* mean, I wondered?
>
> "Oh, trust her mother for that! She won't let another fellow slip through her fingers. She's a first class old Shikarry," returned Mr. Campbell decisively.
>
> *What* was a Shikarry? (99)

Nora is clearly the outsider, and her predicament is much the same when the ship docks in India. She observes "[p]retty, well-dressed women, soldierly looking men, elderly, erect, fiercely-moustached," and she admits that she is "very considerably impressed by [her]

first glimpse of the Anglo-Indian *at home*" (119, emphasis in original). The culture, though impressive, is alien to her.

Nora's integration into Anglo-Indian culture, and thus the discursive amalgamation of the Irish into the British nation, however, does not take long. Before a week is up, Nora is fully comfortable in her Anglo-Indian surroundings and filled with a sense of belonging. She describes her smooth transition while depicting typical Anglo-Indian life in detail:

> I was not long in falling into Indian ways and customs, and it soon seemed quite natural to hear [a servant's] monotonous voice, "Half past five, missy—tea ready;" and it would not be long before I was cantering down the ride with Uncle Jim. The horse I rode was a gray Arab . . . . whilst we rode, auntie took a drive round the shops, or round the cantonment, according to her lazy, fat, Pegu ponies Brandy and Soda felt disposed. When we returned, she was generally to be found among her roses and caladiums exhorting or rebuking [the servants], or feeding her Burmese bantams and long-legged fame-fowl. At eight o'clock we had chotah-hazree under a big tree in the compound; it consisted of tea, toast, seed cake, and fruit, and was a kind of public meal, to which any passing friends invariably stopped, partook of tea, and related the local "gup." We breakfasted at ten o'clock, from twelve to two received visitors; at two we had tiffin. After tiffin auntie indulged in forty winks, and I generally curled myself up in a cosy chair and devoured a novel till five o'clock tea made its appearance. After which we

went for our evening drive to the band, to polo, to cricket-matches. Dinner at eight o'clock, a game of bezique, a song or two, and bed. (125)

Although Anglo-Indian culture does not openly identify itself as English, this passage suggests that it *is* predominantly English, albeit with an Indian flare. Cricket, afternoon tea, and polo, for instance, have decidedly English associations. Nonetheless, Nora is immediately comfortable in her surroundings. They feel 'natural' to her, and she easily adopts the behavior of the colonizing culture. This apparently seamless and unquestioned integration into the culture could stand for the integration of the Irish into the British nation.

As Nora 'becomes' British, her narration, which had challenged the English objectifying gaze during the first half of the novel, *redirects* that gaze toward the Indian. The Irishwoman becomes, so to speak, a British colonizer who defines herself against this Indian Other, discursively positioning her new nation as superior to the Indian nation. Nora's descriptions of India suggest that the country is distasteful, and the Indian people are unruly, savage, and dishonest. Upon arriving in India, Nora complains about the country that disappoints her expectations:

> A mud village, clustered round a tumbled-down fort; then miles of brown barren plain, with here and there a herd of queer looking sheep or goats; then another mud village and an expanse of paddy, with an occasional pool, in which hideous slate-colored buffaloes were lying cooling themselves, with their heads above water. . . . The only things that really came up to and surpassed my expectations were the mosquitoes. Their activity, voracity, and pertinacity knew no bounds.

> The nights spend in Madras had been made miserable, thanks to them. These horrible insects had mysteriously introduced themselves through some little flaw in the mosquito-nets, and had banqueted heartily on my face and hands, and rendered me a deplorable spectacle. (119)

India disappoints Nora's expectations with its dirty, dilapidated, and uncomfortable environment. In contrast, however, the Anglo-Indian world is idyllic. Nora is delighted by the Anglo-Indian station's "long shady roads, wide, open, green maidans, [which] contrasted very pleasantly with the arid, rocky country through which we had been travelling" (121). And when Nora is able to take her "first long and uninterrupted gaze at India," she describes her Anglo-Indian compound as a place clearly distinct and distant from the Indian world outside its gates. She says:

> Beyond the low white wall which bounded our compound was the high road; beyond that again, a green undulating plain, a village among tress, and far away, low blue hills fading into the horizon. Our bungalow was large and straggling, embowered in creepers (and notably with clusters of pale pink flowers, which were trailed around the pillars of the veranda; surrounded by several acres of short, green grass, a number of lofty trees, and many graceful shrubs of curious and dainty foliage, some covered with white, scarlet, and lilac flowers. . . . The sandy avenue was edged at either side by enormous pots of lovely roses, trained over bamboo frames. (123)

The Anglo-Indian compound, safe behind the *white* wall and made comfortable by the importation of British order and style,[20] is constructed as preferable and superior to the Indian world outside.

Now speaking from her position as a British colonizer, Nora depicts the Indian people as unpalatable and inferior as well, as she describes them in clearly Eurocentric terms. They are "dirty-looking native[s]" or "muffled white figures, with holes for their eyes and mouth only in their veils." They are poorly dressed children who are "squatting on the floor" (120). They are "swarthy deft-handed servants, in snow white garments, who [lay] out a table with tea, toast, and fruit (123). They are "little, withered, half-naked savage[s]" (234) who live in "little mud hovels" (233) and present a contrast to the "*beau ideal* of an officer and a gentlemen . . . .[who represents] advanced civilisation" (234). Nora's apparent belief in Indian inferiority is pointedly emphasized, furthermore, when Nora's Uncle Jim shows off his hunting spoils or when Nora tells stories about the "natives." As she is shown around Uncle Jim's study, she becomes convinced that a "pair of skeleton monkeys . . . were the mortal remains of two native babies" (124). The fact that Nora accepts as appropriate the collection and display of Indian skeletons indicates her belief that Indians are somehow less than human, their remains fittingly exhibited as a source of pride in much the same way that a tiger's pelt might be exhibited by a successful hunter. In another instance, Nora retells a story told to her by Uncle Jim. An old woman serving as a doctor to a sick "native girl" claims that "all the jewels of her friends must be collected—the more valuable the better—and placed in a large chatty of water, and soaked for two hours." At the end of that time, the sick girl will be cured by

drinking the water. When it comes time for the girl to drink, "the water was drawn off—the jewels were gone!—and, naturally, the old woman!" Although Nora explains that she has heard many "rather amusing" stories about the Indian people, the only one that finds its way into the text is *this* one: a story that casts the Indian as a thief. Regardless of setting or situation, then, in Nora's descriptions, Indians are inferior to the Anglo-Indian/British.

Given Nora's denigration of the Indian people, it is not surprising that the Indian people are also cast as desperately in need of British intervention. In a textual move that metaphorically justifies colonial occupation and rule, the novel presents a circumstance that allows the British to 'save' an Indian village. While Maurice is in Mulkapore, he learns that a savage tiger, a "'man-eater'" (235), is on a killing rampage, and the inhabitants of villages within a forty mile radius are terrified and helpless. Predictably, Maurice steps in. Within a day, the tiger is dead and Maurice is regarded a hero. The British/Anglo-Indian can do little more than "gaze . . . at our hero with all our eyes" (238), and the Indians venerate Maurice as a god. He recounts his experience:

> "[When the local villagers] descried the body of their enemy lying dead in the middle of the white, moonlit road, their joy knew no bounds. They nearly tore me to pieces; they went down on their knees before me, and wept, and laughed, like so many lunatics.
>
> "When the first mad moments were over, they turned on the tiger, who lay stretched out like a huge striped cat, and spat at him, cursed him, and denounced him with howls of oriental vituperation. . . . The remainder of the night was given

> up to incessant tomtoming, feasting, and singing. Sleep was the last thing to be thought of, so I resigned myself to my fate, and sat in great state, beside the headman of the village, to be seen and admired. I consumed no less than six cheroots, and returned thanks for many magnificent speeches. . . . Early this morning I was wreathed in flowers . . . . The innocent villagers could hardly be persuaded that I was not one of their gods, a deliverer sent from heaven, in the shape of a Feringee soldier." (240-1)

This encounter both reinforces the idea that the Indian is less socially developed than the British (their violent reaction to the tiger's death and their "lunatic" joy suggest that they are more 'primitive' than stately Maurice), and implies the necessity of British rule over India. It suggests that the Indians need the British to survive, and that they are thankful for the British presence in India, even going so far as to worship the British representative as a god.

In India, then, Irishness is ostensibly subsumed into a British whole. Nora, at first an outsider, assimilates into the culture and then speaks from a colonizer's position, redirecting the colonizing gaze that had been focused on the Irish toward the Indian world and people. The apparently homogeneous British culture appears a testament to British superiority; not only does the colonizing nation seem to be in a stable and fixed position in colonial India's power structure, it also seems to have settled the question of Ireland's resistance to English rule by metaphorically turning this rebellious element into an integrated, peaceful part of British society. But just as the text resisted English power in the first half of the novel, it similarly resists it in the second. Nora's narration as a

supposed colonizer in fact destabilizes the colonialist notion that the British occupy an unquestionable position of leadership and superiority in the colonial power structure—whether that structure positions them above the Indian or above the Irish who had seemingly 'disappeared' within the British nation.

Overt ethnocentrism voiced in depictions of the Indian people, which would seem to support a vision of the British as rightful rulers in a colonial hierarchy, contains elements that trouble colonial authority. When Nora and Colonel Keith, for example, witness a dispute in a train station, the narration seems to suggest that the Indian people are deficient to a British norm:

> Presently there arose an argument, at first merely in a loud tone, then executed in a higher and higher key; finally, yells and screams. . . . [The station manager] was utterly useless in the emergency. Both sides of the question were simultaneously launched at his head, and he was evidently denounced by all parties with unanimous shrieks. He withdrew . . . utterly powerless to quell the storm.
>
> "It must be bad enough to be henpecked by one wife," remarked Colonel Keith, "but fancy being the scapegoat of half a dozen! After all, I think we manage these things better in Europe." (120)

Colonel Keith's comment clearly judges the Indian by a Eurocentric standard, and it, along with Nora's description of the event, casts the Indian as contentious, indecorous, and 'substandard.' But at the same time, *Pretty Miss Neville* resists this casting by refusing to *definitively* relegate the Indian to a position of inferiority. That is, Colonel Keith's assertion that Europeans "manage" their affairs in a more civilized manner than

Indians is phrased as a question— "'After all, I think we manage these things better in Europe; what do you say Nora?'"— that is never answered. Where an affirmative response would solidify the Eurocentric assertion, the text produces only silence: "Before I had made a reply," Nora says, "we heard the welcome tinkle of the bell, and the cry 'Passengers to Mulkapore'" (120). The novel, in other words, leaves embedded in Eurocentric assertions doubt about their validity. The narrative silence troubles the suggestion that the British are necessarily superior to the Indian and thus in an appropriate position in the colonial power structure.

Threats to the idea of the fixity of the positions in that power structure are also embedded in the text. While Nora's disappointment in the Indian landscape, for instance, does imply that the Anglo-Indian culture is in a superior cultural position that allows it to objectify and pass judgment on the Indian world, it also betrays anxiety about the British leadership position in India. Literal and metaphorical threats to the Anglo-Indian are implied by the presence of disfiguring mosquitoes whose relentless "feasting" turns Nora into a "deplorable spectacle" (119). The damage the mosquitoes do to Nora represents a very literal threat to the well-being of the colonizer: they can be harmed by elements in the Indian world. In a more metaphorical sense, however, the mosquitoes represent quite another danger. The language of this passage indicates at least a tacit awareness of the instability of the social and political position of the Anglo-Indian. Just as Nora's reversal of the English gaze had implied the potential slippage of the categories of colonizer/colonized, the text suggests here that the same sort of reversal is possible in India. The gazer can easily become the gazed upon; the colonizer can easily lose its

position of power.[21] This potential is subtly noted again when Maurice returns from the tiger hunt. Embedded in the descriptive passages that paint the picture of the villagers' untroubled adulation of Maurice are threatening undertones that imply a potential for anti-European violence, entrapment, and powerlessness. The villagers are, in some sense, in control of Maurice. He is, we recall, "nearly tor[n] . . . to pieces," and he finds himself unable to leave the village (either physically, or even metaphorically, by going to sleep). He must instead "resign [him]self to [his] fate" and submit to being gazed upon ("seen and admired") by the Indian villagers. The text positions Maurice as being in a potentially dangerous situation, robbed of his will. As such, it challenges the notion that the Anglo-Indian/British culture is in a unquestioned, unquestionable, and unchanging state of power.

Maurice's position in this scene, furthermore, is doubly troubling to colonial ideology. Not only is the vision of British power he presents undermined by the potential for violence embedded in the description of the events, but British power is also undermined by the fact that, by this time in the novel, Maurice no longer represents the English as he had in the first half of the novel. Instead, he has come to represent the Irish. As I discussed earlier, Maurice's cultural affiliations early in the novel are with England, allowing him to serve as a representative of the colonizing nation. In India, however, where Nora's Irishness seems to be all but erased as she 'becomes' British (I will have more to say about the extent to which this is the case shortly), Maurice's Irishness becomes more pronounced. The transformation is slow and subtle. Early in the second half of the novel, Nora's friend Mrs. Vane depicts Maurice as *part* Irish when she cites

his ethnicity as a way to explain his military prowess; she tells Nora, whom she does not suspect is Maurice's runaway fiancé, "'Captain Beresford is half Irish'" (161). Later, Maurice discursively 'becomes' even more Irish when he admits to the evil gossip Mrs. Gower that "'My father and grandfather were Irish; and I am only a 'Sassenach' by the mere accident of having been born in England'" (212). And finally, near the end of the novel, Maurice's textual transformation appears complete when Sir Percival, Nora's scorned lover, concludes that he has been jilted in favor of Nora's "*Irish cousin*" (334, emphasis in original). This textual transformation does not displace Maurice from the heroic center of the novel—a fact that is made obvious by the constant praise he receives India—but it puts his presence to different use. Maurice's recasting as Irish disrupts the apparent homogeneity of the British nation and challenges Anglocentric notions about English superiority over not only the colonized Indian, but the colonized Irish as well. Nora's recounting of Maurice's success in the tiger hunt (as well as the accolades showered on him by every other character that appears in India) positions Maurice as the most powerful member of the colonizing nation. Notably, that most-powerful colonizer is not English or even Anglo-Irish, but *Irish*. His success, then, challenges *Ireland's* colonial power structure.

Nora provides a similar challenge to colonial ideology. Although, as I have been arguing, she *seemed* to have fused with the British culture, Nora has only been *mimicking* that culture. She remains distinctly Irish in her cultural/racial affiliation. During a horse race reminiscent of the fox hunt in Ireland, for instance, Nora re-asserts her cultural/racial identity as she explains that her *Irishness* has given her the ability to out-ride the entire

field of competitors, most of whom are English. She reports, "My Irish blood was most thoroughly 'up,' . . . . I had—oh, ecstatic thought!—pounded [her rival] Mrs. St. Ubes and cut down the rest of the field" (201). She further explains her victory by stating simply, "'All Irish girls can ride'" (202). This horse race has little to do with the colonization of India, but much to do with the colonization of Ireland. Represented by Nora (and by Maurice, who finishes the race just behind her), the Irish in this scene are more powerful than the English—*made* more powerful by their Irish blood, which, in colonialist ideology, ostensibly renders them suitable subjects for British rule. The text, in other words, challenges the assumption that the English rightfully and permanently govern Ireland because the Irish are undeniably and essentially inferior to them.

In the second half of the novel, then, Maurice and Nora together create a spatial link between colonized India and colonized Ireland. Nora's narration is therefore able to rhetorically challenge the assumptions that perpetuate colonial control of Ireland: that the so-called inferiority of colonized allows for conquest by the British and situates both colonizer/colonized in a self-evident, 'natural,' and fixed power structure.

Yet, while the novel implies that colonialism's guiding precepts are wrong, it does not substitute their inverse as the 'truth.' When the novel challenges English power or asserts that denigration of the Irish is unwarranted, it does not claim that the Irish are rightful rulers and the English are inferior beings. Instead, Croker's novel seems to exemplify the belief expressed by Terry Eagleton, when he poetically states that the way to combat colonial oppression is by "go[ing] . . . somehow all the way through it and out the other side" ("Nationalism" 23). Eagleton suggests that the only way to find lasting

peace is not by aggressively asserting nationalist agendas, because such agendas seek to reverse but leave intact a dictatorial power structure, but by trying to find a state where differences can coexist. A vision of this heterogeneous state is what Croker's novel offers, and it is this that situates it within JanMohamed's category of the "symbolic." In Nora's narration, Irish and English do ultimately coexist in India. In the end, the Irish are *not* subsumed into the whole, but rather they exist alongside the English *as Irish.* Nora and Maurice embrace their difference from the English—Nora subtly but publicly attributing her triumph at the horse race to her Irishness, for instance, and Maurice proudly explaining that he is only part English because he was born in England—and the English accept that difference with praise and admiration. That this is so indicates the novel's belief that the peaceful coexistence of difference is possible.

Certainly, even given this fact, *Pretty Miss Neville* illustrates that, in late Victorian Britain, there was still a long way to go toward resolving the tensions of colonial conflict—the textual position of the colonized Indian culture is evidence of that. While the novel challenges colonialism's precepts in order to reach a state of Irish-English heterogeneity, when it comes to India, the narration seems to express ethnocentric ideas about the Indian more often than it challenges them. But it does, as I have suggested, at least *begin* to challenge them, no matter how quietly. In examining both the English-Irish and the British-Indian colonial engagements, then, the text seems to imply that there are other ways of envisioning the relationships between races and cultures. *Pretty Miss Neville* can at least *imagine* moving beyond the essentialist binary oppositions and ethnocentric assumptions of static positionality that keep people so

intractably divided. It can at least imagine a world where coexistence of alterity is as common as the presence of competing and antagonistic categories. There was still work to be done to reach this state, but Croker's novel at least imagines a world where colonialism gives way to its own peaceful reconciliation.

[1] Croker's novel seems to exemplify what Margaret Steid claims to be the "form" of the "Anglo-Indian" novel:

> A typical novel generally begins with a voyage, bringing the hero, more often the heroine, to the shores of India. On her arrival in a Presidency town or a mofussil "station" she is welcomed by a father, aunt, or some distant relation, and invariably causes a flutter in the small Anglo-Indian colony there. She becomes the belle of the season, is much sought after, and goes through the usual round of Anglo-Indian gaieties. There follow accounts of *burra-khana*, shooting parties (generally tiger hunts), picnics, visits to places of historical interest, balls and dances. . . and race-meetings. There are scandals and gossips at the club regarding her 'doings', interlaced with love rivalries and misunderstandings, and finally everything ends in a happy marriage. (2)

Alison Sainsbury, in the only chapter-length study on Croker's work, agrees the Croker's *Babes in the Woods* fits this pattern. Although she notes that Steid's scheme is reductive, Sainsbury admits that Anglo-Indian novels in general, and *Babes in the Wood* in particular, are set predominantly in the domestic realm. They deal "with courtship and marriage, with the ordering of Anglo-Indian households, with the relations between family members and among households in the Anglo-Indian community, with the status of the Anglo-Indian household in India" (165). Sainsbury goes on to note, however, that in Anglo-Indian novels the domestic realm spills over into the political. Although I am

not categorizing *Pretty Miss Neville* an Anglo-Indian novel, I will be suggesting that this novel, like *Babes in the Wood*, has political implications.

[2] Biographical information about Croker is almost non-existent. Born in Kilgefin parish to a Church of Ireland clergyman (no biographical sources mention her mother), she was educated in England and France. She lived for 14 years in the East with her husband, an officer in the military, and then moved back to Wicklow Ireland before settling finally in Kent. See Robert Welch's *Oxford Companion to Irish Literature*, p. 120.

[3] Ireland's colonial status is an *a priori* assumption in the Victorian understanding of English-Irish relations, even if the history of that colonized space is so long and complicated that many scholars begin their investigations of it with a disclaimer. K. Theodore Hoppen eloquently admits, for instance, "the more one looks behind surface appearances, the less simple do things become . . . . [in] Ireland's complicated story two and two so often seem to add up to five or sometimes even to six" (5-6). R. F. Foster makes a similar point, noting that even in the nineteenth century, Ireland's history was seen as incredibly complex. He explains that Daniel O'Connell, speaking as advocate for the repeal of the Act of Union in 1834, promised the House of Commons that he would keep his remarks brief, but found himself unable to do so: "he implacably entered upon a disquisition about Irish history from the year 1172, which takes forty-six columns in Hansard before coming anywhere near the present" (78). Foster concludes that, given this lengthy and complicated history, any attempt to understand the Irish past is always much more illusive than one would imagine; no matter from which angle one chooses to view the events of Irish history, there are always other angles to consider (20). Terry Eagleton

seems to agree, and he laments that trying to write about Irish history from the perspective of a "semi-outsider . . . is well-nigh suicide" (*Heathcliff* ix).

My own disclaimer, then: as historian Oliver MacDonagh suggests, the historical moments that one chooses to focus upon in an examination of Irish history are based on subjective choice, and one's understanding of the causes and effects of those moments is largely a matter of educated guessing. My goal in providing a brief (and necessarily reductive) history of Irish colonization is not to imply that my interpretation of events is the right one, or even the only one; nor, certainly, is it to imply that Irish history can be condensed into a few paragraphs. Such an encapsulated history is meant only to situate an argument about the cultural effects of and response to colonization as they were displayed in a late nineteenth-century novel.

[4] Magnusson's *Landlord or Tenant: A View of Irish History* is an invaluable introduction to Irish history, and R. F. Foster's study, *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History* is an excellent critical reassessment of its complexities. For other detailed analyses of Irish history, see Hoppen and MacDonagh.

[5] Whether the British unnecessarily prolonged the Famine is a topic that has engaged historians since the middle of the nineteenth century. See, for example, R. F. Foster and Hoppen.

[6] See R. F. Foster, Magnusson, and Hoppen. Even tentative resolutions of colonial tension would have to wait until well until the twentieth century, and the road to reconciliation has not been smooth. The Treaty of 1921 sought to resolve the Irish-English conflict by separating the country into two sections: six northern counties

comprised one section, and the remaining 26 counties comprised the other, which was granted the status of "dominion." A governor-general represented the English crown at the Irish parliament in Dublin, and the British navy maintained control of some Irish ports. This treaty, however, led not to peace but to a bloody civil war. Those who supported the treaty and those who opposed it because it allowed for some modicum of continued control by the English crown engaged in years of violent and deadly conflict. Although Northern Ireland remains a hotbed of violent political agitation, the second half of the twentieth century has witnessed a growing dedication to peaceful reconciliation.

[7] Sally Mitchell and James D. Startt explain that the British Empire expanded after 1870 to such an extent that, by the end of the century, it covered the globe: "The British Empire by 1897 included India, Canada, New Zealand, and the states of Australia; Ashanti, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, British East Africa, Cape Province, Gambia, the Gold Coast, Natal, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, Somaliland, Uganda, and Zanzibar in Africa; Aden, Brunei, Ceylon, Hong Kong, Labuan, the Malay Federated States, North Borneo, Papua, Sarawak, and Singapore in Asia; the Bahamas, Barbados, British Guinea, British Honduras, the Virgin Islands, the Falkland Islands, Jamaica, the Leeward Islands, Newfoundland, Tobago, Trinidad, Turks and Caicos Islands, and the Windward Islands in America; the Channel Islands, Gibraltar, the Isle of Man, and Malta in Europe, and dozens of other islands scattered about the oceans of the world, including Ascension, Bermuda, St. Helena, Ellice, Gilbert, Southern Solomon, Figi, Pitcairn, and Tasmania" (264). Ireland is notably absent from this list.

[8] For a discussion of JanMohamed's use of Lacanian psychoanalytic terms in this context, see the my introductory chapter.

[9] This term designates particularly English-centered feelings of superiority, while the term "Eurocentric," used later in this chapter, designates more-generally European- or British-centered biases.

[10] Both Sheridan Gilley and R. F. Foster point out that negative representations of the Irish existed alongside positive ones. While this is true, as Foster goes on to suggest, defense of the Irish appeared only sporadically between 1860-1890; the loudest voices in the media were critical ones.

[11] Curtis notes that this tendency to depict the Irish as an inferior race manifested itself before Darwin's *Origin of the Species.* Indeed, well before Darwin's text was published, Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind* (1836-47) contrasted an English race with a Celtic one: Celts were considered "impulsive . . . violent and somewhat childish . . . unchaste, fickle, quick to fight, and [lacking] firmness and self command . . . [and suffering] from physical and moral degeneration" (Volume 3, pp. 175-79, 342). George Stocking notes that, according to Prichard, the physiognomy of the Irish was "evidence of their 'barbarism'" (63).

[12] See also John Wilson Foster's "Who are the Irish?" in *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture* for a discussion of the long-standing debate over this issue (248-262).

[13] The inclusion here of a "Red Indian" as another symbol of a distasteful partner goes farther toward proving the point that Maurice views the Irish as an inferior race to the

English. In grouping together an animal equated with a less-developed version of a human being and a race that was all but exterminated by English colonization of America, Maurice metaphorically casts the Irish as even *lower* on a scale of racial superiority/inferiority.

[14] Maurice is subject to this gaze reversal as well. He is first striking to Nora, for instance, because of his "strange accent" (13). Nora and her friends watch him, study him in order to understand him, and, when they do judge him, they do so in terms of race: Nora states matter-of-factly, "there was nothing Irish about him" (11).

Similarly, when Nora meets the English Miss Gibbon on the *Hindostan*, the English colonial gaze is again reversed, as the women are mutually amazed by one another:

> I gazed at [Miss Gibbon] in mute amazement. She was quite a new experience to the countrified Nora O'Neill!
>
> "You do amuse me," she exclaimed, "you open your great big eyes so wide, and look as if I had seven heads! By the way, what colour do you call your eyes—hazel, or light brown?" she asked in a parenthesis. "I thought *all* Irish girls had blue or gray eyes." (107)

[15] For information on this rebellion, also known as the "Castle Hill Rising," see, for example, Robert Hughes' *The Fatal Shore* , pp. 190-92.

[16] See Ruth Dudley Edwards' *An Atlas of Irish History*, p. 71.

[17] This interpretation is, of course, a reworking of Bhabha's terms. For him, the mimic is a colonized subject who adopts the behaviors of the colonizer in order to gain

power/acceptance. Here, on the other hand, Miss Fluker is a colonizer (English) in a 'colonized' position. She mimics the behaviors not of the colonizer (either English or, in this case, Irish), then, but of a subservient, colonized subject.

[18] Nora rebels when Maurice tries to impose English 'rule' over her as well, and with more success than she has against Miss Fluker. She scoffs at his attempts to introduce her to English pastimes and English behavior, for instance, when she says the he "actually tried to teach us cricket and rounders, and *manners*!" (12). Later, when Maurice tells her that he hopes that she "'improve[s]'" into his vision of appropriate wife, "'quiet, well-informed, amiable, and ladylike'" (64), she once again rebels against his 'rule.' She answers that she hopes he becomes "'less of a donkey and less of a conceited prig, and more of a pleasant companion'" (64). Of course, Maurice's desire for Nora's 'improvement' has much to do with both questions of appropriate *gendered* behavior and her position as an Irish 'subject.'

[19] A formal pursuit of this language resurrection emerged about ten years after the publication of *Pretty Miss Neville* with the creation of the Gaelic League in 1893 (Magnusson 116). According to R. F. Foster, some Irish nationalists claim that only people who know and speak the Irish language have the right to consider themselves Irish (89-91).

[20] Deirdre David comments that English "culture and horticulture" were imported into India, so that the subcontinent was often "made over to look like England" (121-2). This process, however, worked both ways; England also imported vegetation from its colonies and displayed it in public gardens. David notes that despite this apparent reciprocity, the

colonialist hierarchy was always in place: "In the grilling heat of Calcutta, the British look at an Anglicized India, and in the gray damp of London, the British look at an Orientalized England. Whichever way you look at it, however, the British do the looking and the colonies provide the spectacle" (122).

[21] The text also implicitly suggests the potential for the reversal of the gaze when Colonel Keith tells a ghost story about a haunted bungalow. The ghostly head of a "native . . . wear[ing] a large green turban" floats through the bungalow, appearing at nightfall and watching the colonizer: "[it] is to be seen only too constantly, peeping through doorways, . . . looking over your shoulder when you are shaving at the glass. . . sometimes it peeps in at a window; sometimes it grins; sometimes it makes the most truly diabolical faces" (254).

Conclusion

Re-reading (and Re-writing) the World

[If] we can ourselves learn and teach others to read the world in the "proper" risky way . . . perhaps we . . . would not forever be such helpless victims.
Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Reading the World" 95

While working on this project, I found myself in several conversations that followed a similar pattern. Asked by acquaintances about the topic of my dissertation, I would explain that it discusses nineteenth-century British literature that challenged existing doctrines of race and colonialism. They would then ask the inevitable follow-up question, "And what do you intend to do with your degree?" Predictably, I would tell them that I hope someday to teach. The response was almost invariably the same: "And what does your dissertation have to with *that*?" For me, the answer is simple. Everything.

My study of British Victorian colonial discourse has suggested that hegemonic "truths" constructed and mediated in the nineteenth century were also contested and undermined from within colonial ideology. Collins' *Armadale* unsettles colonial ideology's essentialist precepts. Kingsley's *Travels in West Africa* vacillates between tacit acceptance and overt denial of colonial "knowledge." Croker's *Pretty Miss Neville* criticizes the colonizing mission from its margins. The presence of mimics, the creation of hybrid spaces, the recasting of stereotypes, and the metaphorical re-enactment of colonization are textual strategies that help to illustrate the ambivalence and ambiguity of colonial discourse—to suggest that it was not univocal, but constantly competing against other perspectives, other voices, that challenged its validity. Postcolonial theory's dedication to exploring the complexity of discourse is, as I have argued throughout my

discussions, at the heart of each of these discussions. And it is this dedication, which promotes a particular way of *thinking*, that I find essential in the classroom.

Students who use the lens of postcolonial theory to read works of literature are being acquainted with a mode of inquiry that asks them to explore the discursive "dialogue" within texts. Obviously, this endeavor will allow them to identify the complexity of the texts they read. But such an approach to literature also has more global implications. It can help students become critical readers not only of literary texts but of the "texts" that surround them every day—normative discourses that prescribe and govern the way we live. We are, after all, surrounded by such discourses: laws that define "ethical" behavior, films that depict "natural" beauty, advertising that equates material possession with happiness and fulfillment, written treatises that differentiate between "normalcy" and "deviance." Such texts—and surely this abbreviated list could continue for pages—present their "visions" as "truths," which we internalize until they become norms of identity and behavior. We measure ourselves against them, and, when our behavior or identity falls outside of their prescribed realms of the "acceptable," we are forced to see ourselves as deficient, deviant, Other. Teaching students to use postcolonial theory to read literature critically could encourage them, by extension, to read *life* critically, to interrogate the validity of these kinds of *social* texts. We can empower students, in other words, to look up from their books and out into the world, and to see that the dominant ideology that might cast them, and other people, as somehow outside of the norm (whether by nature of their sexuality, race, class, and so on) is ideologically constructed, not self-evident, "natural," or "true."

I do not propose that teaching postcolonial theory in the literature classroom will create ideologically "free" students. This would be a naïve claim and a material impossibility. I do not suggest that a realm of "truth" and ideological freedom exists behind ideology if we can only get to it. Rather, postcolonial theory can supply a model for functioning *within* ideological constructions. It can empower our students to challenge social norms that limit their potential and make them doubt their own worth, to re-read and re-write the "texts" that marginalize them, and thus to avoid becoming trapped within or outside them.

In 1987, postcolonial scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak told Colin MacCabe, "I think less easily of 'changing the world' than in the past. I teach a small number of holders of the can(n)on, male or female, feminist or masculinist, how to read their own texts, as best I can" (MacCabe xix). Teaching students of literature to *think* differently, to approach the so-called realities that surround them as contestable "texts," as postcolonial theory can encourage them to do, is the means to making them more active participants in the ongoing construction and revision of their worlds. If we can encourage even a "small number of holders of the can(n)on" to take part in that process, we will have done our jobs.

List of Works Cited

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso, 1992.

Allon, Henry and James Baldwin Brown. "The Outbreak in Jamaica." *The British Quarterly Review* (October 1866): 452-75.

Archer, James H. C. "Jamaica, and the Recent Insurrection There." *Fraser's Magazine for Town and Country* 63 (February 1866): 161-79.

Argyle. "Problems in Studying Nineteenth-Century Australian Fiction." *Commonwealth Literature: Unity and Diversity in a Common Culture*. Ed. John Press. London: Heinemann, 1965. 48-63.

"Armadale." Rev. of *Armadale* by Wilkie Collins. Saturday Review 16 June 1866.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, eds. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. NY: Routledge, 1995.

Baker, William and William M. Clark, eds. *The Letters of Wilkie Collins*. 2 vols. NY: St. Martin's, 1999.

Ball, Charles. *The History of the Indian Mutiny: giving a detailed account of the Sepoy insurrection in India; and a concise history of the great military events which have tended to consolidate British empire in Hindostan*. London: London Printing and Publishing, 1858

Barker, Francis, Peter Hulme, and Margaret Iversen, eds. *Colonial Discourse/Postcolonial Theory*. NY: Manchester UP, 1994.

Bhabha, Homi K. "The Commitment to Theory." *The Location of Culture*. NY: Routledge, 1994. 19-39.

----. "Difference, Discrimination, and the Discourse of Colonialism." *The Politics of Theory*. Eds. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen, and Dianna Loxley. Colchester: University of Essex Press, 1983. 194-211.

----. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *The Location of Culture*. NY: Routledge, 1994. 85-92.

----, ed. *Nation and Narration*. NY: Routledge, 1990.

----. "Postcolonial Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries:* The Transformation of English and American Studies. Eds. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. NY: MLA, 1992. 437-65.

----. "Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority under a tree outside Delhi, May 1817." *The Location of Culture*. NY: Routledge, 1994. 102-122.

----. "The Other Question: Stereotype, Discrimination, and the Discourse of Colonialism." *The Location of Culture*. NY: Routledge, 1994. 66-84.

Birkett, Dea. *Mary Kingsley: Imperial Adventuress*. London: Macmillan, 1992.

"Black is Not Quite White." *All the Year Round* (March 1866): 173-77.

Blunt, Alison and Gillian Rose. "Introduction: Women's Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies." *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies*. NY: The Guilford Press, 1994. 1-25.

Blunt, Alison. "Mapping Authorship and Authority: Reading Mary Kingsley's Landscape Descriptions." *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies*. NY: The Guilford Press, 1994. 51-72.

----. *Travel, Gender, and Imperialism: Mary Kingsley and West Africa.* NY: The Guilford Press, 1994.

Bowie, Malcolm. *Lacan.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1991.

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

"British Heroism in India." *The London Times* 19 December 1857: 5, col c.

Bromlow, Francis. "A Few Words from Khyber." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82 (November 1857): 605-15.

Burton, Richard. *The Lake Regions of Central Africa.* 2 vols. 1861. NY: Horizon, 1961.

----. *Two Trips to Gorilla Land and the Cataracts of the Congo.* 1876. NY: Johnson, 1967.

Carlyle, Thomas. "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question." *Shooting Niagara: And After?* London: Chapman & Hall, 1867.

Claridge, Elizabeth. Introduction to the Fifth Edition. *Travels in West Africa: Congo Français, Corisco and Cameroons.* Fifth ed. Virago/Beacon Travelers Series. Boston: Beacon, 1982.

Collins, Wilkie. *Armadale.* NY: Oxford UP, 1989.

Croker, Bithia Mary. *Pretty Miss Neville.* London: Collins' Clear-Type Press. Originally published 1883.

----. *Babes in the Wood*: A Romance of the Jungles. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1910.

Crooks, Robert. "Reopening the Mysteries: Colonialist Logic and Culture Differences in *The Moonstone* and *The Horse Latitudes. LIT* 4 (1993): 215-28.

"The Curse of Caste." *The London Times* 29 December 1857: 6, column f.

Curtis, L. Perry Jr. *Anglo-Saxons and Celts: A Study of Anti-Irish Prejudice in Victorian England.* Studies in British History and Culture, Vol. II. Bridgeport: University of Bridgeport, 1968.

----. *Apes and Angles: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1971.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex.* 1874. Adelaide, South Australia: Limited Editions Club, 1971.

David, Deirdre. *Rule Britannia: Women, Empire, and Victorian Writing.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995.

Deane, Seamus. Introduction. *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. 1-19.

Dicey, E. V. "Mr. Gladstone and Our Empire." *Nineteenth Century* 11 (1877): 292-308.

Eagleton, Terry. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger.* NY: Verso, 1995

----. "Nationalism: Irony and Commitment. " *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature.* Ed. Seamus Deane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990. 23-59.

Early, Julie English. "The Spectacle of Science and Self: Mary Kingsley." *Natural Eloquence: Women Reinscribe Science.* Eds. Barbara T. Gates and Ann B. Shteir. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P, 1997.

----. "Unescorted in Africa: Women Ethnographers Toiling in the Fields of Sensational Science." *Journal of American Culture* 18 (1995): 67-75.

"The East India House." *The London Times* 25 March 1858: 11, col c.

Edwardes, Michael. *Bound to Exile: The Victorians in India.* NY: Praeger, 1970

Edwards, Ruth Dudley. *An Atlas of Irish History.* 2nd edition. NY: Routledge, 1991.

Elliot, Anthony. *Psychoanalytic Theory: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

Foster, John Wilson. *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture.* Dublin: Lilliput, 1991.

Foster, R. F. *Paddy and Mr. Punch: Connections in Irish and English History.* NY: Penguin, 1993.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. NY: Pantheon, 1977.

Frank, Katherine. *A Voyager Out: The Life of Mary Kingsley.* NY: Ballantine, 1986.

Gilley, Sheridan. "English Attitudes to the Irish in England, 1789-1900." *Immigrants and Minorities in British Society.* Ed. Colin Holmes. Boston: George Allen & Unwin, 1978. 81-110.

Gilmour, Robin. *The Victorian Period: The Intellectual and Cultural Context of English Literature, 1830-1890.* Longman Literature in English Series. NY: Longman, 1993.

Gladstone, William. "Aggression on Egypt and Freedom in the East." *Nineteenth Century* 11 (1877): 292-308.

Grubgeld, Elizabeth. "Ireland." *Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia.* Ed. Sally Mitchell. NY: Garland, 1988. 400-02.

Gwynn, Stephen. *The Life of Mary Kingsley.* London: Macmillan, 1932.

Hall, Catherine. "Rethinking Imperial Histories: The Reform Act of 1867." *New Left Review* 208 (1994): 3-29.

Heuman, Gad. *The Killing Time: The Morant Bay Rebellion in Jamaica.* London: Macmillan, 1994.

Holt, Thomas C. *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832-1938*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.

Hoppen, K. Theodore. *Ireland Since 1800: Conflict and Conformity*. NY: Longman, 1989.

House, Madeline, Graham Storey, and Kathleen Tillotson, eds. *The Letters of Charles Dickens*. Volume 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Hughes, Robert. *The Fatal Shore*. NY: Knopf, 1987.

"The Indian Mutiny." *The London Times* 22 July 1858: 7, col f.

"The Indian Native Character." *The London Times* 14 January 1858: 12, col d.

"The Irish Frankenstein." *Punch*. 20 May 1899. pp. 234-5.

"The Irish Yahoo." *Punch*. 18 March 1862. p. 165.

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

JanMohamed, Abdul. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature" *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1985): 59-87.

Jeal, Tim. *Livingstone*. NY: Putnum, 1973.

Jeffares, A. Norman. Introduction. *Commonwealth Literature: Unity and Diversity in a Common Culture*. Ed. John Press. London: Heinemann, 1965

-----. Introduction. *National Identity: Papers Delivered at the Commonwealth Literature Conference, University of Queensland, Brisbane, 9-15 August, 1968* edited by K. L. Goodwin. London: Heinemann, 1970. ix-xvi.

Kingsley, Mary Henrietta. "Liquor Traffic With West Africa." *The Fortnightly Review* 69 (April 1898): 537-60.

----. "Miss Kingsley's Travels n West Africa." Response to Review of *Travels in West Africa. Athenaeum* (Feb 27, 1897): 278-9.

----. *Travels in West Africa: Congo Français, Corisco and Cameroons.* 1897. Fifth ed. Virago/Beacon Travelers Series. Boston: Beacon, 1988.

Knoepflmacher, U.C. "The Counterworld of Victorian Fiction *and The Woman in White.*" *The Worlds of Fiction.* Ed. Jerome Buckley. Harvard English Series 6. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975. 351-69.

Kreilkamp, Vera. *The Anglo-Irish Novel and the Big House.* Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1998.

Landry, Donna and Gerald Maclean. *The Spivak Reader.* NY: Routledge, 1996.

Law, Graham. "Wilkie in the Weeklies: The Serialization and Syndication of Collins's Late Novels." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 30 (1997): 244-268.

Lawrence, Katherine R. *Penelope Voyages: Women and Travel in the British Literary Tradition.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.

Livingstone, David. *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast; Thence Across the Continent, Down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean.* NY: Harper and Brothers, 1858.

Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism.* NY: Routledge, 1998.

MacCabe, Colin. Foreword. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics.* By Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. NY: Routledge, 1988. iv-xix.

MacDonagh, Oliver. *States of Mind: A Study of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1780-1980.* London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983.

Magnusson, Magnus. *Landlord or Tenant: A View of Irish History.* London: The Bodley Head 1978.

Mahood, Molly. *The Colonial Encounter: A Reading of Six Novels.* London: Collings, 1977.

McEwan, Cheryl. "Encounters with West African Women: Textual Representations of Difference by White Women Abroad." *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies.* NY: The Guilford Press, 1994. 73-100.

Mehta, Jaya. "English Romance, Indian Violence." *Centennial Review* 34 (1995): 537-58.

Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Mills, Sara. "Discourses of Difference." *Cultural Studies* 4(2): (1990): 128-140.

----. *Discourses of Difference: An analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism.* NY: Routledge, 1991.

----. "Knowledge, Gender, and Empire." *Writing Women and Space: Colonial and Postcolonial Geographies.* NY: The Guilford Press, 1994. 29-50.

Mitchell, Sally and James D. Startt. "Empire and Imperialism." *Victorian Britain: An Encyclopedia.* Ed. Sally Mitchell. NY: Garland, 1988. 263-5.

Moore-Gilbert, Bart. *Postcolonial Theory: Context, Practices, Politics.* NY: Verso, 1998.

----. "Writing India, Reorienting Colonial Discourse Analysis." *Writing India: 1757-1990: The Literature of British India.* Ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert. NY: Manchester UP, 1996. 1-29

Morris, M. O'Connor. "Jamaica." *Temple Bar* 16 (December 1865-March 1866): 209-218.

Nnoromele, Salome, C. "Mary Kingsley and West Africa: Race, Gender, and Colonial Discourse." Diss. U of Kentucky, 1995.

Nott, Josiah C. and George R. Gliddon. *Types of Mankind; or Ethnological Researches, Based Upon the Ancient Monuments, Paintings, Sculptures, and Crania of Races, and Upon Their Natural, Geographical, Philological, and Biblical History.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo, and Company, 1854.

"On the Irish Character." *London Times* 8 January 1869. p. 6, col. e-g.

Page, Norman. *Wilkie Collins: The Critical Heritage*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974. 78-124.

Parry, Benita. "The Contents and Discontents of Kipling's Imperialism." *New Formations* 6 (1988): 49-64.

Pathak, Zakia, Saswati Sengutpa, and Sharmila Purkayastha. "The Prisonhouse of Orientalism." *Textual Practice* 5 (1991): 195-218.

Patterson, Robert Hogarth. "European Politics." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 81 (January 1857): 125-141.

Peters, Catherine. Introduction. *Armadale*. By Wilkie Collins. Ed. Peters. NY: Oxford UP, 1989. vii-xxx.

----. *The King of Inventors: A Life of Wilkie Collins*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

Porter, Dennis. "Orientalism and its Problems." *Colonial Discourse/Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. NY: Columbia UP, 1994. 151-160.

Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation.* NY: Routledge, 1994

Prichard, James Cowles. *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.* 3rd edition. 5 vols. London: Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper, 1836-47.

Reed, John R. "English Imperialism and the Unacknowledged Crime of *The Moonstone.*" *Clio* 2 (1973): 281-90.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism.* NY: Knopf, 1993.

----. *Orientalism.* NY: Vintage, 1979.

----. "*Orientalism* Reconsidered." *Europe and its Others.* 2 vols. Eds. Francis Barker, Peter Hulme, Margaret Iversen, and Dianna Loxley. Colchester: University of Essex Press, 1985. 14-27.

Sainsbury, Alison. "Married to the Empire: the Anglo Indian Domestic Novel." *Writing India, 1757-1990: The Literature of British India.* Ed. Bart Moore-Gilbert. NY: Manchester UP, 1996. pp. 163-187.

Sandison, Alan. *The Wheel of Empire: A Study of the Imperial Idea in Some Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Fiction.* London: Macmillan, 1967.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *Critique of Dialectical Reason: I. Theory of Practical Ensembles.* Trans. Alan Sheridan-Smith. London: New Left Books, 1976.

Sharpe, Jenny. "Figures of Colonial Resistance." *Modern Fiction Studies* 35 (1989): 137-55.

Singh, Rashna. *The Imperishable Empire: A Study of British Fiction on India.* Washington D.C.: Three Continents Press, 1988.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Marginality in the Teaching Machine." *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. NY: Routledge, 1993. 53-76.

----. "Reading the World: Literary Studies in the Eighties." *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. NY: Routledge, 1988. 95-102.

Steid, Margaret. "Anglo-Indian Romances: Tracts for the Times." *Journal of Popular Culture* (1985): 2-20.

Stevenson, Catherine B. "Female Anger and African Politics." *Turn of the Century Women* 2 (1985): 7-17.

Stocking, George W. *Victorian Anthropology*. NY: Free Press, 1987.

Swayne, G. C. "Cambria and Cottonopolis." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82 (November 1857): 593-605.

Taylor, Jenny Bourne. *In the Secret Theater of Home: Wilkie Collins*. NY: Routledge, 1988.

Thomas, Ronald R. "Wilkie Collins and the Sensation Novel." *The Columbia History of the British Novel*. Ed. John Richetti. NY: Columbia UP, 1994. 479-507.

Thoms, Peter. *The Windings of the Labyrinth: Quest and Structure in the Major Novels of Wilkie Collins*. Athens: Ohio UP, 1992.

Trevelyan, G. O. *Cawnpore*. London: MacMillan, 1865.

Trevor, George. "The Company's Raj." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* 82 (November 1857): 615-42.

Vann, J. Donn. *Victorian Novels in Serial*. NY: Modern Language Association, 1985.

Vaughan. Megan. "Colonial Discourse Theory and African History, or Has Postmodernism Passed Us By." *Social Dynamics: A Journal of the Centre for African Studies University of Cape Town* 20 (1994): 1-23.

Walsh, William. *Commonwealth Literature*. London: Oxford UP, 1973.

Watson, Tim. "Jamaica, Genealogy, George Eliot: Inheriting the Empire After Morant Bay." *Jouvert: a Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 1 (1997): 47 par. Available: http:// 152.1.96.5/jouvert/v1i1/watson.htm.

Wilberforce, Henry William. "Jamaica." *The Dublin Review* 7 (October 1866): 362-414.

Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman. Introduction to "Part II: Theorizing the West." *Colonial Discourse/Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. Eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. NY: Columbia UP, 1994. 127-131.

Young, Robert J. C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race*. NY: Routledge, 1995.

----. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. NY: Routledge, 1990.

Yule, Col. Henry and A. C. Burnell. *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive*. Nai Sarak, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1903.

Zeitz, Lisa M. and Peter Thoms. "Collins's Use of the Strasbourg Clock in *Armadale*." *Nineteenth Century Literature* 45 (1991): 495-503.

Anne M. Dickson
224 East North Street
Apartment #4
Bethlehem, PA 18018
(610) 861-8242

Education:

Lehigh University, Bethlehem PA
Ph.D. in English—June 2001

Lehigh University, Bethlehem PA
MA in English—May 1995

Moravian College, Bethlehem PA
BA—May 1993, Magna Cum Laude with Honors in English

Professional Experience

English Instructor. Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA. September 1994-May 1998. Taught first-year composition and literature courses. Experience in both computer and conventional classrooms.

English Tutor. The Center for Writing, Math, and Study Skills, Lehigh University. September 1997-May 1998. Worked individually with students in writing and English-as-a-second-language.

Marketing Associate. Lucent Technologies, Wireless Systems Business Unit, Allentown, PA. May 1998-present. Assist the marketing team in customer communications. Write and edit presentations and correspondence, attend trade shows, publish all internal documentation (in addition to published Marketing Communications Department material).

Technical Writer. Lucent Technologies, Marketing Communications Department, Allentown, PA. May 1995-present. Prepare, format, edit, and track technical documentation for publication. Interface with clients via email, telephone, and face-to-face meetings. Prepare weekly status reports for Wireless Systems Group. Manage documentation inventory.

Freelance Researcher/Editor. Rodale Press, Books Division, Allentown, PA. November 1999-present. Fact-check and edit manuscripts. Conduct independent research and integrate resulting information into document. Interface with experts via email and telephone, and track and incorporate their responses into text.

Guest Lectures

"Reading Life's Texts with Critical Theory." Guest Lecture, Moravian College, Bethlehem, PA. May 1998. Lecture aimed at making literary theory "real" to resistant students. Applied current trends in literary scholarship to contemporary culture.

"Gender and Duality in Charlotte Brontë's Shirley" Guest Lecture, Lehigh University, Bethlehem PA. May 1998. Lecture/discussion that analyzed several gender issues in a lesser-known text by Charlotte Brontë.

"Working with Robert Wood Johnson." Lecture/faculty workshop, Lehigh University. April 1999. The culmination of a 2-semester attempt to create an awareness of and a plan for dealing with binge drinking on campus. This workshop aimed at getting Lehigh's faculty "on-board" with a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation initiative to deal with the problem.

Workshop Leader. Lehigh University. September 1995-May 1998. Led various workshops for Lehigh's teaching staff. Topics included: the planning and implementation of a pilot course entitled "Crime and Punishment in America," teaching literature-based writing courses, choosing texts for beginner-level writing and "inquiry-driven" courses, and using Daedalus Integrated Writing Environment in the computer-based writing classroom.

Scholarship and Research:

"*Reading the World* with Gayatri Spivak." Currently in review for publication at the *Journal of Advanced Composition.*

British Victorian Prose Anthology. Assisted Professor Rosemary J. Mundhenk in the production of this anthology, published in 1999.

"John as Joseph: Mirror of Ignorance." Published in the *Chaucer Yearbook*, May 1996, and presented at the Medieval Literature Conference at Plymouth State College, April 1994.

The Wife of Bath: Critical Edition. Researched scholarship for the publication of this edition in 1996.

Jane Austen's History of England. Annotated parts of the work for publication in 1995.

Professional Activities:

Member of the *Modern Language Association*. September 1995-present.
Graduate Committee Representative. September 1996-May 1998.
Brochure Subcommittee. April 1998. Produced a brochure aimed at prospective graduate students in English.
Graduate Student Council Representative. September 1995-May 1996.

Awards and Honors:

Comprehensive Doctoral Exams in 19th Century British Literature and Contemporary American Literature passed with distinction; "High pass" in Composition and Rhetoric Doctoral Exam; Teaching Fellowship, Lehigh University (full tuition and monthly stipend); Omicron Delta Kappa (National Academic and Leadership Honor Society); Sigma Tau Delta (National English Honor Society); Phi Sigma Iota (International Foreign Language Honor Society); Sigma Tau Sigma (Service Sorority); Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities; Dean's List.

Business Skills:

Windows 95; Microsoft Word; Microsoft Exchange; Microsoft Excel; Microsoft Schedule Plus; WordPerfect 6.0-8.0; Framemaker for Windows, Macintosh, and Unix; excellent researching (via the internet and/or with traditional library research), writing, editing, proofreading, and organizing skills; typing 70+ wpm.

References:

Rosemary J. Mundhenk, Professor of English, Lehigh University, (610)-758-3308
Carole K. Brown, Professor of English, Moravian College, (610) 691-2929
Eileen Rinaudo, Marketing Administrator, Lucent Technologies, (610) 939-3461