

Book Reviews

meditates on what it means to view “India, 1818–1860” “less from the perspective of British rule and more from those practices of Indian society.” One approach, Washbrook observes, “is to see Indian society’s reaction to the new colonial hegemony as dominated by resistance and reaction.” But such an approach, he concludes, is not “entirely satisfactory.” The rest of Washbrook’s excellent chapter explains why, and I am persuaded. Nevertheless, I found myself looking for something more concrete than Spivak’s gap in Washbrook’s acknowledgement of the Subaltern Studies historiographic project. “For many years,” Washbrook continues, “the responses represented in the Great Mutiny and Civil Rebellion of 1857 were interpreted in this light. More recently, a new historiography of the ‘subaltern’ orders of society has highlighted similar imperatives.” The chapter’s final notation on Subaltern methodology appears in the ensuing footnote.

So it is that, via its eventual methodological displacement of the Subaltern studies project, British imperial historiography returns itself to the side of the angels. It goes without saying that historically detailed work continues to take place inside the disciplinary paramouncy—that is not what is sacrificed in the process of disciplinary renewal that relocates this particular mode of Indian historiography from Delhi to Oxford. What, perhaps, is sacrificed is something one feels most acutely from beyond the pale of historiography and its disciplinary protocols: a motive for undisciplined but engaged reading of scholarship committed to a small few of the great many who comprise history’s endlessly undisclosed subjects. That sacrifice could have implications for how postcolonial pedagogy continues to understand its theoretical commitment to future political change.

Stephen Slemon

Purnima Bose. *Organizing Empire: Individualism, Collective Agency & India*. Durham: Duke UP, 2003. Pp. ix, 278. \$22.95 pb.

The pitfalls of nationalism, Fanon reminds us, are as perilous as those of colonialism. To this truth we must add Purnima Bose’s caution that nationalism and colonialism are entwined in often subtle ways—so many ways, in fact, that we continue to speak the rhetoric of these twin ideologies even as we try to disentangle their implications. Bose goes a long way toward accomplishing the latter in her important contribution to postcolonial studies. Specifically, Bose probes the dialectic between so-called individual and collective narrative strategies that helped shape the politics, histories and stories of twentieth-

Book Reviews

century India. She shows how the colonial state rhetorically deploys certain notions of individualism to excuse its actions. Yet Bose also illuminates how nationalist resistance, especially by women, emerges in complex ways to subvert this dominant rhetoric.

Bose uses four “case studies” in as many chapters to explore a “taxonomy” of individualism. The title of Chapter 1, “Rogue-Colonial Individualism: General Dyer, Colonial Masculinity, Intentionality, and the Amritsar Massacre,” though unwieldy, encapsulates this chapter’s insightful reading of the Dyer case. Bose chooses this highly visible 1919 incident precisely for its notoriety, providing as it does a leitmotif for the project’s chief claims, as well as a prominent colonialist foil for the less noticeable acts of individualism discussed in later chapters. In singling out Dyer’s violent act, Bose argues, the colonial administration “scapegoated” him as an “aberration” of the rule of law, thereby deflecting criticism from the administration’s inherently violent dominance (31, 72). Dyer’s British defenders, moreover, consciously invoked the 1857 Mutiny “as a trope for acts of violence against Englishwomen,” reinforcing the masculinist rhetoric upon which colonial rule built its justifications (36).

In Chapter 2, “Feminist-Nationalist Individualism: Margaret Cousins, Activism, and Witnessing,” Bose examines Cousins’s writing as “an alternative archive that is at once feminist, activist, and transcultural” (75). A founder of such path breaking organizations as the Irish Women’s Franchise League and the All India Women’s Conference, Cousins is an apt figure for Bose’s focus on how early feminists (much as now) had to “continuously negotiat[e]” a place for women’s subjectivity, one that was besieged by the competing compulsions of individual and collective agencies (126). For this very reason, Bose observes, Cousins betrays some contradictions, such as her advocacy of a “golden” Vedic past in which women were putatively liberated—a position that depended on an orientalist notion of the despoiling effects of a “Muhammadan invasion” (121). But Cousins’s “split self-fashioning” in the contexts of Irish and Indian emancipatory movements is itself a product of the contradictions inherent in modern colonialism. Indeed, this is the well-known theme of the subaltern studies collective’s pioneering historical studies, which themselves cannot completely elude the disciplinary grasp of History.

Bose’s third taxonomic label, “Heroic-Nationalist Individualism: Kalpana Dutt, Gender, and the Bengali ‘Terrorist’ Movement,” is perhaps the most innovative, and complements Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s classic essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Like Spivak, Bose shines a light on the plight of a Bengali woman who cast her lot with armed resistance in the 1920s and 30s.

Book Reviews

But whereas Spivak (rightly) concludes that the tragic fate of her own case subject, Bhuvanewari Bhaduri, proves that the subaltern woman is doubly removed from access to agency, Bose argues (also rightly) for a re-framing of the very question. Relying in part on Dipesh Chakrabarty's on-going analysis of Bengali autobiography, Bose notes that Kalpana Dutt's memoir, though ostensibly the record of group action, "valorizes the figure of the individual" through its "formal narrative structure," which is essentially biographical (130). Texts like Dutt's, claims Bose, illustrate the need to ask not about *the* subaltern, but about the subjectivities that colonialism and nationalism variously interpellate. One quibble: the text Bose chooses is written in English, and is therefore questionable as a model of the sort of tensions the author sees in "heroic-nationalist individualism." Nonetheless, Bose's investigation sheds new light on the interplay between narration and the gendered nation.

The book's final chapter, "Heroic-Colonial Individualism: Raj Nostalgia and the Recuperation of Colonial History," is an engaging analysis of the motivations behind imperial revivalism, extending from a Kipling story to Charles Allen's popular *Plain Tales from the Raj* and Ruth Pravar Jhabvala's *Heat and Dust*. Citing the work of that "curious society," the British Association for Cemeteries in South Asia (196), Bose notes, as others have done, that the 1970s and '80s were especially profitable for the nostalgia industry. Rather like Ian Baucom's study of Englishness, *Out of Place* (1999), which Bose surprisingly neglects to consider, this chapter shows how Britain continues to tell itself the old story of colonial rectitude, a story that serves to distract the world from the Irish question. Englishness, moreover, is no less an artifice than was British India. In short, Raj revivalism mimics the rhetoric employed by General Dyer's defenders decades earlier, demonstrating once again just how persuasive a rhetoric of empire can be—a rhetoric that has, alas, been renewed in today's headlines.

Taken together, Bose's taxonomic case studies of individual agency offer a fresh, nuanced look at the complex narratives of colonialism and nationalism. For anyone interested in the interconnections among colonial and postcolonial histories, literatures, and politics, this is an essential book.

Alan Johnson