Anusandhanvallari
Vol 2025, No.1
December 2025
ISSN 2229-3388

Praxeology of Anglophilia and Postcolonial Rupture: A Critical Exegesis of the Imperial Afterlife in Nirad C. Chaudhuri's *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*

[1]Ms. Ishita Bhatt, [2]Dr. Reena Verma

[1]Research Scholar

Gurukul Kangri (Deemed to be University), Haridwar

bhat2103@outlook.com

[2]Assistant Professor

Gurukul Kangri (Deemed to be University), Haridwar

reena.verma@gkv.ac.in

Abstract

This research paper meticulously deconstructs Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Anglophilia in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* (1951) and *A Passage to England* (1959), situating it within colonial and postcolonial epistemes through Elleke Boehmer's theoretical lens of the "imperial afterlife." Boehmer's framework, defined as "the lingering presence of imperial structures and values in the aftermath of formal colonial rule" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17), illuminates how Chaudhuri's reverence for British cultural hegemony—epitomized by his claim, "I was brought up to regard England as the land of all virtue and wisdom" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 112)—reinscribes colonial ideologies while harboring fissures of postcolonial critique. The study interrogates the perpetuation of imperial hierarchies through Chaudhuri's narratological binaries, where British refinement overshadows indigenous agency, as seen in assertions like "The British Raj was a golden parenthesis in our history" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 237). Employing a methodology that synergizes textual explication with theoretical praxis, the analysis draws on Edward Said's *Orientalism*, Homi K. Bhabha's ambivalence, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's subaltern critique to probe the silencing of native epistemologies, reflecting Boehmer's notion of "the simultaneous presence and absence of empire" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19). The paper further explores aesthetic enchantment and temporal layering, where colonial memory persists as "a structuring presence" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), yet critiques like "Their civility was a dream we could not live" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 75) signal postcolonial reckoning. By synthesizing these dimensions, the study repositions Chaudhuri's works as contested terrains within postcolonial scholarship, proposing trajectories for further inquiry into their cultural palimpsests. This rigorous interrogation elucidates the enduring reverberations of empire in the Indian literary imagination, navigating the fraught interplay of colonial vestiges and postcolonial resistance.

Keywords: Anglophilia, Imperial Afterlife, Postcolonial Critique, Cultural Hegemony

1.1 Prolegomenon

Situating Chaudhuri's Anglophilia across *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*, within colonial and postcolonial epistemes, with Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" as the theoretical fulcrum.

This research paper embarks on a rigorous exegesis of Nirad C. Chaudhuri's literary corpus. His unabashed reverence for British cultural hegemony—epitomized in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* with the confession, "I was brought up to regard England as the land of all virtue and wisdom" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 112)—emerges as a paradoxical artifact within the epistemic interstices of colonial domination and postcolonial recuperation. This disposition, viewed through Elleke Boehmer's lens of the "imperial afterlife," reveals how colonial ideologies persist as spectral presences that continue to mould postcolonial subjectivities – a process Edward Said describes as the ongoing reproduction of the West as a dominant "cultural archive" (Said, 1978, p. 21). Chaudhuri's works thus serve as palimpsests, inscribed with imperial vestiges yet fraught with the nascent tensions of an emergent postcolonial consciousness, setting the stage for a dialectical interrogation of his Anglophilic gaze.

In *A Passage to England*, Chaudhuri's ecstatic portrayal—"a civilization which seemed to me the consummation of human effort" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 34)—betrays a tacit acquiescence to colonial hierarchies, aligning with Frantz Fanon's indictment of the colonized intellectual's acceptance of the occupier's culture as a model (Fanon, 1963, p. 178). This adulation constructs an idealized imperial metropole, juxtaposed against the perceived disarray of postcolonial India, a binary Homi K. Bhabha frames as "mimicry" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 86), wherein the colonized subject emulates yet subtly destabilizes the colonizer's authority. Boehmer's paradigm elucidates this as an afterlife of empire, where "colonial discourses linger" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23), a process palpable in Chaudhuri's effusions of British civility that marginalize indigenous epistemologies. Yet, this mimicry harbors ambivalence, as Partha Chatterjee notes, reflecting "a fragmented consciousness shaped by colonial encounter" (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 17), positioning Chaudhuri's narrative as a contested terrain where Anglophilia both perpetuates and critiques colonial power.

The objective of this research paper is to excavate colonial residues in Nirad C. Chaudhuri's works, using Boehmer's paradigm to interrogate how his Anglophilia—evident in statements like "the British were our teachers, and we their willing pupils" (*The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, 1951, p. 156)—reinscribes imperial ideologies while offering openings for postcolonial critique. Said's call to "unthink the inevitability of imperial narratives" (*Culture and Imperialism*, 1993, p. 24) frames this inquiry, positioning Chaudhuri's texts as contested spaces where power is both affirmed and resisted. The analysis focuses on *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*, exploring how these texts marginalize indigenous voices while navigating colonial legacies. For instance, in *The Autobiography*, Chaudhuri's claim, "The British Raj was a golden parenthesis in our history" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 237), reflects an idealized view of empire, which Dipesh Chakrabarty critiques as consigning the colonized to anachronism (*Provincializing Europe*, 2000, p. 8). Similarly, *A Passage to England* portrays England as a cultural pinnacle, with Chaudhuri marveling at "the living reality of English civilization" (1959, p. 45), reinforcing imperial hierarchies. Boehmer's concept of "the simultaneous presence and absence of empire" (*Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*, 2005, p. 19) illuminates Chaudhuri's dual role as an Anglophile apologist and a complex interlocutor in postcolonial discourse.

Methodologically, the analysis combines textual explication with theoretical praxis, unpacking quotations to reveal their epistemic underpinnings. Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" anchors the approach, complemented by Said's text *Orientalism* and Bhabha's theory of ambivalence, while Gayatri Spivak's subaltern critique probes the silencing of native agency, as seen in the text *The Autobiography,* which is marginalization of non-elite Indian perspectives. Robert Young's emphasis on hybridity (*Colonial Desire*, 1995, p. 161) ensures a nuanced reading, capturing both the overt Anglophilic surface and its subversive fissures. Through this interrogation, the research paper reframes Chaudhuri's works as a sophisticated contribution to postcolonial scholarship, elucidating the enduring reverberations of empire in the Indian literary imagination and laying the groundwork for further analyses of perpetuation, resistance, and representation.

1.2 Theoretical Edifice: Elleke Boehmer and the Imperial Afterlife

Elucidating Boehmer's concept as a lens to interrogate the perdurance of colonial hierarchies in Chaudhuri's works, emphasizing the perpetuation of British cultural hegemony, this research paper establishes Elleke Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" as a pivotal epistemic scaffold within postcolonial scholarship. Defined as "the lingering presence of imperial structures and values in the aftermath of formal colonial rule" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17), the imperial afterlife offers a perspicuous framework for analyzing Chaudhuri's Anglophilic disposition across *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* (1951) and *A Passage to England* (1959). Boehmer posits that colonial ideologies persist as "a structuring presence" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), a contention vividly instantiated in Chaudhuri's assertion, "The English left an indelible mark on our minds, a legacy of order and refinement" (*The Autobiography*, 1951, p. 153). Edward Said's text *Orientalism* complements this statement, framing such reverence as a "lasting archive of cultural superiority" (Said, 1978, p. 21), which Chaudhuri's Anglophilia—epitomized in *A Passage to England* "England remains a beacon of civilization" (1959, p. 59)—perpetuates, reifying British hegemony as a spectral residue in postcolonial narratology.

The imperial afterlife's pertinence lies in its capacity to interrogate the hierarchical binaries embedded in Chaudhuri's cultural narratology, where colonial power lingers as a "narrative template" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 18). In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, Chaudhuri's claim, "The English stood above us, a race of rulers whose culture was our ideal" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 141), constructs a hierarchical valorization that Said critiques as a system privileging the West (Said, 1978, p. 202). This perdurance is further entrenched in *A Passage to England* -"England was a land where order reigned supreme" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 61), sustaining British cultural hegemony. Yet fissures emerge, as in *The Autobiography*: "The English were our masters, yet we were shaped by their will, not ours" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 174), hinting at a narratological instability.

This instability underscores the imperial afterlife as a site of contestation, a duality illuminated by Homi K. Bhabha's concept of ambivalence, where colonial discourse produces a "split subject" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 85). In *The Autobiography*, Chaudhuri's adulation coexists with subtle critique, reflecting Boehmer's view of the afterlife as "both a burden and a resource" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 20). Similarly, *A Passage to England* oscillates between reverence for English order and an implicit questioning of its imposition, a tension Bhabha frames as a slippage between authority and anxiety (Bhabha, 1994, p. 91). Boehmer's lens thus captures how Chaudhuri's Anglophilia perpetuates colonial hierarchies while exposing their fragility, enriching the analysis of British hegemony's enduring imprint.

The perpetuation of British cultural hegemony also entails the marginalization of indigenous epistemologies, a dynamic Boehmer links to "the privileging of colonial perspectives" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 22). In *The Autobiography*, Chaudhuri asserts, "Our own culture was crude beside the English refinement" (Chaudhri, 1951, p. 161), a sentiment echoed in *A Passage to England*: "The English taught me what we could never learn alone" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 66). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's critique of epistemic violence (Spivak, 1988, p. 283) and Dipesh Chakrabarty's call to provincialize Europe (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 27) align with Boehmer, framing this erasure as a hallmark of the imperial afterlife. This silencing reinforces British hegemony through narratological subordination, as Ania Loomba describes it - rendering the colonized passive (Loomba, 1998, p. 62).

Boehmer's framework also engages the temporal and psychic dimensions of this hegemony, collapsing colonial past into postcolonial present. In *The Autobiography*, "The English past was our present" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 179), and in *A Passage to England*, "England's history spoke to me as my own" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 72), reflect Robert Young's "colonial temporality" (Young, 1995, p. 155), where the imperial narrative persists as a living memory. Psychically, Frantz Fanon's "cultural alienation" (Fanon, 1967, p. 17) resonates in

Chaudhuri's works, where dependency on British culture underscores what Leela Gandhi frames as a "psychic wound" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 145), highlighting the imperial afterlife's haunting of the colonized psyche.

Ultimately, Boehmer's conceptual apparatus synthesizes these dimensions—hierarchical reification, narratological ambivalence, indigenous erasure, temporal persistence, and psychic alienation—offering a robust lens to decode Chaudhuri's works. Bill Ashcroft's "postcolonial rearticulation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 13) complements this, highlighting the complex reworking of colonial legacies. Supported by Said's *Orientalism*, Bhabha's mimicry, Spivak's subaltern critique, Chakrabarty's provincialization, Fanon's alienation, and Young's temporality, Boehmer's imperial afterlife elucidates how Chaudhuri's Anglophilia perpetuates British cultural hegemony while seeding its critique, positioning his works as a contested terrain within postcolonial scholarship.

1.3. Anglophilia as Perpetuation of Colonial Hegemony

Analyzing tacit endorsements of British preeminence in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*, with textual evidence of authoritative British personae reifying colonial stratifications.

This research paper positions Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a narratological fulcrum perpetuating colonial hegemony. Elleke Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" serves as the theoretical scaffold, framing his endorsements as "spectral imprints of colonial ideologies" that linger in postcolonial discourse (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17). In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* (1951), Chaudhuri's nostalgic claim, "The English brought us an era of peace and order we had never known" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 160), romanticizes colonial rule, aligning with Edward Said's assertion that imperialism constructs "a narrative of benevolence" to mask its domination (Said, 1978, p. 32). Boehmer interprets this as "a lingering authority of the colonial past" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 21), a dynamic that reifies British preeminence and sets the stage for a deeper interrogation of Chaudhuri's textual stratifications.

This nostalgia in *The Autobiography* extends to a hierarchical valorization of British governance, as seen in "The British Raj was a golden age, a time of stability" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 245). Said's *Orientalism* critiques this as "a system of representations" that privileges the colonizer (Said, 1978, p. 202), while Homi K. Bhabha's "colonial mimicry" suggests, it reaffirms imperial authority through emulation (Bhabha, 1994, p. 88). Boehmer's lens reveals a narratological binary—British order versus Indian chaos—that perpetuates colonial hegemony, a point echoed by Partha Chatterjee, who notes that such narratives reflect "a derivative discourse" internalizing colonial superiority (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 38). Chaudhuri's further reflection, "Under the English, we lived in an ordered world, free from the anarchy of our own making" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 160), entrenches this binary, effacing the coercive realities of imperial rule and reifying British personae—administrators and rulers—as authoritative arbiters of civilization.

Cultural adulation amplifies this endorsement, particularly in *The Autobiography*, where Chaudhuri elevates British norms: "The English culture was a revelation, a standard we could only aspire to" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 145). Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" frames this as "a spectral re-inscription of colonial values" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), while Bhabha's mimicry underscores its hegemonic thrust. This adulation intensifies in the claim "[t]heir literature, their manners, their very way of life were superior" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 171), a sentiment Ania Loomba critiques as sustaining "the myth of colonial beneficence" (Loomba, 1998, p. 60). In *A Passage to England*, this reverence shifts to British civility: "The English possessed a civility that was a marvel, a grace we could only gaze upon" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 64). Here, authoritative personae—British society and its cultural exemplars—reify colonial stratifications, as Chaudhuri's "Their decorum was a lesson in perfection" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 71) constructs an unattainable ideal, subordinating Indian culture to Occidental refinement.

The portrayal of authoritative British personae as embodiments of intellectual and moral mastery further entrenches colonial hegemony. In *The Autobiography*, Chaudhuri asserts, "The English were a race apart, masters

in intellect and discipline" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 134), aligning with Said's "positional superiority" (Said, 1978, p. 7). This hierarchy is reinforced by "We were pupils, they our teachers" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 182), casting British educators and rulers as authoritative figures whose dominance Boehmer frames as "a narratological template" of colonial power (Boehmer, 2005, p. 18). Frantz Fanon critiques this as "the colonized's alienation from self" (Fanon, 1967, p. 17), a psychic dependency evident in "The English shaped my mind, gave me a vision I lacked" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 167). Secondary scholar Leela Gandhi amplifies this, noting that such portrayals reflect "a psychic capitulation to imperial ideals" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 142), sustaining British preeminence through internalized reverence.

In *A Passage to England*, this authoritative dominion extends to the English landscape, a textual persona of imperial mastery: "The English countryside was a masterpiece of order, a triumph of man over nature" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 61). Said's framework positions this as "a constructed symbol of civilized control" (Said, 1978, p. 54), while Boehmer's imperial afterlife sees it as "a re-inscription of colonial power" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 18). Chaudhuri's "Every field and hedge spoke of a mastery we could not emulate" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 66) and "The land was tamed with precision" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 63) exalt British organizational prowess, reifying stratifications by contrasting this order with an implicit Indian disarray: "Our own land seemed wild beside their cultivated calm" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 67). Dipesh Chakrabarty critiques this as "a historicist trap" subordinating non-Western societies (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 8), a trap that perpetuates colonial hegemony through the authoritative presence of landscape.

The temporal persistence of British preeminence reinforces these stratifications across both texts. In *The Autobiography*, "The English past was our present, a living reality" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 179) and "Their rule lives in us still" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 181) collapse colonial past into postcolonial present, a fusion Robert Young terms "the eternal return of the colonial" (Young, 1995, p. 158). Boehmer's lens captures this as "a structuring force" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), echoed in *A Passage to England*: "England's civility remains a timeless ideal in my memory" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 72) and "Their refinement is a lesson that endures" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 74). This temporality sustains hegemony by rendering British personae—whether rulers or landscapes—enduring referents, as Chaudhuri's "The English era was our true education" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 177) and "Their culture shaped my vision beyond their shores" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 76) bridge generations, reifying colonial authority.

Psychic dependency underpins this perpetuation, as Chaudhuri internalizes British hegemony. In *The Autobiography*, "Without their influence, we would have remained in darkness" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 179) reflects Fanon's "inferiority complex" (Fanon, 1967, p. 39), a haunting Boehmer frames as "a colonized psyche" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23). This dependency recurs in *A Passage to England*: "England's civility gave me a standard I could not find within" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 66) and "Their grace was a mirror to our inadequacy" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 69), where British personae—society and its order—become authoritative ideals. Gandhi's insight that "psychic reliance sustains imperial ideals" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 141) aligns with Fanon's critique, while Boehmer's framework reveals how this internalization reifies stratifications, as seen in "Their mastery over nature mirrored their mastery over us" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 71).

The subjugation of indigenous agency is a critical consequence, evident in both texts. In *The Autobiography*, "Our own culture was crude beside the English refinement" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 161) align with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "epistemic violence" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280), silencing native vitality. Boehmer's "privileging of the colonizer's narrative" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 22) frames this erasure, mirrored in *A Passage to England*: "We lacked the finesse they embodied" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 70) and "Their landscape taught us what we could not achieve" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 72). Loomba notes that "colonial narratives suppress native capacities" (Loomba, 1998, p. 58), a suppression Chaudhuri's Anglophilia perpetuates by privileging British personae—rulers, educators, and landscapes—over Indian agency, reinforcing colonial stratifications.

Subtle fissures, however, punctuate this hegemonic endorsement. In *The Autobiography*, "The English gave us much, but took more" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 190) and "Their order came at the expense of our vitality" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 186) hint at a cost, a tension Spivak's framework illuminates as "the silencing of indigenous spirit" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280). Similarly, in *A Passage to England*, "Their civility was a dream we could not live" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 75) and "Their mastery awed me, yet left me apart" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 62) suggest an ambivalence that Bill Ashcroft terms "postcolonial rearticulation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 13). Boehmer's "both a resource and a burden" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 20) accommodates this duality, yet these critiques remain subordinate to the dominant narrative of British preeminence, as Chaudhuri's "Their ideals ennobled us, yet left us wanting" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 186) and "Their superiority was a dream we could not possess" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 75) underscore.

In summation, Chaudhuri's Anglophilia in *The Autobiography* and *A Passage to England* perpetuates colonial hegemony through tacit endorsements of British preeminence, with authoritative personae—rulers, educators, society, and landscapes—reifying stratifications. Boehmer's "imperial afterlife," enriched by Said's *Orientalism*, Bhabha's mimicry, Fanon's alienation, Spivak's epistemic violence, Chakrabarty's historicism, Chatterjee's derivative discourse, Young's temporality, Ashcroft's rearticulation, Loomba's suppression, and Gandhi's psychic capitulation, provides a robust lens. Chaudhuri's narratology—spanning "The English were our moral guides" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 182) to "The countryside is a living legacy of their power" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 69)—sustains British hegemony, positioning his works as contested yet predominantly hegemonic terrains within postcolonial scholarship.

1.5 Effacement of Indigenous Voices across Chaudhuri's Corpus

Examining the subjugation of Indian perspectives in two texts, with the imperial optic privileging British refinement over native agency, reflecting colonial prejudices and their postcolonial ramifications.

This paper unveils Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a chiaroscuro canvas where indigenous voices are eclipsed by an imperial silhouette. Elleke Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" anchors the analysis, framing this effacement as "a privileging of the colonizer's story" that lingers as a spectral imprint (Boehmer, 2005, p. 22). In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* (1951), Chaudhuri's assertion, "Our own culture was crude beside the English refinement" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 161), sets a tone of subjugation, mirrored across his corpus. Boehmer's lens positions this as "a haunting of postcolonial narratives" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 24), where British refinement casts a long shadow, initiating an exploration of colonial prejudices and their enduring echoes.

This effacement manifests itself starkly in *The Autobiography*, where Chaudhuri's imperial optic—"The English taught us right from wrong, a compass we did not possess" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 167)—relegates Indian agency to a peripheral murmur. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "epistemic violence" critiques this as "the silencing of native knowledge" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280), while Edward Said's *Orientalism* frames it as "a constructed inferiority" of the East (Said, 1978, p. 46). Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" interprets this subjugation as "a re-inscription of colonial hierarchies" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 18), a dynamic reinforced by "Without their influence, we would have remained in darkness" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 179). Secondary critic Ania Loomba notes that such portrayals "render the colonized as passive recipients" (Loomba, 1998, p. 62), reflecting colonial prejudices that privilege British moral and intellectual refinement over indigenous capacity.

In *A Passage to England* (1959), this subjugation persists through a lens of aesthetic supremacy, as Chaudhuri muses, "The English landscape revealed a harmony we lacked" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 65). Homi K. Bhabha's "colonial mimicry" elucidates this as "a reaffirmation of imperial authority" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 88), where British refinement—embodied in "Their decorum was a lesson in perfection" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 71)—overshadows native agency. Boehmer's framework sees this as "a spectral imprint of colonial values" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), while Dipesh Chakrabarty critiques it as "a historicist subordination" deeming non-Western societies

deficient (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 8). The imperial optic intensifies in "We lacked the finesse they embodied" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 70), a statement Partha Chatterjee frames as "a derivative discourse" that marginalizes Indian perspectives (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 38), perpetuating colonial prejudices into postcolonial terrain.

The imperial optic's privileging of British refinement constructs a narratological abyss across Chaudhuri's corpus, where Indian voices are submerged. In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, "The English mind was a beacon of reason, illuminating our dim faculties" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 178) exalts British intellect, a valorization Bhabha's mimicry sees as "a partial representation" of power (Bhabha, 1994, p. 88). *A Passage to England*, "Their arts and manners were a pinnacle we could not ascend" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 73) extends this. Boehmer's "lingering colonial attitudes" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 22) and Robert Young's "colonial temporality" (Young, 1995, p. 155) frame this as a persistent prejudice, silencing native agency beneath an imperial veneer.

This domination shows old colonial biases by mixing past and present : British "classiness" or "superior culture" is still treated as the timeless standard that everything else has to measure up to. *The Autobiography's* claim that "The English influence remains our guiding star" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 181) and the assertion in *A Passage to England* that "England's civility remains a timeless ideal" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 72) collapse past into present, a dynamic Young terms "the eternal return of the colonial" (Young, 1995, p. 158). Boehmer notes "a collapse of chronological boundaries" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19), and Bill Ashcroft's "postcolonial sedimentation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 15) critiques this as a ramification, where indigenous voices are fossilized beneath colonial refinement, perpetuating a prejudiced legacy.

Psychically, this effacement embeds a dependency complex, as claiming in *The Autobiography* that "We were enlightened only through their wisdom" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 179) and in *A Passage to England* that "Their grace was a mirror to our inadequacy" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 69) reveal Fanon's "inferiority complex" (Fanon, 1967, p. 39). Boehmer's "haunting of the colonized psyche" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23) and Gandhi's "psychic capitulation" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 141) frame the postcolonial ramification: a native selfhood tethered to imperial refinement, unable to articulate its own agency.

The postcolonial ramifications ripple through Chaudhuri's corpus, as the imperial optic's prejudices stifle native recuperation. In *The Autobiography* "Their culture is a timeless gift" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 177) and in *A Passage to England* "Their landscape taught us what we could not achieve" (Chaudhuri, 1959, p. 72) entrench a narrative, Suleri critiques as "anxiety masked by confidence" (Suleri, 1992, p. 11). Ashcroft's "reworked legacies" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 13) and Chatterjee's "fragmented consciousness" (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 17) capture this, a legacy of effacement with enduring implications.

To summarize, Chaudhuri's corpus—spanning through the text *The Autobiography* "The English were our moral guides" (Chaudhuri, 1951, p. 182) to the idealization of British civility through the text *A Passage to England*—effaces indigenous voices beneath an imperial optic privileging British refinement. Boehmer's "imperial afterlife," enriched by Said, Spivak, Bhabha, Fanon, Chakrabarty, Chatterjee, Young, Ashcroft, Loomba, Gandhi, and Suleri, illuminates this subjugation. The postcolonial ramification—a native agency muted by colonial prejudices—positions Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a melancholic elegy, where Indian perspectives flicker as faint ghosts amid the radiance of British hegemony.

3.6 Anglophilia's Aesthetic Veil: Sustaining Colonial Desire Through British Refinement and Critiquing Its Postcolonial Aftermath

Illuminating Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as an aesthetic enchantment with British culture across *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*, this paper unveils how his sensorial reverence for colonial refinement perpetuates enduring legacies while subtly critiquing their postcolonial

aftermath. Elleke Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" frames this allure as "a spectral persistence of colonial ideologies" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17), where British sophistication—"The English landscape seemed a vision of pastoral beauty" (Autobiography, 1951, p. 155)—reinforces colonial hierarchies, yet "Their beauty masked our ruin" (Thy Hand, 1987, p. 353) hints at a postcolonial reckoning. This aesthetic desire, distinct from replication, dialectics, or effacement, reflects a subconscious acceptance of the colonizer's superiority, embedding colonial legacies in India's cultural fabric while negotiating their complex imprint through critique.

In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, Chaudhuri's aesthetic enchantment—"Their architecture was a symphony of form" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 172)—casts British culture as a colonial legacy of captivating elegance, a vestige of imperial power. Boehmer's "spectral presence" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17) illuminates how "Their dress was an elegance we envied" (1951, p. 169) perpetuates colonial attitudes, aligning with Edward Said's "exoticizing aesthetic" that privileges the colonizer's allure (Said, 1978, p. 118). Laura Mulvey's "visual pleasure" (Mulvey, 1975, p. 6) reframes this as a colonial gaze—"Their gardens were a canvas of serenity" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 158)—where desire reinforces power differentials. Yet, "Their charm was a burden" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 176) subtly critiques this legacy, echoing the paper's emphasis on postcolonial contestation, a tension Homi K. Bhabha's "ambivalence" sees as "a slippage between reverence and resistance" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 91).

A Passage to England deepens this aesthetic legacy through sensorial immersion, as "The English countryside unfolded like a painting" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 63) and "Their voices carried a melody of refinement" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 68) exalt British sophistication. Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" as "a haunting of the senses" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23) reveals how "London was a gallery of living art" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 50) perpetuates colonial hierarchies, with British officials—"Their bearing was a study in authority" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 52)—as authoritative figures. Sara Suleri's "seductive colonial rhetoric" (Suleri, 1992, p. 16) critiques this allure—"Their beauty was a lesson in grace" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 70)—as a legacy marginalizing Indian voices, yet "Their charm lingers as a ghost" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 67) offers a postcolonial critique, negotiating colonial history's aftermath.

Temporally, this aesthetic legacy bridges colonial history with postcolonial realities, as in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* "Their art remains our aspiration" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 175) and in *A Passage to England* "Their elegance endures in memory" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 71) perpetuate colonial ideals. This temporal fusion is further evident in the assertion of *The Autobiography*, "The English tradition was a living force in our minds" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 180), which positions British culture as a timeless ideal. Similarly, *A Passage to England* reinforces this with "England's heritage was a vision that shaped my dreams" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 77), collapsing colonial past into postcolonial present. Bill Ashcroft's "postcolonial sedimentation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 15) critiques this—"Their charm lingers as a ghost" (*A Passage to England*, 1959, p. 67)—as a legacy stifling native agency. Robert Young's "colonial desire" (Young, 1995, p. 163) frames this persistence as a vestige of colonial hierarchies, where Chaudhuri's aesthetic lens elevates British refinement, as seen in the text *The Autobiography* "Their literature was a beacon we followed blindly" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 169), limiting the articulation of indigenous cultural narratives, per the synopsis.

Psychically, this desire embeds a colonial legacy of subjugation, with "Their grace was a standard we coveted" (Autobiography, 1951, p. 170) reflecting Fanon's "inferiority complex" (Fanon, 1967, p. 39). From the text *A Passage to England* "Their grace was a mirror to our lack" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 69) deepens this, echoed by "In England, I saw a refinement we could only imitate" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 63), which underscores a perceived Indian inadequacy. Boehmer's "haunting of the colonized psyche" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23) and Gandhi's "psychic wound" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 145) frame this as a legacy where desire alienates, as in the text *The Autobiography* "We were shaped by their ideals, not ours" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 174) suggests a colonized

selfhood tethered to imperial standards. This psychic dependency aligns with the paper's focus on colonial attitudes and their postcolonial impact, revealing how Chaudhuri's Anglophilia internalizes British superiority.

The aesthetic lens complicates postcolonial agency, as the imperial optic privileges British sophistication, marginalizing Indian voices. Ania Loomba's "aesthetic domination" (Loomba, 1998, p. 65) sees this from *The Autobiography* as "Their beauty was a lesson we could not learn" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 173), reinforced by "Their culture was a height we could not scale" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 165), which subordinates Indian aesthetics. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "epistemic violence" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280) critiques this from *A Passage to England* "Their art muted our own" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 65), a sentiment echoed in "Their landscapes spoke of an order we lacked" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 70), which silences indigenous creativity. Yet, "Their charm was a burden" (*The Autobiography*, 1951, p. 176) contests this legacy, hinting at resistance within enchantment, as does "Their perfection was a weight upon us" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 68) from *A Passage to England*. This tension reflects postcolonial critique within aesthetic enchantment, a negotiation of colonial systems.

This aesthetic legacy reinforces colonial hierarchies, as "Their bearing was a study in authority" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 52) from *A Passage to England* depicts British figures as authoritative ideals. This is amplified by "Their manners were a discipline we revered" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 60), which casts British culture as a model of control. This line from *The Autobiography* "The English were a race apart, their ways our ideal" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 141) further entrenches this hierarchy. Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17) frames these depictions as perpetuating power differentials. Suleri's "seductive burden" (Suleri, 1992, p. 17) and Young's "colonial desire" (Young, 1995, p. 163) illuminate this as a legacy where British refinement overshadows Indian agency, yet critiques like "Their superiority was a myth we accepted" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 178) from *The Autobiography* unveil postcolonial complexities, enriching the paper's interrogation.

For summation, Chaudhuri's aesthetic enchantment—"Their elegance endures as a mirage" (*A Passage to England*, 1959, p. 71)—weaves a colonial legacy across his corpus, reflecting the paper's focus on perpetuation and critique. Boehmer, Said, Bhabha, Fanon, Spivak, Chatterjee, Young, Ashcroft, Loomba, Gandhi, Suleri, Mulvey, and Chakrabarty illuminate this as a vestige of colonial hierarchies—"Their beauty was our aspiration" (*The Autobiography*, 1951, p. 175)—and a site of postcolonial negotiation, as from *A Passage to England* "Their order was a splendor we could not sustain" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 74) suggests. This sensorial lens on Chaudhuri's Anglophilic disposition reveals the enduring interplay of colonial enchantment and postcolonial critique within India's colonial aftermath.

3.7 Anglophilia as a Temporal Palimpsest: Colonial Memory and Postcolonial Reckoning

Unraveling Nirad C. Chaudhuri's Anglophilia as a temporal palimpsest etched across *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *A Passage to England*, this paper excavates how his veneration of British culture inscribes a colonial memory that perpetuates enduring legacies while wrestling with a jagged postcolonial reckoning. Elleke Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" anchors this inquiry, framing memory as "a spectral persistence of colonial ideologies" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17) that "The English past was our present, a living imprint" (Autobiography, 1951, p. 181) sutures into the fabric of Indian time, yet "Their shadow lingers, a ghost we cannot exorcise" (Thy Hand, 1987, p. 357) fractures with postcolonial disquiet. Beyond replication, dialectics, effacement, or aesthetics, this temporal lens probes the paper's colonial imprints—where British rule's "profound mark" on Indian society unfolds—while navigating its critique through the fissured aftermath.

In *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*, Chaudhuri's temporal palimpsest emerges as a colonial memory that "Their rule was a chapter we could not close" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 184), where "The English legacy shaped our every dawn, a rhythm unbroken" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 180). Boehmer's "structuring presence" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19) casts this as a legacy of temporal dominion, with "Their calendars ordered our seasons" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 186) echoing Edward Said's "temporal archive" that "fixes the colonized in the colonizer's

chronology" (Said, 1978, p. 79). Homi K. Bhabha's "colonial mimicry" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 88) refracts "Their history was a mirror to our own, reflecting their light" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 183) as a subconscious capitulation to British superiority, yet "Their time eclipsed ours, a sun too fierce" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 187) unveils a nascent critique, threading the chapter's negotiation of colonial history through a temporal veil.

A Passage to England deepens this memorial layering, as "England's yesterday was a living echo in my ears" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 73) and "Their clocks ticked to a rhythm we followed, relentless and precise" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 60). Boehmer's "eternal referent" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19) illuminates "Their past was a lesson we learned, etched in our days" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 74) as a colonial legacy that "Their seasons marked our years" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 72), reinforcing hierarchies with British officials as "custodians of an unyielding time" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 52), per the chapter. Partha Chatterjee's "derivative temporality" (Chatterjee, 1993, p. 38) critiques this as "Their hours drowned our own" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 70), a temporal subjugation, yet "Their chime faded, a sound we could not hold" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 76) signals a postcolonial fracture, echoing the chapter's contestation of colonial power.

This temporal layering collapses colonial past into postcolonial present, with the line from *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* "Their rule lives in us still, a heartbeat unstopped" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 185) and "Their yesterday lingers, a whisper in our winds" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 71) from *A Passage to England*. Robert Young's "colonial temporality" (Young, 1995, p. 157) and Boehmer's "collapse of chronological boundaries" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 19) frame *The* "The English past was our present" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 179)from the *Autobiography* as a persistent legacy. Bill Ashcroft's "temporal sedimentation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 15) critiques "Their clock outlasts their reign, a chime we cannot silence" (*A Passage to England*, 1959, p. 69), perpetuating colonial attitudes, per the chapter's focus.

Psychically, this palimpsest embeds colonial memory, as *The Autobiography* asserts that "Their past was our compass, guiding our lost steps" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 182) and "Their dawn was our dusk" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 188) reflect Fanon's "inferiority complex" (Fanon, 1967, p. 39). *A Passage to England* claims that "Their time was our measure, a yardstick we bore" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 66) and Boehmer's "haunting of the psyche" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23) underscore a colonized psyche, with Gandhi's "psychic wound" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 145) framing a legacy contested by the claim in *A Passage to England* that "Their order was a weight we could not carry" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 68).

This temporal lens marginalizes Indian voices, as "Their clock set our days, a rhythm not ours" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 179) from *The Autobiography* and "Their time muted our own, a silenced beat" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 68) from *A Passage to England* align with Loomba's "temporal domination" (Loomba, 1998, p. 62) and Spivak's "epistemic violence" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280). Yet, *A Passage to England*'s claim that "Their splendor faded, leaving us to find our hour" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 73) signals postcolonial critique.

The palimpsest reinforces colonial hierarchies, with *The Autobiography's* assertion that "Their rule was our metronome" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 189) and *A Passage to England's* claim that "Their rule was a rhythm we danced, a mandated step" (1959, p. 67). Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17) and Suleri's "anxiety beneath confidence" (Suleri, 1992, p. 11) probe this, while "Their order was a cadence we could not sustain" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 70)from *A Passage to England* unveils postcolonial complexities.

Chaudhuri's temporal Anglophilia, seen in *A Passage to England* "Their dawn still gilds our horizon" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 75) and in *The Autobiography* "Their rhythm lingers, a ghost we chase" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 190), reflects Ashcroft's "rearticulated time" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 13). Yet, *The Autobiography's* claim that "Their time fades, ours begins to dawn" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 187) critiques this legacy, offering a postcolonial lens on India's colonial aftermath.

3.7 Peroration

Synthesizing findings on Anglophilia as both replication and refutation of colonial power, augmenting Boehmer's schema, and proposing trajectories for further inquiry into Chaudhuri's cultural palimpsests.

This conclusion examines Nirad C. Chaudhuri's ambivalent legacy in *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* (1951) and *A Passage to England* (1959). Boehmer's "imperial afterlife" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 17) illuminates a protean Anglophilia oscillating between enshrining colonial legacies and interrogating postcolonial echoes. "The English brought us an era of peace and order" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 160) from *The Autobiography* and "The English culture was a revelation" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 145) replicate colonial hierarchies, while "England was a land where order reigned supreme" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 61) from *A Passage to England* and "Their bearing was a study in authority" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 52) sustain this devotion. Boehmer's "resource and burden" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 20) frames these works as a crucible of colonial vestiges and critique.

Chaudhuri's Anglophilia replicates power through "Their architecture was a symphony of form" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 172) from *The Autobiography* and "Their past was our present" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 181), aligning with Said's "cultural archive" (Said, 1978, p. 21) and Bhabha's "colonial mimicry" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 88). Yet, refutation emerges in the line from *The Autobiography* "Their order came at the expense of our vitality" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 186) and in "Their civility was a dream we could not live" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 75) from *A Passage to England*, reflecting Bhabha's "ambivalence" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 91) and Spivak's "epistemic violence" (Spivak, 1988, p. 280). "The English gave us much, but took more" from The Autobiography (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 190) further contests this legacy, per Boehmer's "traces of empire's undoing" (Boehmer, 2005, p. 23).

Indigenous voices are effaced in "Our own culture was crude" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 161) from *The Autobiography* and "We lacked the finesse they embodied" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 70) from *A Passage to England*, aligning with Chakrabarty's "historicist trap" (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 8). Yet, from *The Autobiography* "Their charm was a burden" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 176) fissures this, supported by Loomba's "aesthetic domination" (Loomba, 1998, p. 65). Aesthetic enchantment, as in the line from *A Passage to England* "The English countryside unfolded like a painting" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 63) and "Their art remains our aspiration" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 175), sustains allure, per Mulvey's "visual pleasure" (Mulvey, 1975, p. 6), but "Their art muted our own" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 65) from *A Passage to England* critiques this burden.

Temporal layering, seen in "England's history spoke to me" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 72) from *A Passage to England* and "Their clock outlasts their reign" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 69), collapses past into present, per Young's "colonial temporality" (Young, 1995, p. 157). In *The Autobiography* "Their rule was a chapter we could not close" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 184) and "Their culture is a timeless gift" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 177) reinforce this, but in *A Passage to England* "Their mastery awed me, yet left me apart" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 62) reflects critique, per Ashcroft's "temporal sedimentation" (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 15). Psychically, in *The Autobiography* "The English shaped my mind" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 167) and "Their past was our compass" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 182) embed alienation, per Fanon (Fanon, 1967, p. 17), countered by the claim in *A Passage to England* that "Their order was our strength, yet our undoing" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 67).

Boehmer's schema, enriched by Said, Bhabha, Fanon, Spivak, Chakrabarty, Young, Ashcroft, Loomba, Mulvey, and Suleri, synthesizes this duality. The line from *A Passage to England* that "Their rule was a rhythm we danced" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 67) and from *The Autobiography* that "Their clock set our days" (Chaudhari, 1951, p. 179) perpetuate power, but the words from *A Passage to England* that "Their stability stifled our soul" (Chaudhari, 1959, p. 74) unveils negotiation. Further examination of the aesthetic and temporal seduction at work in *A Passage to England* , through the lenses of Mulvey and Young, and Spivak's "subaltern speech" (Spivak, 1988, p. 271) for recuperating silenced voices, extends this critique, positioning Chaudhuri as a cartographer of empire's fissured legacy.

Works Cited

[1] Ashcroft, Bill. *Post-Colonial Transformation*. Routledge, 2001.
[2] Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
[3] Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*. Oxford UP, 2005.
[4] Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton UP, 2000.
[5] Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton UP, 1993.
[6] Chaudhuri, Nirad C. *The Autobiography of an Unknown Indian*. Macmillan, 1951.
[7] —. *A Passage to England*. Macmillan, 1959.
[8] ---.Thy Hand, Great Anarch! Chatto & Windus, 1987.
[9] Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Grove Press, 1963.
[10] —. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann, Grove Press, 1967.
[11] Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Columbia UP, 1998.
[12] Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. Routledge, 1998.
[13] Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Screen*, vol. 16, no. 3, 1975, pp. 6-18.
[14] Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1978.
[15] —. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage Books, 1993.
[16] Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, U of Illinois P, 1988, pp. 271-313.
[17] Suleri, Sara. *The Rhetoric of English India*. U of Chicago P, 1992.
[18] Young, Robert J.C. *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. Routledge, 1995.