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Abstract

The present dissertation is a comparative study between Mary Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1868) and Louise Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et l’Extrême Orient* (1888). The aim of the research is to demonstrate the authors’ contribution to discourses of Orientalism and Imperialism. It also re-situates the writers’ feminist discourse in a highly racialized and imperial context to understand the dynamics that govern the emergence of the female emancipative movement. To reach our purpose, we have analyzed their respective discourses in terms of Race, Gender and Nationalism. We have divided our work into three chapters. The first chapter explores the affinities the writers’ share in their racist attitudes toward the Indians following Edward Said’s *Orientalism* (1978). The second chapter discusses the implication of feminist principles which both writers inscribed in their texts relying on Reina Lewis’s *Gendering Orientalism* (1996). The third chapter depicts the divergence between the two texts relying on their (writers) nationalists’ attitudes with reference to Said’s Orientalism. The results of this analysis underscore Carpenter and Bourbonnaud’s appropriation of Orientalist and imperialist rhetoric to formulate their feminist practices and justify their presence in the exclusive Public sphere of the late nineteenth century.
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I. Introduction

The nineteenth century is characterized by profound social changes as a consequence of great industrial transformations in Europe.\(^1\) Even if the Industrial Revolution seems to have brought prosperity and imperial power; women were still put aside and under the legal authority of men. Yet some emerging feminist authors maneuver within this male imperialist environment and provide an argument for the equality between the sexes. They question the existing social and legal inequalities and further try to dismantle the imposed role of the “Angel in the House”\(^1\) by entering in the “Public sphere.”\(^1a\) The case of Mary Carpenter and Louise Bourbonnau perfectly illustrates this emancipative consciousness embedded in their travel writings.

In fact, since the 1970s the raise of Postcolonial Studies marked resurgence in investigating the relations of the West with the East in the literature of late nineteenth century.\(^2\) Theorists such as Edward Said, in his influential *Orientalism: complete the full name* (1978) offer a new way to conceptualize the history of relations between the West and the East. He analyzes how the Orientalist classification of the East as different and inferior legitimized Western domination.\(^2a\) Said argues that “Orientalist images” do not only ‘misrepresent’ the Orient, but they also misrepresent the Occident – obscuring in their flattering European superiority the tensions along the lines of gender, class and ethnicity that rupture the domestic scene.”\(^3\) In general, theorists about colonialism have stressed its “masculine” nature and left aside women. Yet, given the enormous impact of imperialism on Victorian life and the increasing presence of European female travelers (add reference to monicats percentage of femal travellers), scholars such as Reina Lewis and Antoinette Burton explored an important but neglected historical dimension of the relationship between feminism and Orientalism /imperialism, in the mid to late nineteenth century.\(^4\) Their seminal
works confront complex issues like race and gender to shed light on the role women played in
an imperial context.

Among the writers who have inscribed their works within the period of high
imperialism stands out the British Mary Carpenter and the French Louise Bourbonnau. Their
respective travelogues *Six Months in India* (1868)\(^a\) and *Les Indes et L’Extrème Orient*
(1892)\(^b\) are among the literary works that inform about “the heterogeneity of the imperial
moment”\(^c\) and attest the emancipatory consciousness the authors indicate in their enterprise
of writing and travelling.

Several researches have addressed the issue of women travel writers in the late
nineteenth century, particularly after the emergence of *gender studies*.\(^5\) The works under
study namely Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1868) and Bourbonnau’s *Les Indes et
l’Extrème-Orient* (1892) have not been widely reviewed. Yet, the critics that analyzed them
drew attention to the important role the two authors played as women in a highly imperialist
and male dominating environment.

To start with, Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1868) has received substantial criticism
from Antoinette Burton in her *Burdens of History* (1994) and Mrs. Bayle Bernard in “The
Position of Women in India” (1989). Bernard’s article was the first of many in the
*Englishwomen’s Review* to examine the lives of Indian women.\(^5a\) Her analysis of Carpenter’s
work is based on two points. On the one hand, she depicts Carpenter’s account as relatively
positive description of India and its inhabitants, containing “comprehensive views and lucid
statements”\(^6\) and “had no such “frivolous details”\(^6a\) that degrade India. She emphasizes that
her writings “would be much more acceptable to the readers of the *Englishwomen’s Review*
since Carpenter did not depict India in ‘such dark colors’.”\(^7\) Here we understand that women
in general and Carpenter in particular held temperate racist attitudes. On the other hand,
Bernard points out the idea that the images Carpenter gives of the condition of Indian women
“can hardly be considered as flattering.” Such statements can be comprehended as being contradictory yet, Bernard’s aim is to portray Carpenter as a racist who knows to take advantage of the existing ideologies. She explains that the Orientalist images, Carpenter produces over Indian women, is a strategy to justify her presence in the imperial dominions.

Burton in her *Burdens of History*, agrees with Bernard’s assumption and calls Carpenter an “earnest philanthropist.” She argues that Carpenter purposely endorses “The White Women’s Burden” and assumes the responsibility British women have over their Hindoo “sisters.” Burton gives evidence that the sentimental effect Carpenter spreads throughout her work is nothing but an invitation for other Western women to free themselves from the “domestic sphere.” Burton says:

> Many contemporary feminists were convinced that work on behalf of the Indian women helped to demolish the case against female emancipation. As Mary Carpenter put it in 1868, “the devoted work of multitudes of Englishwomen in the great continent shows what our sex can do.”

Burton claims that Carpenter proves her feminist attitudes toward the members of her own sex, initially by helping the Indian women and further by emancipating the British women from the constraints of domesticity.

Besides, Burton argues that nationalism is prevailing in Carpenter’s work. She acknowledges that Carpenter is “well aware of Britain’s empire and often expressed pride in belonging to a nation with worldwide possessions.” Carpenter referred variously to her nation as “our great Oriental empire or our magnificent colonies.” Yet, her nationalist position, Burton asserts, is not historically innocent, “for Marry Carpenter, the empire was considered as nothing less than the natural ground for the practice of British women’s philanthropy for feminism in action.”

Next, Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et l’Extrême-Orient* (1892) has also been reviewed mainly from Francoise Lapeyre and Bénidict Monicat. To begin with, Lapeyre in her work, *Le Roman des Voyageuses Françaises* (2007) traces back the experience of French women...
travelers all around the world. She shows the racist attitudes Bourbonnaud expresses in her work. However, she postulates that although Borbonnaud shows some racism towards the natives, her discourse is not categorical. She says: “parler d’attitude raciste à son propos serait cependant se priver du terme pour d’autre voyageurses qu’elle aurait scandalisées par son appréciation sur Toussaint Louverture.” This statement makes it clear that, despite the incorporation of Orientalist attitudes in her writings, Bourbonnaud is not a fervent racist.

In addition, Lapeyre portrays Bourbonnaud as a tireless “Globetrotter”, with an irrepressible desire to go and discover. She claims that Bourbonnaud reveals herself as a true explorer, capable of enduring with courage the misfortunes of traveling, in contrast to what stereotypes about women may usually suggest: “seule avec des Africains, révélant soudain de varies qualities de voyageuse – audace, curiosité, absence de prejudices.” In addition, she declares that if Bourbonnaud acquires such freedom in her travels, it is because she is a widow. Lapeyre reinforces her claim that men acted as oppressors by saying that “Partir et écrire: double emancipation dans une societé qui veut limiter le territoire des femmes à la vie domestique.” Furthermore, Lapeyre highlights the chauvinistic patriotism which Bourbonnaud proudly shows. In the very first sentence of her chapter “Les globe-trotteuses”, she asserts that “Louise Bourbonnaud n’aime rien tant que la France, et les cent quatre-vingt mille kilomètres qu’elle va parcourir en quatre voyages ne lui vaudront chaque fois qu’une grande joie: celle de rentrer.”

Bénidict Monicat, as well, sheds light criticalaly on Bourbonnaud’s nationalist and feminist attitudes. She asks: “Les voyageuses porte-drapeau est-elle alors aussi porte-parole d’une emancipation feminine.” Monicat reflection on Bourbonnaud’s writing goes on to claim that Bourbonnaud makes use of her writing to grant herself the legitimacy to stand in the public sphere. She says:
(Her writings) élaborent un discours émancipateur centré sur la valeur des femmes [...] Mixtes d’information factuel et de réflexion racistes, les ouvrage de Bourbonnaud articulent l’expérience de la voyageuse dans le contexte d’une entreprise pourvoyeuse d’autorité qui, politique ou narrative, confronte les hiérarchies en place.23

In addition, Monicat highlights the fact that Boubonnaud’s transgression of the public sphere raised disputes, but their simultaneous complicity and resistance offers them the possibility to integrate masculine institutions, where their feminine presence is contained and recognized.

**Issue and Working Hypotheses**

From the above review of literature, we deduce that Both Carpenter and Bourbonnaud have succeeded to introduce gender to the dominating Orientalist male discourse. However, the two authors have not been studied together. Consequently, we engage in comparing the British Mary Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1867) and the French Louise Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et L’Extrême Orient* (1888) in terms of Race, Gender and Nationalism.

In so doing, we aim at highlighting the idea that their appropriation of Orientalist and imperialist discourses is not innocent. We believe that their adhesion and support of the dominating ideologies, produced by male imperialists at that time, is a strategy, Carpenter and Bourbonnaud utilize to take part in the traditionally exclusive Public sphere. In fact, we posit that, by enlisting themselves in the same ideology as men, these two writers guarantee that their recognition and thus their emancipation cannot be rejected by the male sex in particular and by society in general. Furthermore, they remodel tactically the “White Men’s Burden”24 to a “White Women’s Burden”25 and invent themselves a mission to justify their presence in the public sphere and voice their grievances about the inequalities they were experiencing, in a nineteenth century patriarchal society.

Despite the importance of Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s texts, earlier criticism has not deemed it necessary to compare them. The similarity we have drawn from the thematic analysis, in addition to the fact that they write in the same period and belong to the same
literary tradition, their works constitute in our opinion, a valid justification for comparison. Therefore, it will be our primary concern, in this research, to compare Carpenter’s work to Bourbonnaud’s work through a postcolonial perspective, in terms of similarities and differences. The similarities consist of the misrepresentation both authors produced about the Indians and their culture. In addition, we bring to light their support for the Western tradition and their belief in the supposed superiority of the West over the East. The second similarity is the implication of feminist principles in their works by formulating a Western women’s mission to justify their presence in the public sphere. As far as the differences are concerned, we will analyze the engagement of the two writers in the celebration of their respective empires namely the French and the British following the colonial ideologies that were adopted by their countries.

To reach our goal, we divide the discussion of this research paper into three sections. The first focuses on Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s production of Orientalist representations of the natives in India. The second studies the implementation of gender within their Orientalist productions, to show how they succeed to formulate feminist principles in a male dominating context. The third section examines how the writers supported their respective country’s imperialistic ideology and rhetoric to justify their own right to equality.
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II. Methods and Materials:

Methods:

Our theoretical framework rests on the formulation of *Orientalism* (1978) by Edward Said and *Gendering Orientalism* (1996) by Reina Lewis. We assume that *Orientalism* and *Gendering Orientalism* are the most appropriate approaches in carrying out this research because firstly, the writers are Westerners and secondly, they are women writers. Differently put, being evolved in the highest period of imperialism, Carpenter and Bourbonnaud affiliate themselves to the dominating discourse of the time. They support and reproduce the stereotypical images about the Orientals. Yet it is important to note that the authors’ texts are subversive in essence. The gendered aspect embodied in Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s works attests for a determination to negotiate their place in the public sphere through the “killing” of the Victorian “angel in the house”\(^1\) concept.

Said’s *Orientalism* is relevant to our study of the colonial discourse and the celebration of the British and French empires in the two works because it deals with the European superiority which stands as opposed to the inferiority of the Easterners. Said defines Orientalism as “a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between “the Orient” and (most of the time) ‘the occident’”\(^2\). In other words, Orientalism is the process of deliberately expressing ideas related to the existing difference between Europe and the East. He introduced this concept to refer to the Western established ideas about the Orient and to show the Westerners’ strong belief in their superiority. It is assumed that the “ontological and epistemological distinction”\(^2\) of Orientalism makes of the Orient “an object of knowledge”\(^2a\) and thus, it constitutes “the identity of the West”\(^3\). In the same context, Said adds: “The Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience”.\(^4\) This quotation summarizes the kind of representation given to the Orient in Orientalist discourse, a Western representation that sees
the Orientals as the uncivilized race which is in opposition to the civilized Europeans. These Orientalist stereotypes, which show the backwardness of the Orient and its people, enabled the Europeans first to define themselves as superior and civilized, and then to reinforce the idea of their superiority.

Moreover, Said argues that the images of inferiority and backwardness associated with the Orientals are not just simple reflections of what is seen, but they are inscribed in supposed scientific and objective accounts. These misrepresentations are most of the time embodied in travel literature so as to show the backwardness of the Easterners and to maintain them in their inferior position while the West holds the superior one. In this context, Siber argues that for Said the Westerners produce a kind of literature which contains accounts and beliefs about the Orient and the Orientals in order to confirm “the imperial power.”

According to Said, the French and the English Orientalists are the center of power in the process of colonization. In this context, he says: “Orientalism derives from a particular closeness experienced between Britain and France.” However, he asserts that these two empires are extending their territories in a political and cultural clash against each other. This is one idea that we are going to demonstrate in relation to the two works already mentioned.

Despite the fact of being an incredibly fertile ground to investigate Orientalists’ discussion of the West’s relationships with the East, Said’s Orientalism excluded women from his analysis. Thus, since our study is concerned with two women travel writers, we are going to rely on Lewis’s Gendering Orientalism to explore the gendered aspect of Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s works. Lewis’s theory developed in Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity and Representation (1996) is relevant in an attempt to demonstrate that Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s appropriation of Orientalist discourse is deeply affected by their gender.
Lewis takes on Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) as her point of critical departure; she accused him of neglecting the analysis of female discourse in his study of Orientalism pointing out “its myopia about gender and sexual difference.” Lewis claims that an analysis of the Western women’s representations will develop “an understanding of the interdependence of ideologies of race and gender in the colonial discourse of the period.” She points to “the specificity of the female gaze as part of critical movement that has undercut the potentially unified, and paradigmatically male, colonial subject outlined in Said’s *Orientalism* in 1978”. Lewis extricated the differences the “female gaze” presents and challenges the unity of the Orientalist discourse. She argues that women produce a less negative and more tolerant discourse toward the natives in general and the female in particular. She portrays Western women’s involvement in Orientalism as not “pejorative in the totalizing sense characteristic of hegemonic Orientalist discourse”. Such statements shed “light on the internal schisms within the fantasized unity of the sovereign imperial subject” and highlight the specific discourse women did produce in their Orientalism.

Lewis also “has done more than simply annexing woman or gender to Said’s argument”, for she examines more closely the implicit role of imperialism in the life of Western women. Lewis says: “One of my arguments is that imperialism played a role in the very construction of creative opportunities for European women.” She argues that it is due to the imperial movements of exploration that European women succeeded to enter the Public sphere and articulate an emancipative consciousness. In fact, during imperialism, “European women imagined and propelled themselves in the potentially transgressive position of cultural producer” and explorers. Differently put, Lewis’s argument goes on demonstrating how Western women make use of imperialism to get opportunities of traveling and writing in a more public sphere. Their enterprise is characterized by a will to ask for their rights and a desire to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of patriarchy.
Materials

Summary of Carpenter’s Six Months in India (1868).

Six Months in India is a two-volume travel narrative written by Carpenter and published in 1868. The book traces the travels of Carpenter in India that lasted for six months. It details her visits to girls’ school, prisons and mental asylums in several cities of India. She recounts her interest in the elevation of the Indian women. It also includes many aspects of the Indian character and culture. Carpenter describes the Indians with an Orientalist ideology. Her travel started from Bombay where she attended the opening of the railways. There, she depicts the natives as ignorant people because of their belief in superstition. Then, she travelled to reach the cities of Surat and Ahmedabad. Once at Surat, Carpenter does not hide her negative vision of the Indian culture. She criticized the fact that the natives do not have any interest in covering their bodies.

The text begins with Carpenter’s statement that it is not her intention to do some work in India, but her visit is inscribed in a friendly relation. Being advanced by her reputation as a social reformer, Carpenter is asked by the native government to formulate some recommendation to improve the Indian institutions. Her attention has been caught at the sight of the huge inequalities that the Indian rule is imposing on women; she details her analysis of the small number of women attending school and the quality of education they are receiving. Carpenter reinforces the importance of her work among the native women by presenting them as nucleus factor for the development of the Indian nation.

Summary of Bourbonnaud’s Les Indes et l’Extrême Orient (1892)

Les Indes et L’Extrême Orient: Impressions de Voyage d’une Parisienne is a book written by Bourbonnaud and published in 1868. It is divided into fifteen chapters, and each chapter relates her experience in a given Eastern town. Her work is a record of a journey from Bombay to Madras, Pondicherry, Colombo, Singapour, Saigon and then to China and finally
in Japan which enabled Bourbonnaud to discover the hidden life of the Easterners. To reach India, her travel started in a train from Paris to Trieste, and then, in a steamer to Port Said and to Bombay. She expressed her disregard of the bad conditions she has to encounter during her travel. She also criticized the natives and their way of life. Once in Pondicherry, Bourbonnaud states that the Indians are in a degrading state because they still believe in superstition. She also gives comments about the Indians’ laziness which she deduced in their disinterest in working.

Bourbonnaud insists on the danger and demanding experience of travelling for a woman in the nineteenth century. Her records of the hardship she experienced in travelling to the Far East, were to prove her capacity to endure what is seen as a male practice, namely “travelling”. Throughout her work, she describes the natives and their practices with a tone of an ethnographer, expressing her desire to visit and know more about India and its people. Yet, her thirst for knowledge does not constitute the sole objective of her work.
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III. Results and Discussion

After having studied Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1880) and Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et l’Extrême-Orient: Impressions de voyage d’une parisienne* (1892) in the light of Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) and Lewis’s *Gendering Orientalism* (1996), we notice that the two works share three main interrelated issues: Race, Gender and Nationalist Imperialism. Though Carpenter and Bourbonnaud differ in the perspective and the priority they accord to these concerns, the two authors are supportive of the Orientalist and Imperialist ideologies in India. However, they diverge when it comes to the celebration of their own empires.

At the level of race, both Carpenter and Bourbonnaud adopted an Orientalist representation of the Orient and the Orientals. They devote long descriptive passages to evoke the savageness and the dirtiness of people, of their homes, and of the landscape. Concurrently, the writers secure an image of the West which is rational, civilized and Christian. Differently put, we understand that because the writers wrote from the in-group, they demonstrate a “Eurocentric” thought. Hence, it is clearly understandable that Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s objective in the two literary works is to legitimize the European presence in India.

Besides, the positive images they gave of the Oriental women and sympathy in their regards attest of a specific relationship between them and the natives. Even if Carpenter and Bourbonnaud embrace the Orientalist discourse, their gender difference from the male sex, allow them to register racial differences less pejoratively than is Said’s claim. We found that the running thread of our research is drawn from Lewis’s claim that Western women’s appropriation of Orientalist and imperialist ideologies is not historically innocent. Through our analysis of Carpenter and Bourbonnaud works, we understand that they intentionally adopted the Orientalist discourse to formulate their emancipation.
Relying on Said’s discussion of the antagonistic relations between France and Britain in colonial dominions, we note that both Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s works bear the marks of such political and ideological clashes. The authors adhered to the imperialist project of their respective countries; Carpenter supports the British Empire while Bourbonnaud celebrates the French one. Thus, we understand that their nationalities affected their positioning in the imperial debate. In addition, even if both are supportive of the presence of their respective countries in India, Bourbonnaud extended her patriotic feelings to the denigration of the British rule in India.

Chapter One: Orientalist Representations of Indians and Europeans in Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* and Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et l’Extrême Orient*

Travel literature’s purpose in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was to represent Europe as knowing and civilized, and the Orient as ignorant and uncivilized. P. Sharp states that Western travel writing is “formed around various discourses of Otherness”\(^1\). Hence, in their narratives, Western writers disclose representations that reinforce the Orientalist discourse which tends to misrepresent the Orient and its people. Siber in his thesis claims that “The Orient and the Orientals are regarded as inferior to the Westerners, who bestow on themselves with a kind of burden of taking light and civilization to the Orientals”\(^2\). In this quotation, Siber affirms that the East and its people are downgraded to an inferior position by the Westerners who define themselves as superior. He also indicates that Europeans pretend a mission of civilizing the Orient to go to it.

Moreover, Said assumes that the representations associated with the Orientals led the Westerners to widen the chasm between them as being the superior and civilized race and the Orientals as being their contrasting race\(^3\). In fact, those representations are not reflections of a true reality, but they are images which came to define the Orient and Orientals as inferior, backward, and irrational in opposition to the West and its people. The Easterners are
associated with many stereotypes to the point that a Western intervention is needed so as to enlighten and civilize them. It is assumed that the civilizing mission that characterizes the Anglo-Indian colonial relation is a set of “images that show the natives being freed from despotic rule, raised from their ignorance, and saved from cruel and barbarous practices”⁴.

Carpenter and Bourbonnaud reinforce the colonialist discourse which tends to misrepresent the Indians. The natives of India are always seen as ignorant whereas the English and French are seen as civilized. The word “ignorant” which refers to the primitiveness of the natives is the most recurrent in Carpenter’s work. She associates the natives with superstition which is one mark of ignorance and primitiveness. For instance, the inhabitants of Bombay express “a considerable indignation”⁵ at the idea of building a bridge to cross the stream they consider as divine. They argue that the river is held by a goddess and that the construction of the bridge is done in “defiance of the goddess of the river”⁶. Therefore, with the opening of the railway, the natives assemble in the “sacred stream”⁷ to see “its titular divinity execute vengeance on the perpetrators of this impious outrage⁸”. They think that the “sudden stoppage⁹” of a train during the opening of the railways was due to a supernatural appearance that came to revenge the construction of the railways. “The power of the goddess was now manifest to the assembled multitudes; she was about to be avenged¹⁰, they think. When the train succeeds in crossing the bridge again, the natives think it is now due to the power of a God, so they consider the railroad as a God and some began to worship it. This confirms that the Indians are superstitious. The Europeans believe that the natives’ superstition constitute an obstacle to their progress since they refuse the building of a bridges. Carpenter reinforces more clearly her stereotyped vision of the natives of India, by saying: “The railway must indeed appear something supernatural to these ignorant inhabitants¹¹” so as to degrade them. Such instance is made to confirm that the natives are ignorant and to keep them in an inferior position.
Similarly, Bourbonnaudd associates the natives with ignorance which is manifested in their belief in superstition. For instance, the natives of Pondicherry used to burn the widows and the new born girls. They believe that this act is a sacrifice to satisfy their divine gods. This explains that they have a belief in supernatural things. Bourbonnaudd states that the act of burning widows and new born girls started to reduce in this century. In exchange, they kill a large number of sheep in the divine place so as to rejoice the gods. They argue that the Gods now prefer the second manner instead of the former one. The author reinforces more explicitly her stereotyped vision about the natives by saying: “Ces populations, en somme n’ont point l’air féroces, mais plutôt abruties par le fanatisme”\(^\text{12}\), which means that, those populations who do such practices are doomed by fanaticism. Bourbonnaudd uses such expression in order to prove that the natives are ignorant and to degrade them to a very low position.

According to the authors, the backwardness of the Indians manifests not only in their superstition but also in their laziness. Carpenter and Bourbonnaudd affirm that the natives are lazy people who waste their time in their passivity. Both writers assert that the natives of India are not attracted to engage themselves in interesting activities. In this context, Siber affirms that Western writers associate the colonized people with laziness which they use to “denote the extent to which the Orientals need to be integrated into a system that would incite them to work and promote themselves”\(^\text{14}\).

Carpenter describes the Indians as lazy people who have no occupation and prefer to do nothing instead of working. When she arrives to Surat, she is shocked by the fact that people do not work. She is struck by the “air of desolation pervading all the streets”\(^\text{15}\) of Surat which is the result of their laziness. According to Carpenter, Indians do not care of cleaning their streets. For her, because of the Indians’ laziness, the country could never reach its development. She argues that the natives do not react to make their country progress.
are observing with “a dull stupid gaze”\textsuperscript{16} who do nothing but “standing and fixing”\textsuperscript{17} on passengers. “What we saw gave us a far from pleasant impression of a Hindoo city”\textsuperscript{18}, she claims. The natives do not act to flee themselves from the state of primitivism. Therefore, Carpenter states that the situation is “very unpromising”\textsuperscript{19}. With such expressions, Carpenter wants to show the Indians’ laziness and their carelessness about changing their lives. They do not take advantage of the British support for their development.

Similar comments about the laziness of the native population of India are made by Bourbonnaud. She portrays the natives as lazy people because they do not cultivate their land. Therefore, it is the Western workers who manage to do it. In this context, Bourbonnaud says: “chose digne de remarque, les Cyngalais sont trop paresseux pour travailler”\textsuperscript{20}. According to this quote, the natives are careless of accomplishing their duties as workers. This again stands as a mark of their primitiveness and need for European intervention. Moreover, the small amounts of native workers are prisoners who are controlled by soldiers in order not to run away. Bourbonnaud portrays them as lazy people because they do not feel any enjoyment or enthusiasm for the work. She says: “ils sont au moins une soixantaine sous la conduite de quelques gardiens armés de triques à l’usage de ceux qui voudraient s’enfuir ou faire les paresseux”\textsuperscript{21}. These natives cannot work without being controlled because of their laziness. This shows the Easterners’ irresponsibility which maintains them in a degrading state of backwardness.

The backwardness of the Indians is not only manifested in their ignorance and laziness but also in their habits. The Orientalist discourse does not only tend to misrepresent the Indians morally but also denigrates their customs and habits. Siber writes that, among the aspects of the Orientalist discourse, there is the fact of considering “the European culture as opposed to the cultures of the dominated people”\textsuperscript{22}. Moreover, Said states that “the idea of European identity” is considered as being superior and opposed to the “non-European peoples
and cultures. Carpenter and Bourbonnaud follow this tradition in their respective works. They provide a gloomy and negative image of the Indian traditions. The two authors depict the Indian culture as primitive and strange in contrast to the Western culture. Carpenter and Bourbonnaud degrade the status of the Indians and claim that they, most of the time, do not cover their bodies. Both authors state that the natives do not care about wearing cloths and covering their bodies like civilized people do. In this context, Siber and Riche state that “Due to the fact that the ways of these people were different from those of the Westerners, the latter took it as the very sign of their primitivism.” In her travel narrative, Carpenter finds that the native women are “wholly devoid of any feeling of delicacy” because they came to public places with “their bodies uncovered”. This kind of behavior demonstrates that the natives have no respect to the society they live in. They are primitive to the extent that they do not wear clothe. Carpenter describes this habit as being strange and inelegant. They are careless of wearing cloths, and they do not care about the way they are viewed by the Westerners. This habit of not covering their bodies demarks them from the civilized Europeans. In addition, Carpenter goes far to associate the Moplahs with savageness which is manifested in the fact that they show no interest in covering their bodies. She describes them as “half-naked” people who bring knives with them. Here she draws a picture of their savageness to affirm that they are completely different from the Europeans. Siber and Riche quoting Regis Stella affirm that “nakedness was the other major marker employed by Europeans to define indigenous people as savages.”

Similarly, Bourbonnaud believes that the natives of India have backward habits. Like Carpenter, Bourbonnaud states that the inhabitants of India neglect covering their bodies. To quote Bourbonnaud: “Il n’y a que des indigènes tous nus qui grimpent dans les arbres comme des singes, animaux auxquels ils ressemblent par plus d’un point,” we understand that there are only unclothed indigenous people who climb trees like monkeys, animals to whom they
widely resemble. From this quotation, it is clear that Bourbonnaud depreciates the scene she has seen in Saigon. She relates the natives with animals to distinguish them from the civilized Europeans and to emphasize the idea of their primitiveness. Siber and Riche argue that “nakedness is a colonial stereotype that stands metonymically for primitivism”\textsuperscript{29}. Bourbonnaud does not only associate the natives to monkeys but she also insists on the fact that there are many points that make them similar to monkeys. She uses such stereotyped images to mark the extent to which the Indians are backward and to insist on the importance of the European presence so as to humanize them.

Besides, Carpenter and Bourbonnaud place the natives of India in an inferior position and consider them as servants. Reformulate For both authors, the Indians are born to be servants for their English masters. The duties of the natives are concerned with keeping the house clean, preparing food and serving it to their masters. Carpenter, in her work, openly indicates how the Indians serve the British assistants. She says: “The table was spread as in an English gentleman’s house, and, except the presence of Hindoo servants, there was little to remind me that I was separated from my native land”\textsuperscript{30}. It is clear that Carpenter is served by the natives who work for her and who present the only elements that make her feel she is not in her own country. The natives work as servants in order to obey their masters’ orders. Carpenter does not express any astonishment about the natives who work as servants of the white men, for she believes that this is the fate of the Indians. Throughout her text, it is clear that no name is given to those servants. They remain nameless in the eyes of their masters. Carpenter, despite her sympathy with Indian women, does not show any curiosity to ask for their names. She only refers to them as “servants”. What is important for her is only the fact of receiving hospitality from them.

In addition, Carpenter makes it clear that the good education of children is the one which comes from their European and Aristocratic mothers, instead of the servants. The
children of rich families are taken care of by servants, while those who belong to poor families are educated by their mothers. The author believes that the Indians remain in a backward stage because of the “baneful influence of the ignorant, and not infrequently vicious, servants and maidservants” who are given the task of bringing up the children. According to her, it is inappropriate to give for servants the role of taking care of children because of their ignorance which can easily be transmitted to those children. However, Indians prefer to let their children to be educated by servants. The Indian’s barbarity and their indifference to men’s life make them consider servants as suitable to do this task because of their indifference to men’s life and their barbarity.

To maintain the stereotyped view of Orientals, Carpenter sees the servants as a barbaric race because of their confused habits. For instance, when a servant was asked to take something for the author, he “puts it down at a short distance” from Carpenter, and then, “quickly retreated” himself. Carpenter describes this act as a backwrad custom that stresses the distance between the Westerners as masters and the natives as slaves.

The idea that the natives of India are inferior and submissive to the Westerners is also recurrent in Bourbonnaud’s work. The author sheds light on the relationship that exists between Europeans and Indians as a relation of master/slave. The natives are portrayed as servants who work in obedience to the Westerners. The author owns a number of servants who obey her orders correctly. She says: “Une nuée- c’est le mot- de serviteurs envahit ma chambre ; on vient faire le ménage et ce n’est pas une petite affaire, ah, mais non ! D’abord, je demande que l’on change les draps de lit…” It is clear that Bourbonnaud does nothing but ordering the servants to keep her room clean. She also does not care of naming her servants. She always refers to them as “mon domestique”, meaning my servant. They remain unnamed and the only thing they are used for is to obey the orders of their masters.
Both Carpenter and Bourbonnaud use aspects of “mimicry” in their writing so as to mock the natives of India and to maintain them in an inferior position. Bhabha, advancing the idea of mimicry in colonial discourse, defines it as an ironic and elusive strategy which deciphers the relation between the colonized and the colonizer to be one of powerlessness and power. “The discourse of mimicry”36, he says, “is constructed around ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference”37. Carpenter focuses her description on the natives who work in Government under European control. She says about them that they “wear neat white clothing”38 when they are “on duty, or visiting the English”39. She comments on this act as being “essential to proper self-respect”40. The encounter with such natives who correctly cover their bodies is seen by Carpenter as a habit that makes those individuals different from the barbarians of India. Not only do they cover their bodies, but they do it in the European way of clothing. However, Carpenter believes that those natives who try to resemble to Europeans are at an inferior position because “on other occasions, they indulge themselves in native freedom from the restraints of clothing”41. She considers them as primitive people despite the efforts they make in order to resemble the white men.

Bourbonnaud speaks about a native gentleman who is getting married. She says that he is “Un indien tout à fait civilisé et instruit”41. He works as a representative of the hotel’s chief. Then, she adds: “il est vêtu à l’Européenne”42. It is believed that “The nakedness of the natives gives the colonial an opportunity to incorporate in them cloth that would bind them forever as ruler and ruled”42. Bourbonnaud, through her description, shows the extent to which the natives can become “mimic” of the behavior of their white masters. She asserts that the native worker wears convenient cloths and masters eight languages; he is literate and talented with civility. Generally, the natives of India are not associated with such images. Since the gentleman gives importance to his image, he is not referred to with stereotypes of
nakedness and dirtiness. However, despite all the efforts he makes to be like a civilized white man, the native worker cannot reach this position. He is appointed to work as an agent during the absence of his boss, but he cannot be the boss. This is due to the generalized stereotypes of barbarism which are associated with Indians. It is believed that mimicry results in a difference between the colonized and the colonizer\textsuperscript{43}. It endeavors to make of the ‘other’ a normalized subject, but it always constructs an ambiguity by making a space for subversion\textsuperscript{44}. Bhabha acknowledges that the ambivalence of mimicry is a result that is “almost the same, but not quite”\textsuperscript{45}. This means that when the colonized “mimic[s]” the colonizer, the result is never equal to those who had been mimicked. For both writers, the civility of some natives is related to the success of the European’s civilizing mission, which helped them to learn some enlightening habits.

Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s descriptions of Indians are stereotypes made to place the Occident higher than the Orient. Both writers reflect the certitude of European dominance in their works and describe Europe as superior to India and its people. Carpenter is convinced of the generosity of the European mission in India. Therefore, in order to put emphasis on the European efforts there, she glorifies the fact that they encourage the natives to do a good work. As she speaks about the Public Library, she says that it “appears in progress to be a very good and complete”\textsuperscript{46} library, thanks to the natives who work under “European encouragement and help”\textsuperscript{47}. She even acknowledges that the European government, with its system of ruling furnishes efforts to the development of India and the progress of its people. Here is, for instance, an example through which she pays tribute to Europe and its people who are living in India:

It is a happy thought that our nation has been the means of bringing this about; that our government has, even with defects and shortcomings, conceived and executed so wise a system of ruling; that our people, with all their faults, have been the means of carrying it out, and of kindly giving a stimulus and aid to those who require it\textsuperscript{48}. 
This is, of course, part of Carpenter’s desire to justify their occupation by the inability of the natives to work without European help. Carpenter’s attempt is to show the enormous difference between the ‘lazy’ natives and the ones who take advantage from the European stimulation and aid. This is a way for Europeans to justify their quest to enlarge their territories and power as having duty over the primitive Indians under what is known as the “civilizing mission”.

As for Bourbonnaud, she highlights the idea of the necessity of Western presence in India, so as to improve the way of life of Indians and end their primitiveness. Regarding the Indian culture as primitive, Bourbonnaud states that the presence of European ideas has helped to put an end for some barbaric actions such as the abolition of slavery, as a way to value the European presence. She says:

Cependant, sous l’influence des idées Européennes, ces barrières formidables s’abaissent peu à peu ; l’abolition de l’esclavage, en supprimant la vente de l’homme, a relevé en quelque sorte les Hindous des basses castes à leurs propres yeux. This quotation proves what has already been said above. Bourbonnaud believes that the presence of Europeans has somewhat civilized them. Respectively, Carpenter and Bourbonnaud celebrate the Western intervention in India. The necessity of European presence is expressed in different fields by both writers.

Said argues that Orientalist representations maintain the Orient as Europe’s contrastive image. Therefore, the gloomy representation of India as backward and primitive by Carpenter and Bourbonnaud implies their representation of Britain and France, or generically Europe as civilized. Carpenter begins her travelogue by drawing attention to “civilized Europe”. She then moves to her own country which she associates with “civilized life” and “true light”. Bourbonnaud is no less different from her. She celebrates French civilization. She uses the notion of “notre civilization modern”. She then, moves to describe the mission the French claimed in their colonial expansion. She writes: “Je retrouverai sur ma route d’autres contrées ou ma chère patrie a planté son drapeau dans les plis desquels elle apporte la
civilization et la liberté\textsuperscript{55}. The two authors do not go deeper into describing civilized Europeans, British and French. As we have shown, they expand their Orientalist representations on Indians and other Orientals. They, however, celebrate the missionary work implemented by the French and the British in India. This aspect of their work will be analyzed in the last chapter.
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Chapter two: Gendering the Orientalist Discourse in the two Works.

After having analyzed Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* (1880) and Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et l’Extrême-Orient: Impressions de voyage d’une parisienne* (1892) through the Orientalist perspective, this chapter explores the imbrications of feminist principles in the two texts under study. Our aim is to demonstrate that Carpenter and Bourbonnaud incorporate gender in their predominantly Orientalist discourse. Our concern is not simply to see their accounts as a mere reflection of their gender but also to locate feminist attitudes in their appropriation of Orientalist discourse. To prove our assumption, we are going to rely on Lewis’s theory developed in her *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity and Representation* (1996). The present chapter deals with two aspects. The first relates to “the specificity of the female gaze”¹¹ in their portrayal of the non-Western women as “helpless, degraded victims”¹² in need for help and to show how their Orientalist gaze is inscribed in a feminist and emancipative scope. The second relates to how the two authors “propelled themselves into the potentially transgressive position”³ of travelers and travel writers and demonstrate more closely the “implicit role imperialism played in the very construction of the professional creative opportunities for European women.”⁴

Lewis focuses on “representations by women” themselves rather than the Orientalist images *of* women.”⁵ She acknowledges that Western “women did produce imperialist images”⁶, yet she adds that they “[retain] a sense of difference from the Orient […] that is not necessarily registered as pejorative in the totalizing sense characteristic of hegemonic Orientalist discourse.”⁷ In contrast to Said’s view that all Westerners produce Orientalist images, Lewis demonstrates “the inappropriateness of such totalizing explanations.”⁸ She argues that because of their gender difference, Western women are not as Orientalist as men. Lewis’s assumption explains the fact that they express sympathy toward the Indian women.
In a nutshell, Lewis agrees that the Western women adhere to the imperial ideology, but the way they articulate their Orientalist ideas differs from the way Western male writers do. She explains:

Women’s differential, gendered access to the positionalities of imperial discourse produced a gaze on the Orient and the Orientalized ‘other’ that registered difference less pejoratively and less absolutely than was implied by Said’s original formulation.⁹

Accordingly, throughout her work, Carpenter provides a positive portrayal of the Indian women. In her visits to the girls’ school, she notices that “The students show much proficiency in all the different subjects”¹⁰. She carries on saying that “in arithmetic the Hindoo are peculiarly adepts”¹¹. This statement gives a picture of rather bright Indian women. Carpenter goes further saying that the students manifested “an attention and good conduct, as well as intelligence, rarely witnessed in England in a large school.”¹² Carpenter shows her sympathy once again toward the Indian women in her visit to Bombay. She speaks of an Indian widow that initiates the subject of female education with high regards and consideration. She says “she is a superior woman”¹³ (Bold ours) and considers her as one of her “Hindoo sisters”¹⁴. Carpenter proclaims that the object of her coming to India was “without any other motive than a desire to manifest a friendly sympathy to them [native women]”¹⁵. She gives them gifts and tried to interact despite the fact that the Hindoo women cannot speak a word of English. Such behavior reveals the specificity of Carpenter’s gaze towards the Indian women.

Lewis rightly insists that “gender, as a differentiating term, was integral to the structure of [Orientalist] discourse and individual experience of it”¹⁶. Because Carpenter is a woman, she shows consideration and compassion toward the other members of her own sex. In a formal meeting with the Indian women, Carpenter says: “I went among them [the native women] endeavoring to make my friendly feelings understood.”¹⁷ She writes that “It was impossible of course, to interchange many ideas with her or with any other native ladies, but
the sympathy and kindness which were reciprocated between us were valued in each side.”

It is clearly indicated that Carpenter is interested in the education of the Indian women, which she considers an important way to free them from inferiority and backwardness.

Similar remarks about the effectiveness of the “female gaze” are embodied in Bourbonnaud’s text. Bourbonnaud encompasses a “gendered gaze” in her writing and focuses on the physical description of the Oriental women rather than on their intellectual aptitudes. She says: “j’aperçois une vieille bonne femme” meaning, “I saw an old good woman.” She is old but still appears beautiful. The use of the adjective “good” connotes a myriad of positive images that come to the reader’s mind. In another situation, Bourbonnaud describes the Oriental women going to a ball. The picture she draws gives us the impression of a European scene, with elegant dresses and graceful manners that leave Bourbonnaud with charming impressions, saying: “Dans une voiture découverte arrivent deux femmes annamites […] Elles sont en grande toilette, jupe de soie rose et corsage vert.” Bourbonnaud gives a different picture of the Oriental women as we find less of the image of dirty, nude and ignorant women. She also says: “Les femmes aussi sont fort belles […] Je retrouve ici également ces grands yeux noirs, doux et profonds.” It is true that the Oriental women have long been seen as the embodiment of sensuality, but Bourbonnaud’s depiction of their beauty is loaded with a desire to give a rather positive and dignified image of the Oriental women. She says that they have gracious manners and are admirable as mothers. She states: “Ce que j’admire toujours par exemple, c'est la manière toute gracieuse dont les femmes, couchées dans le hamac, bercent leur bébé étendu auprès d'elles.” Bourbonnaud’s appreciation and wonder for the Oriental woman and mother is the legitimate respect and support that can only come from another woman of whatever country, religion or culture. It is a kind of a universal sisterly protective and caring instinct, a maternal sensitivity. This admiration Bourbonnaud
feels for the Oriental woman is the legitimate respect and support a woman can sense toward the members of her own sex.

Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s interest in the native women’s condition does not only manifest in the positive portrayal of their education and their physique but also in aspects of the Indian culture that limit their freedom and social condition. Both writers explore the idea of early marriage of the Indian women which they consider as an awful habit. In her travelogue, Carpenter reports on the terrible conditions in which Indian women are living and particularly calls attention to their seclusion. She says: “in that city no lady is ever allowed to come out in public, and in the house it is considered indecorous for a gentlemen to speak to his wife, or even to notice her, in presence of strangers.”

Carpenter denounces the confinement of women to domestic sphere where they are subservient and invisible.

Carpenter also informs the reader that the ill-treatment of women extends over young girls who are forced to get married at an early age. She says: “marriage may be celebrated only once in twelve years. This involves the necessity of performing the first marriage or betrothal when the child is an infant.”

Bernard gives the following analysis of Carpenter’s work:

[
the Indian women
They must rise early and go late to bad, eat the worst of food and act as servants [...] and as they commonly become mothers at twelve and grandmothers at Twenty-five they appear withered old women when they ought only to have reached their prime. Ordinarily betrothed in infancy, should their fiancé die even before marriage has taken place, they are still locked on as widows, and widowhood is the culmination of female misery, for all in that state are condemned to the utmost neglect and privation, utterly hopeless, since remarriage is strictly forbidden.

From the above quotation, we understand that Carpenter in her work denounces early marriage for young girls. She considers those girls as victims of their degrading culture because of which they remain in an inferior condition. Carpenter expresses her sympathy with the Indian women who are victims of early marriage so as to show the primitiveness of the Indian culture.
In another situation, Carpenter reports on the terrible conditions in which the Hindoo women are living. She says; “there were some miserable women employed in drudgery work.” The author associates the Indian women with misery which she explains by their integration in drudgery work. Accordingly, Burton in her analysis declares that Carpenter says that the Indian women “in the harem were imprisoned an idle in the sunless, airless rooms all day long.” She clearly identifies the fact that the Indian Women are represented almost invariably as helpless, degraded victims of religious customs and uncivilized cultural practices.

Similarly, in her *Les Indes et L'Extrême Orient* Bourbonnaud puts emphasis on denouncing the practice of marrying young girls. She highlights the injustices of such traditional practices and categorizes them as being pagan and uncivilized. She reports:

Les païens sont divisés ici en plusieurs sectes ; dans l'une d'elles l'homme ne peut se marier qu'une fois. Il demande sa femme en mariage au berceau mais il ne peut l'emmener dans sa maison que quand elle a atteint l'âge de la puberté. Néanmoins, si l'époux vient à mourir avant cette époque la pauvre épouse est condamnée à rester veuve jusqu'à la fin de ses jours!

Bourbonnaud expresses her sadness at the sight of such pagan practices and sympathizes with the unfortunate Indian women. She feels pity for them and considers them as victims of their own traditions. Once more, in a greatly expressive dialogue, she expresses her consternation when she hears of a five-year old child who is already married. Her astonishment is a proof of the horrifying feelings such practices inspires her. She questions:

— Mariée ? A cinq ans ?
— Mais oui ! c'est l'usage ici ; et son époux a douze ans, mais on ne lui donnera sa femme que lorsqu'elle sera nubile. Pauvres enfants ! Voilà où je reconnais l'utilité des sœurs et des missionnaires pour civiliser tout ce monde-là.

This quotation summarizes the despairing situation to which women are confronted in India because of their customs and religion. Bourbonnaud believes that the female sex in India is subject to mistreatment. She criticizes the early marriage and considers it as a primitive custom. She argues that this nation is in need for European Christians and missionaries so as to civilize them. In fact, European feminists deliberately cultivated the civilizing
responsibility as their own modern womanly burden because it affirmed an emancipated role for them in the imperial nation.\textsuperscript{31} Besides, both authors portray Indian views on women as primitive in order to legitimize the European intervention and to put an end to the barbarous practices.

Accordingly, Carpenter expresses her duty toward the “the benighted women of [her] Queen’s vast empire”\textsuperscript{32}. She joins the work of feminists who deliberately cultivated this responsibility because it attributed them an active role in the imperial affairs. She says: “I felt grieved and shocked that in any part of the British dominions, women who were rendered helpless by being deprived of liberty, and thus fell under our [British women] special responsibility.”\textsuperscript{33} This sentence perfectly illustrates Carpenter’s feelings toward her Indian “sisters”\textsuperscript{34}. She presents the Indian women as “helpless victim[s]”\textsuperscript{35} with no opportunity of work. She says: “There were no female attendants, and indeed no attempt appeared to be made to improve their wretched condition”\textsuperscript{36}. Carpenter carries on by presenting a religious argument which calls for the inclusion of Indian women in the public sphere and emancipate them from the thralldom of their customs. She argues:

However clever and well-qualified male officials may be – however devoted to their duty, and anxious to discharge it well,- they cannot understand, or do if comprehended, the work of a woman, any one of the other sex can take the place of a man. Our Heavenly father has created the tow sexes with different powers, and for different spheres of work, in his world. One cannot take the duties of another without disturbing the order of his providence. A man cannot comprehend the proper work of a woman.\textsuperscript{37}

Here, Carpenter provides a strong argument for the necessity of introducing women in the public sphere. She relies on a religious validation to highlight the fact that women cannot be replaced by men, and each has a special responsibility.

It is agreed that theater “is the mirror of human existence”.\textsuperscript{37a} Bourbonnaud draws analogy between theater and real life to denounce the exclusion of women in the public sphere. She says; “Comme toujours, les rôles de femmes sont tenus par des hommes revêtus du costume féminin.”\textsuperscript{37b} The fact that the roles of women are taken by male in theater reveals
their exclusion in the real theater, life. Through her metaphor, Bourbonnaud implicitly attracts attention implicitly to the inequalities from which women suffer in a male dominated environment. In addition, Bourbonnaud encourages the presence of Indian women in the public space. She presents the case of women in India who are the commanders of boats. She says: “à chaque extrémité se trouve une plateforme où se tient celui ou plutôt celle qui manœuvre le bateau, car il est à remarquer que c'est très souvent une femme qui fait l'office de pilote.” Bourbonnaud uses rhetoric to attract attention to the identity of the commander of the boat. At the beginning, she said purposefully “celui” to contradict this traditional view and say “celle”. By using this rhetorical device the writer attracts attention about the fact that it is a woman who takes charge of commending the boat and not a man. By asserting that it is a woman that undertakes what can be considered as a male work, Bourbonnaud demonstrates that gendered classification of jobs is just a matter of culture and that the supposed inferiority of women is not scientifically sustainable.

However, we have strong evidence that Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s argumentation goes on upholding women’s presence in the public space and not in the domestic one. As in Lewis’s formulation, when European female writers gained entry to the imperial dominions their Orientalist writings offered “a feminized vision of the Orient” on which they transposed “Western concepts of femininity and domesticity.” In fact, most Victorian women were restricted to “home-based work” as the Indian women in the Orient. At this level, we understand that the Western women are drawing a parallel with their Eastern sisters in relation to their gender-specific restrictions on women’s activities at work, and at politics. Thus, this portrayal of the Oriental domesticity as analogy for the Western domesticity reinforces the authors’ vindication of emancipation and their quest for equal rights at home. Some Western women formulated a “White women’s Burden” to gain power in the public sphere to legitimize themselves as responsible and important imperial citizens. Thus, the
arguments Carpenter and Bourbonnaud are formulating on the emancipation of the Indian woman are also valid and work for their own emancipation.

The assumption that the Western women use the wretched condition of the Indian women to articulate their own emancipation is clearly demonstrated in Carpenter’s work. Carpenter undertakes the mission of elevating the condition of native women in India. She says that it is “most desirable and absolutely necessary for female education in Guzerat, to have a Normal Training School for female teachers”\(^{42}\). It may be clear that such an enterprise aims at helping the native women of India. Yet carpenter reports that “there was no female teacher”\(^{43}\) in India, so who are to be the teachers of the Indian women since none of them did receive any training on teaching English? It is at this moment that the white women intervene in their “White woman’s Burden” to help the native women but also to secure for themselves (the western women) a working post in the public space. The logical means Carpenter finds to have English female teachers is to get these teachers directly from England. She reports that Mr. Curtis, the educational inspector, “fully agreed in the importance of providing for a supply of female teachers, in the same manner as this has been done successfully for male teachers.”\(^{44}\) This portrays a strategic opening that Carpenter used to help her sisters in Britain to be freed from the chaining domesticity. Implicitly put, Carpenter reveals her hidden intention to emancipate her countrywomen. According to Burton, Victorian and Edwardian feminists such as Carpenter relied on images of an enslaved and primitive “Oriental womanhood” in need of liberation at the hands of their emancipated British “sisters”. She says:

Mary Carpenter’s visit to India in 1860’s and 1870’s and the emphasis she gave to the importance of Indian female education were also crucial in “opening up” the colonies as a field for British women’s social reformer. Especially given the premium she placed on the opportunities that India provided for women training as professional teachers in Britain.\(^{45}\)

Burton argues that Western women instrumentalize native women: “at different times and in different ways the possibility of the systemic exploitation of the feminized colonial
other was a prerequisite for progressive developments in gender relations at home. This means that the power they gained in foreign lands allowed them to improve their position in Europe.

We conclude that Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s Orientalist images are influenced by their gender and condition. They present a gaze on the Oriental woman that portrays them as victims in need for help. Both authors retain a sense of sympathy and compassion toward the members of their own sex. The gendered discourse the Western women deployed is a means to authorize their presence in the East. They create for themselves a mission to justify their intrusion in the public space by including the “White Women’s Burden” in their texts. This helps to formulate their own emancipation as Western women. Carpenter sought opportunities for independence through educating the native woman and Bourbonnaud went to the colonies to transplant French culture and values and prove her capacity as a woman.

As we have already demonstrated Carpenter and Bourbonnaud take on the imperial civilizing mission to formulate their own emancipation, but they also take advantage of the British and French geo-political expansions to travel, write and enter the public sphere. Carpenter and Bourbonnaud lived in a period when “ideas about gender variously restricted the educational opportunities open to uprising women writers, the forms and techniques they could use, the subjects they could cover and their opportunities for exhibition and publication.” Yet both authors “propelled themselves into the potentially transgressive position of cultural producer” and revealed their emancipative consciousness regarding the social Victorian constraints.

In fact, one particular trait of the Victorian Age is the presence of women travelers and, implicitly, of travel literature written by women in the public sphere. Nancy Fraser argues that marginalized groups are excluded from the universal public sphere. She claims that the public sphere is, in fact, constituted of a “number of significant exclusions,” a
sphere long regarded as men’s domain whereas women were supposed to occupy the private/domestic sphere.\textsuperscript{50} In the nineteenth century, women’s general destinies and duties were to be good wives and caring mothers. However, at the highest stage of imperialism, some women embarked on travels and challenged such assumptions that women are too weak to endure long travels as men do. Some began to travel for many personal and political reasons; a number of women sought to vindicate a cause, like missionary work, while others traveled to satisfy personal curiosities for “exotic” lands. Most women, however, traveled to escape gender oppression in Europe.\textsuperscript{51} Traveling in the nineteenth century were far from being a pleasant experience, for “traveling any distance was both slow and difficult.”\textsuperscript{52} Women were generally not permitted to travel under the pretext that they are too weak to endure voyages. Consequently, by travelling Carpenter and Bourbonnaud challenged such assumptions. They proved their strength rather than weakness and empowered themselves.

Carpenter in her travelogue focuses on the hardships women can endure while travelling to India. Burton reports that Carpenter “was one of the few British female reformers who actually traveled to India in the Victorian period.”\textsuperscript{53} This proclamation highlights the particularity of Carpenter’s enterprise. She states that even after enduring quarantine and survived “the danger of infection”\textsuperscript{54} the “troubles, however, were not yet begun.”\textsuperscript{55} She says:

One poor lady was very ill and passed a night of agony on the narrow wooden benches, groaning piteously; the poor children were of course full of discomfort, which they expressed after their own peculiar fashion […] No comfort of any kind could be procured, few could obtain even snatches of broken sleep. Thus we passed the night.\textsuperscript{56}

Carpenter also reports on the sore weather conditions may wreak the travelers. She claims: “the intense heat we should have to encounter was much feared […] we were thus prepared for something very trying for our health.”\textsuperscript{57} These conditions are so difficult to bear that no one can endure them. She asserts: “One passenger felt the heat more than she can bear […] she became worse and worse … [and] soon breathed her last.”\textsuperscript{58} In addition to the intolerable heat that leads to the death of a passenger, she adds: “[our] Sabbath calm was somewhat
interrupted in the afternoon by a slight alarm of fire […] it appeared that some injury was
done.” Thus, she clearly highlights the fact that traveling is indeed a demanding experience
either for men or women, so being able to endure all the hardships of travelling goes against
patriarchal views of women’s weakness.

Likewise, Bourbonnau depicts traveling as a troublesome experience and highlights
her courage and merit by enduring it. She dedicates a whole chapter to report on the
suffocating heat of the East. She says: “il fait une chaleur encore plus accablante que les
jours précédents, est un véritable étouffoir; on suffoque littéralement.” Bourbonnau
emphasizes the difficulty of travelling, and she recognizes the fact of over telling her troubles.
She confesses: “Oh ! qu’il fait chaud C’est un désagréable refrain que je me vois obligée de
repeater”. After the unbearable heat, she aggravates the tone of her accounts by retelling the
dramatic experience she survives at sea:

Au matin, quand il s’agit de s’habiller, c’est une autre chose! J’ai toutes les peines du monde à
mettre mes vêtements, et pendant que je cherche, sans y parvenir, à boutonner mes bottines, je
suis violemment projetée sur la modeste étagère qui a la prétention d’orner le réduit qui
semble être une bosse au front […] Le lendemain, vendredi, même temps que la
veille. Que diriez-vous! pire encore, si cela se peut. Je suis anéantie et ne saurais ni boire, ni
manger […] De violente secousse, combinée avec un tremblement de l’hélice qui
probablement s’est trouvée un instant hors de l’eau, me fait croire que tout est fini, que le
paquebot fait naufrage et que nous allons être tous engloutis.”

In her review of Bourbonnau, Lapeyre depicts the terrible conditions the author was
enduring. She says: “[elle] reprend la mer pour des jours et des jours de dans les
tempêtes.” She also acknowledges that Bourbonnau remains courageous and shows self-
control in front of all the misfortunes she undergoes. She says “révélant soudain de vrais
qualités de voyageuse – audace, curiosité, absence de préjugés”. In fact, by enduring the
hardship of voyage, Bourbonnau dismantles the stereotypes of the European women who
“would be stoical, motherly submissive and chaste” as well poor and weak creatures only
made to rear children and stay at home as good wives. As a woman, she proves her capacity
in going through experiences that were once considered exclusively male and succeeds to
make a rift in the wall separating women from the public sphere, what plainly highlights her feminist attitudes.

Carpenter acknowledges the hardship she confronts while traveling, but at the same time she draws attention to the fact that she could endure it. At her arrival to India, she says: “For myself I may bear witness that, looking back on this voyage now after my return home, I do not remember having found this part of it peculiarly unpleasant.” She tells her audience, particularly men, that she can be strong enough to endure the hardship of voyage. Besides, she says that when traveling in India women “were comfortably seated in one of the first-class carriages, which on the Indian railways, are very large and commodious.” Such declarations may be perceived as contradictory, but, in fact, as a feminist, Carpenter worked to incite other visitors and mainly women to travel. Indira Ghose declares in her *Women Travelers in Colonial India* that “Traveling provided women with immediate empowerment.” Her statement proved that Carpenter and Bourbonnaud as travelers were hailed for their advancement of feminism. Their traveling and resistance to the hardships of voyage demolished the gender stereotypes and opened them to the public space where they could vindicate their equality to men.

In addition to proving their physical ability to resist hardship, women write accounts of their travels to emphasize their extrication form the domestic sphere. In fact, one form of gender oppression had manifested in scholarly and scientific writing where women scholars were not taken seriously and were generally excluded from. This is part of the larger goal of *Gendering Orientalism* to investigate “the role of white European women as cultural agents.” Lewis claims that “women were not imagined to have the intellectual, philosophical, or visionary qualities required for creative endeavours.” Any creative energy they may have should be directed to “their innate maternal vocation.” So any women who wanted publically to produce and publish works was “contravened several codes of class and
gender-appropriate behavior”\textsuperscript{73}. These restrictions explain women’s endeavor to voice themselves through writing as a way to take part in the public sphere where relations of power are formulated and negotiated. Carpenter and Bourbonnaud “put pen to paper, and they have done so while trekking to every corner of the world.”\textsuperscript{74} They make use of their talent to enter and legitimize their presence in the public sphere.

Accordingly, in the very first sentence of her travelogue, Carpenter gives justification for her writings and shows the importance of the knowledge she is producing while traveling to India. She says:

> It was not my intention, when I went to India, to write an account of my travels [however] Circumstances recorded in the following narrative, led me to modify my original intention, and greatly extended my sphere of observation. The light afforded me by my past experience, as well as the sympathy in my work of the Supreme Government and that of each Presidency, and the friendly confidence of the native inhabitants enabled me, in my brief visit, to see and learn much which does not usually come under the notice of travelers.”\textsuperscript{75}

Carpenter draws attention to the knowledge she is going to bring back to Britain and highlights the importance of her enterprise. She explains that it is due to circumstances recorded there that she modified her original intention. Therefore, she places herself in the place of a knowledge producer; she shifts from a “friendly visit” to an agent with an “extended sphere of observation.”\textsuperscript{76} Moreover, she is not just writing, but she compares her impressions with “those of official gentlemen, and of experienced residents in the country, and thus [for] correcting or strengthening them.”\textsuperscript{77} By doing so, she gives authority to her writing and elevates them to the astute of male writings, a position that was not allowed for them at that time. She states overtly:

> On my return to England, it appeared to those how are most desirous to benefit India, that an important means of drawing attention to that great country would be lost, if I did not record my observations and impressions for publication. On reflection, I accorded with this opinion, and now respectfully offer to my countrymen and countrywomen these volumes for their kind consideration.\textsuperscript{78}

Clearly, Carpenter states the magnitude of the knowledge she brings and alludes to her readiness to share it, or more appropriately to bargain it. As a woman, she has no access to the
public sphere, so she uses the knowledge she acquires while travelling to voice herself in a male-dominated environment.

In her writings, Carpenter “observes” in an objective way. She says: “I must not allow my mind to be influenced by the representations of individual, however intelligent or however long they had resided in India.” She presents herself as a true and independent seeker of truth. She receives divergent viewpoints from male residents in India; some argue that they can train the natives while some others affirm that “it is impossible to train these people.” Carpenter, on her side, is “determined to remain in the position [she] had chosen, that of a learner.” She emphasizes her independence in the constitution and distribution of knowledge. Therefore, it is clear that Carpenter’s writings are inscribed “in a process of empowerment of women” through its participative mode.

Bourbonnaud lived in a period when women were not permitted to intervene in politics. In *Les Indes et l’Extrême-Orient*, she highlights the importance of producing knowledge and shows how women travel writings are inscribed in a scientific, transgressive and emancipative scope. Bourbonnaud strategically uses her writings to discuss implicitly political matters. She reports “Je soupçonne fort le gouvernement de sa gracieuse majesté de faire au profit des musées londoniens, rafle de tous les objets curieux collectionnés par les musées coloniaux.” By denouncing the English dubious practices, Bourbonnaud calls attention on the valuable data she is collecting. The knowledge she brings confirms her legitimacy to intervene in politics. In addition she constantly proclaims her intellectual curiosity, and stresses her desire to acquire knowledge. She says:

Je ne me plais pas dans le monde. Ce que je veux m’instruire, c’est savoir, c’est m’ouvrir au milieu de larges horizons, voyager et voyager bien loin, voir la planète, c’est-à-dire voir les mers et les terres nouvelle, presque inconnues.84a

Monicat asks the following question in her analysis of Bourbonnaud’s writing experience: “are the writings of women travelers more linked to a desire for knowledge ‘connaissance’ or
of recognition ‘reconnaissance’?

(Translation ours) Monicat’s reflection goes on to reveal the real intentions of Bourbonnaud in her quest for knowledge. She argues that due to her writings Bourbonnaud initiates a reflection around the written productions of women in a context which seems to be problematic and that Bourbonnaud’s writings and acquisition of valuable knowledge are inscribed in a desire to affirm her legitimacy to acquire power in the public sphere. She explains:

Ces écrits témoignent en tout cas d’une tension entre l’affirmation d’un savoir et la légitimation d’une expérience qui fait de la science un outil du pouvoir collectif et exprime le désir de connaissance selon un modèle héroïque de relation au monde. Ils élaborent un discours émancipateur centré sur la valeur des femmes […] Mixtes d’information factuel et de réflexion racistes, les ouvrage de Bourbonnaud articulent l’expérience de la voyageuse dans le contexte d’une entreprise pourvoyeuse d’autorité qui, politique ou narrative, confronte les hiérarchies en place.  

In addition to her writings, Bourbonnaud is among the founders of the Geographical Society of Paris. Her belonging to a government institution helped to place her writings directly in the public sphere where knowledge formulated. Monicat also investigates the ambiguous situation of women who belong to geographical societies. She says that their writings can be considered as “une para-litterature scientifique” that is situated in a field of knowledge, “un lieu de savoir”, explicitly connected to a field of power “un lieu de pouvoir” where the public image is masculine. Accordingly, Foucault argues that “knowledge is always an exercise of power and power always a function of knowledge.” This relation of interdependence between knowledge and power Bourbonnaud understood it well. She ultimately confronts the masculine predominance in the public sphere and negotiates the knowledge she acquired in India against a recognition or a pedestal in institutions productive of power as the Geographical Societies.

What comes out of this analysis is that Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s travel writings constitute a feminist conquest of the male discourse. Their writing is revealed to be a mode of participation in the constitution and transmission of knowledge, a way to enter the public
sphere and empower themselves. By traveling to India and fulfilling their mission they proved their ability “to exercise [their] civilizing cogito”91 and emphasize the possibility of their participation in the public sphere through bargaining their position as writers, travelers and intellectuals in Britain and France. Accordingly, in the following chapter we are going to analyze the nationalist discourse in order to prove that while empire was crucial to the realization of the feminist aspirations and objectives, women writers support and work equally for the maintenance of the Empire.
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Chapter three: Nationalism in Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s Works:

Our research has so far analyzed the similarities between Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s works in terms of race and gender. The present chapter’s concern, however, is to highlight the extent to which the differences between the French and the British imperial policies in India are encompassed in Carpenter’s and Bourbonnaud’s embodiment of nationalism. Gayatri Spivak states, “It is impossible to consider any text (by men or women) without taking imperialism into account.” In analyzing the discursive practices and the historical context, we explain that Carpenter and Bourbonnaud as individuals growing in an age of unprecedented imperial expansion are affected by and involved in colonial ideology and imperial relations. They engaged in celebrating the presence of their respective countries in India, they but express their nationalist feelings in different degrees. Carpenter is a temperate nationalist while Bourbonnaud is a fervent one. This difference can be justified by their adherence to their countries’ colonial policies.

The 19th century has been called the age of nationalism in Europe, and the literature of the period embodied in its lines the support each writer holds for his or her own country. In Orientalism, Said believes that a writer is a good representative of the empire he or she belongs to. Every scholar or thinker, consciously or unconsciously, holds a position that suits the ideology of his/her country and tries to strengthen it in his/her literary productions. He writes:

Yet in so relatively insulated and specialized a tradition as Orientalism, I think there is in each scholar some awareness, partly conscious and partly non-conscious, of national tradition, if not of national ideology.

In fact, the British and French writers at that period were influenced by the abhorrence that characterized the Anglo-French relations in the field of war. This means that the hostilities that prevailed between them were later on transformed into an ideological conflict between scholars, intellectuals, and writers. Carpenter and Bourbonnaud are among those
writers whose travel narratives embody that struggle in their lines. They include aspects of the British-French conflict in India, take side with their own countries and denigrate the rival one.

Throughout her text, Carpenter demonstrates nationalist attitudes and pays tribute to the greatness of her country Britain as being “the empire on which the sun never sets”\(^{11}\). At the very beginning of her travelogue, Carpenter draws attention to “This entrance from the East to civilized Europe”\(^2\) that marks her Euro-centrism with the dialectic of the West and the Rest. Yet, she rapidly moves to the depiction of her country as the sole supremacy in the East. She is impressed by the power of the empire she belongs to and praises its merits: “the spirit of the imperial capital seemed spreading here, and gave one a striking impression of the power […] of the empire”\(^3\).

Bourbonnaud also behaves as a true patriotic agent and loads her writing with her nationalism. She mentions fifty-two times the name of her country “France” in her text. In fact, considering the context of high imperialism when she wrote, colonialist ideas were highly cultivated and nationalism was the logical result of the equation. Monicat argues that “Lorsqu’il (le voyage) s’inscrit dans le contexte de celui des sociétés de géographie, le projet des voyageuses est inévitablement un projet colonialiste.”\(^4\) Accordingly, in her analysis of Bourbonnaud’s works, Lapeyre began by noting that Bourbonnaud “n’aime rien tant que la France, et les cent quatre-vingt mille kilomètres qu’elle va parcourir en quatre voyages ne lui vaudront chaque fois qu’une grande joie : celle de rentrer.”\(^5\) If Bourbonnaud loves something more than traveling, it is her return to her country. She notices the three colors of her country’s flag everywhere she goes and proudly proclaims her belonging to the French Empire. She proudly says:

Je suis fière, moi Française, de penser que c'est un Français qui a conçu et mené à bonne fin l'exécution de cette œuvre gigantesque, qui a-, d'un trait hardi, fendu cette barrière de sable qui séparait deux parties de l'ancien monde.\(^6\)
Every time she sees French colonies or soldiers and hears the French language, she rapidly expresses her pride. In Port Said, she does not prevent herself from expressing her great joy about being in a French region. In this context, she says:

Chose digne de Remarque, la ville de Port Said est toute française: les commerçants sont français, les rues portent des noms français, tout le monde parle notre langue jusqu’au petits enfants qui, me voyant passer, me disent : -Bonjour madame, vous allez bien ?

Bourbonnaud shows how she is proud of being in a French territory. She is also greatly pleased when she heard her mother language well spoken in Egypt. When she hears the French national anthem, her heart is greatly rejoiced. She reports: “A Port-Saïd, j'ai entendu chanter la Marseillaise, ce qui a réjoui mon cœur de patriote.”8 In addition, when she passed by the Suez Canal her thought goes back to that French man thanks to whom the canal was constructed. Accordingly, she says: “Je suis fiére, moi française de penser que c’est un français qui a conçu et mené à bonne fin l’exécution de cette œuvre gigantesque”.9 She attributed the greatness of such an achievement to her country and confirms that it was only under the French control that the Suez Canal is built. She praises also the French empire as being the most powerful. In a discussion with a French country man, she reports his words saying “je ne pense pas qu'il y ait beaucoup de puissances possédant une aussi belle marine que la nôtre.”10 She depicts the greatness and magnitude of her country saying: “ notre civilisation raffinée.”11 We note that both Carpenter and Bourbonnaud believe in the racial superiority of the country they are belonging to.

Carpenter depicts the admiration and respect the native Indians have for her country after their visit to Britain. She presents her country as an Eldorado, a country where the Indians can reach their aspiration. She recounts the story of a “young lady herself was not a little rejoiced to return to her native land.”12 She depicts the admiration the Indians have for her country and cites England with approbation and glorification reinforcing the pride of
being a citizen of Britain. She also speaks of a Hindoo gentleman from Calcutta, who is returning to India after spending five years of studies in England. She narrates:

He was leaving with much regret the country where a new and civilized life had been opened to him; where he had seen the natives of our marvelous island of Great Britain in their true light, and where he had received the courteous hospitality which we always desire to show to strangers.\(^{13}\)

These words demonstrate Carpenter’s ambition to confirm that England is the greatest civilized country in Europe. The gentleman’s annoyance, when he left England, is a recognition of the refining and enlightening life he experienced in England. Carpenter also portrays the allegiance the natives expressed for the British rule in India. She recounts her haphazard meeting with a native who could speak little English but who shows “with much pride likenesses of the queen and the Royal Family in lockets appended to his handsome gold watch-chain.”\(^ {14}\) She says: “he gave us a very favorable impression of the tone of feelings existing in this province”\(^ {15}\). She adds that the natives under the English rule “are obtaining unconsciously an excellent training of more value to them than any pecuniary recompense.”\(^ {16}\) For her, the Indians should be thankful for all the enlightenment English brought to their darkened spirits. Carpenter inscribes this feeling in a letter her host writes when she departed from Ahmadabad to Bombay. He says:

It is not for nothing that India has been placed under the British rule. It is impossible to think that her destinies have been rules by a blind unsparing fate, or that is for the glory and power of England alone … there is one hope, on intense conviction from which no true patriot can escape—that is, that England and India are two mutual blessing; that our country, once famous in the world’s history, is destined to be helped out of her degeneracy and utter stagnation. And is there no reason for this hope? And are there no data to base this conviction upon? What was India a few years ago, and what do we see around us? We see a marked progress, brought about by the progress of the western civilization… May India be grateful to England for the blessings she has been enjoying under her benign trust and the responsibility which cannot be thrown away!\(^ {17}\)

Carpenter deemed it necessary to copy down a letter of tow pages long in her travelogue, and this is not done haphazardly. By doing so she gives credence to the English presence in India, and thus puts emphasis on her patriotic feelings and her adhesion to the civilizing mission of her country. In the letter above, Carpenter portrays an India which is rejoiced to be under the
protectorate of such a civilized country. As a response, the English felt that they should realize such long cherished hopes and aspiration of the natives that “were anxious to bring Western civilization into their own country.”

The English presence in India is portrayed as being required and even vital for the survival of civilization in those parts of the world that are considered to be only savage and ignorant.

Likewise, Bourbonnaud depicts the complicity between the French and the natives as an argument for the presence of France in India. She wants to prove that France has a great reputation in India. She says: “Bien qu’il y ait ici des gens de toutes nationalités, beaucoup de Grecs entre autres, on voit tout de suite que la sympathie populaire est acquise à la France.”

She adds as if to emphasise the esteem the natives hold for the French: “La langue française est, avec l'Arabe, la seule parlée par les indigènes.” Her argumentation goes on to state that the natives prefer the French over the British: “ces gens ont meilleure mine et sont plus propres que dans les villes anglaises.” She carries on by saying that the natives are speaking French very well unlike in British territories where the natives do not at all master the English language. She reports:

C'est un indien qui parle assez bien le français, ce qui n'est pas rare ; car, chose digne en remarque, les indigènes, à Pondicherry, parlent beaucoup mieux notre langue que les Hindous ne parlent généralement l'anglais dans les cités anglo-indiennes.

By reporting that the natives master French better than English, Bourbonnaud implies that they are appreciating the French more than the English. Hence, she brings evidence of the French powerful and esteemed presence in India and reinforces her nationalist pride.

For Said, Britain and France were the two biggest and strongest colonial powers in Europe that are partners and co-workers sometimes and opposed and conflicting on other times. Here, Said puts emphasis on the conflict between Britain and France which is manifested in their desire to claim their supremacy and the necessity of their presence in the colonies. Said argues thus that behind the disputing clash between the two powers lies a
strong ambition for making of oneself (The British or the French) the dominant foreign power in the East with a vast number of territories. Age Mooy developed this idea in his essay, *Prelude to War*, saying that:

The French and the English had coexisted relatively peacefully […] for nearly a century. But by the 1750’s, as both English and French settlements expanded, religious and commercial tensions began to produce new frictions and new conflicts.\textsuperscript{24}

It goes without saying that the struggle between the two powers led both authors through their embodiment of nationalism to support their respective counties colonial polices.

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, imperialists justified invading a foreign territory by citing the improvements that their culture and innovation had introduced on the occupied territory.\textsuperscript{25} Carpenter does so. She provides a set of arguments that confirm her country’s right to occupy India. She says: “To give any adequate account of what is being done in India by Great Britain to instruct the natives of that country would require a volume rather than a few pages.”\textsuperscript{26} Then, she reaffirms that the British presence in India can only benefit the natives. She points out the benefits that the railway implemented by the British offers saying that it taught Indians to be friendly and punctual. She says: “Habits of punctuality and attention to duty are also thought, both directly and indirectly, by the railway.”\textsuperscript{30} She adds that the natives are freely “obtaining unconsciously an excellent training, of more value than any pecuniary recompense.”\textsuperscript{31} Here Carpenter “shows the possibility of improving even the inferior portion of the native race, under judicious government”\textsuperscript{32}. Using the railway, she is praising all the benefits Britain is offering to Indians.

Carpenter behaves as the spokeswoman of her nation and highlights the salvation of the non-enlightened people that Britain alone gathered “circumstances which gave rise to the beginning of what promises to be the great socio-religious movement of modern India under the enlightened rule of Britain.”\textsuperscript{33} She describes “the desolation prevailing all along the streets [yet] few traces of its old splendor remain.”\textsuperscript{34} Carpenter implies that India needs Britain. She
presents Britain as the guardian of order in India since “British justice enables anyone who is thus treated at once to obtain his remedy by law”\textsuperscript{35}. Britain plays the role of “breaking down the narrow ignorance which characterizes most parts of India, and in promoting friendly intercourse between different parts of the country, as well as facilitating commerce”\textsuperscript{36}. In this context, Burton asserts that “Most feminists believed in the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race, frequently citing possession of empire as evidence of a superiority that was not just racial, but religious and cultural as well.”\textsuperscript{37}

In her turn, Bourbonnaud gives strong evidence of the legitimacy of the French government in India. She depicts the English as hindering the elevation of Indian towns. She says: “Ce fut surtout pendant la guerre de la sécession, de 1860 à 1865, que Bombay traversa une ère de prospérité sans exemple,”\textsuperscript{38} meaning that while England was occupied elsewhere in America, Bombay embraced a new and prosperous era thanks to the French. Here Bourbonnaud again reinforces the presence of her country in India because of all the benefits it is granting to the region. We clearly see that Bourbonnaud takes part in the moral mission her country endorses to lift the world up to French standards. Jules Ferry declared: “The higher races have a right over the lower races, they have a duty to civilize the inferior races.”\textsuperscript{39} To illustrate the point, Bourbonnaud says:

\textit{La ville de Pondichéry était autrefois un petit village paria absolument inconnu qui par sa situation sur les dangereuses plages de sable de la côte de Coromandel, ne semblait nullement appelé à devenir une place importante.}\textsuperscript{40}

Bourbonnaud proudly denotes that without her country the town of Pondicherry could not become an important place. She presents her country as the savior without which India cannot stand. She adds: “la France va bientôt faire dresser un état civil pour les indiens, car ceux-ci ne connaissent pas leur âge.”\textsuperscript{41} Depicting all the advancements France is taking to India marks her devotion for her nation’s interests.

If by saying that Britain is civilizing India, Carpenter implies the idea that its rivals namely France is not needed there, Bourbonnaud overtly attacks the English presence in
India. She vacillates from nationalist attitudes to merely chauvinistic ones. Bourbonnaud’s hate of the British is apparent in the very first lines of her work. In her preface, she declares that the travelers became “des gens d’affaires, surtout depuis l’introduction de voyageurs de race anglo-américaine”⁴². In fact, she does not content herself with praising her country but she also denigrates all what is not French, particularly all what is English. She engages in a comparison between the French and English territories and portrays the French colonies as superior and better entertained. She says: “Le pays est bien cultivé et les villages que l’on rencontre respirent un air de prospérité qui manque aux villages de l’Inde anglaise.”⁴³ She adds: “ces gens ont meilleure mine et sont plus propres que dans les villes anglaises.”⁴⁴ We understand that she extends her comparison to the people whom she regards as better than the ones who are under British control.

Bourbonnaud highlights the fact that it is not only the French who recognize the misrule of the British but also the natives who are complaining of the bad treatment they undergo. She reports the story of a young thief who was captured and then received his retribution. She expresses her compassion with the young boy, but she is immediately reassured that he was lucky to be captured in a French territory since the English punishment system is much more severe.

Les Anglais sont en effet très durs pour les Voleurs … et les frappent avec une corde à nœuds jusqu’à ce qu’ils tombent sans connaissance et tout ensanglantés. Aussi les indigènes préfèrent-ils de beaucoup le régime des punitions françaises.⁴⁵

Bourbonnaud reports on the severity of the English government which in her view does not lie on the noble principles of justice but on oppressive and dictatorial tenets. She illustrates her point by describing an English harbor, saying: “Ce port mis à la mode par les Anglais qui viennent y prendre la malle des Indes, m’a fait l’effet d’un vilain trou!”⁴⁶ She carries on by showing the cruelty of the British toward the natives. She relates the great famine that killed no less than four millions of Indians, without the smallest intervention of
the English to soothe their suffering. For her, they worsened the situation by taking advantage of it to export cereals from India and let the Indians die in famine. She writes:

pas moins de quatre millions de victimes. Et, pendant ce temps-là, dit un écrivain anglais, le port de Calcutta ne cessait d'expédier à l'étranger d'énormes quantités de grains ; les malheureux Hindous n'avaient pas le moyen d'acheter le blé, le riz ou le millet qui les eussent empêchés de mourir de faim.47

The different attitudes Carpenter and Bourbonnaud adopted can be explained through the different policies their respective countries implemented in India. In fact, since the fiftieth century, a great rivalry for supremacy between Britain and France characterized the European colonization of India. Thus, the struggle for succession and territories between the two countries became part of the Indian history. However, the outbreak of the Seven Years War (1756-1763) led to open conflicts between them in India. The Carnatic Wars that opposed the French and the British East India Company resulted in the British victory. While France lost nearly all its territories, Britain established its political and commercial dominance over India.48 Consequently, France deployed attacking strategies to regain some territories while Britain no longer identified France as a rival to be afraid of in India.

To conclude what has been discussed in this chapter, we may say that Carpenter and Bourbonnaud are supportive of their countries’ colonial policies. Their works embody their nationalist feelings towards their respective countries. Yet, despite the fact that both are committed to the defence and promotion of the countries they belong to, Carpenter contents herself with celebrating the presence of her county in India whereas Bourbonnaud extends her patriotism to attacking the British existence in the Orient.
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IV. Conclusion

Our comparison of Carpenter’s *Six Months in India* and Bourbonnaud’s *Les Indes et L’Extrême Orient* has allowed us to reach certain conclusions on both the authors and their works. The two works are vivid examples of the role Carpenter and Bourbonnaud played in both maintaining and resisting the dominant ideologies of the late nineteenth century. We have demonstrated that the two works are similar in their Orientalist representation of the Orient and Europe and in their gendered representation of women. The two works, however, are different in the way every writer celebrates her own empire.

Our analysis proved that both writers associate the natives of India with a number of stereotypes such as ignorance and laziness so as to maintain them in a backward position far from the enlightened white men. As female travel writers, they are dependent on their belonging to Eurocentric countries. Their ideas about the primitiveness of Indians and the denigration of their culture are shaped by the imperial ideology of their time. They also meet in points related to their personal goals as female travel writers who want to challenge the male dominance in society and to confirm their existence as individuals equal to men. While apparently adhering to traditionally masculine ideologies, namely Orientalism, Carpenter and Bourbonnaud deploy elements in their works that attest for their defiance to patriarchy. In their Orientalist representation of the natives, they purposefully portray the Indian women as helpless victims in need of salvation to reinforce the importance of their presence in India and not at home. In addition, through their proved capacity to resist hardships of voyage and bring valuable knowledge, they ingeniously take advantage of imperialism to enlarge their emancipation scope.

However, their writings diverge when it comes to the affirmation of which country is the most powerful and has the right and duty to colonize India. As they witnessed and lived during a period of high imperialism and bourgeoning nationalism, they write about
imperialism but each supports her own country, Carpenter the British and Bourbonnaud the French. They reproduce the moral discourse of imperialism and claim fervently the legitimacy of their respective countries to intervene in India. Carpenter restricted her discourse to celebrate the British Empire while Bourbonnaud extended her patriotism to the denigration of the French Empire’s rivals, the English.

Consequently, our study demonstrates the connection between race, gender and nation in *Six Months in India* and *Les Indes et L’Extrême Orient*. We have shown how Carpenter and Bourbonnaud preserve hierarchies of race and ethnicity while they question hierarchies of gender to formulate their own emancipation. This shows that when it comes to analyzing women travel writing the entities of race, gender and nationalism count. It is, however, interesting to open the scope of the analysis to include male travel writing in such a manner as to investigate any possible differences between male and female points of view on the entities. It is worth knowing that among other male authors, Louis Rousselet and Rudyard Kipling are representatives of French and English Empires in India, respectively. Hence, we advise students to study any one of the female authors investigated in our research with any other one of the male authors listed above.
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