

Shadow Projection in Adiga's *The White Tiger* and Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day*

Roghayeh Farsi

Department of English, University of Neyshabur, Neyshabur 917883391, Khorasan Razavi, Iran

ABSTRACT

This study compares shadow projection in two postcolonial novels: Adiga's *The white tiger* (2008) and Ishiguro's *The remains of the day* (1989). It takes these autobiographies as narratives of shadow and investigates how each protagonist projects his shadow in his narrative of servitude. The study draws on Carl Jung's view of shadow and shadow projection and holds an analytic and comparative methodology. The analysis focuses on the influential forces that shape each protagonist's shadow, while the comparison reveals psychosocial differences between them. The study tracks a line of psychological continuation between the two novels and concludes with psychological similarities that link the protagonists cross-culturally. Finally, it is concluded the detection of shadow projection is beneficial to character analysis, but it falls short at addressing the rhetoric-linguistic aspects of each novel.

Keywords: Adiga, Ishiguro, Jung, postcolonial, servitude, shadow projection

INTRODUCTION

Adiga and Ishiguro are Asian writers who write from the margins of their postcolonial contexts. This study compares the Indian novel, *The white tiger* (Adiga, 2008), with Ishiguro's *The remains of the day* (Ishiguro,

1989) from a psychosocial perspective. Despite their socio-cultural differences, these two novels share many interesting features which render the comparison quite fruitful. This study focuses on the theme of servitude which lies at the core of colonial encounter. The paper argues Adiga and Ishiguro present servitude at its two extremities: for Adiga's protagonist, servitude is depreciated, while for Ishiguro's it is appreciated. Adiga's protagonist sacrifices his master to gain individuality; Ishiguro's butler sacrifices his individuality to serve his lord. The Indian

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 22 September 2018

Accepted: 10 December 2019

Published: 19 March 2020

E-mail address:

rofarsi@yahoo.com

servant escapes servitude, while the British butler assimilates it. This paper interprets and analyzes these different behaviors based on Carl Jung's theory of shadow and shadow projection. It investigates the notion and function of shadow on both personal (psychology) and public (social) scales. While the personal dimension presents similarities between the two serving agents psychologically, the social side pinpoints differences between their socio-cultural contexts.

The questions of the study are:

1. How does each protagonist project his shadow?
2. What are the psychosocial forces that construct each protagonist's shadow?
3. How are global forces involved in the construction and projection of shadows, and how do they differ in different contexts?

To answer these questions, the study first provides a rather brief history of marginalization in both British and Indian societies, highlighting the differences as well as similarities. It then introduces Jung's view of shadow and shadow projection. Next, it reads servant-master relationship in the light of this frame and analyzes the different projections of Adiga's and Ishiguro's protagonists. In a separate part, the socio-cultural context of each novel is studied as it is treated by each novelist. The paper concludes by comparing the psychological as well as social findings together.

Marginalization in Britain and India

In their study of social class in Britain, Evans and Tilley (2017) argued that class division was a key element of Britain's political structure. For them, measures of class position were useful to the degree that they demonstrate "important relationships between social position and outcomes" (Evans & Tilley, 2017, p. 2-3). According to them, "Class has not disappeared: objective inequalities among classes, class identities, and ideological divisions between classes are unchanged. Britain remains a class-divided society" (Evans & Tilley, 2017, p. 191). Ishiguro's novel attends to the inequalities that occur due to social discrimination. The protagonist, Stevens, as a butler, was the offspring of Britain's classed hierarchies. Coming from a socially low-class father, Stevens fabricated his class identity by attaching himself to his landlord. However, he remains a marginal figure who was easily handed over along with the house from the previous lord to the new American gentleman.

Although Adiga and Ishiguro both came from ostensibly different geopolitical contexts, the history of British colonization of India interlinked them in an intricate way. Colonization is the meeting point between the British and Indian societies. As Mines (2009) contended, the structure of colonization deeply penetrated all aspects of an individual's life. The British distorted Indian practices and understandings by taking castes as "separate races with different essences or natural temperaments

and qualities” (Mines, 2009, p. 41). Thus, they assumed that caste and religion played a key role in the character of the population and were, for Indians, the fundamental bases for social organization.

Viewing Indian casts in the light of “their own cultural categories and understandings of class, [the British] attempted to identify and fix caste orders to create rational social categories they could count, characterize, and create policies about” (Mines, 2009, p. 37). Therefore, the fluid and locally disparate castes turned into fixed all-India categories and thereby created new social identities that Indians, in turn, shaped further. Caste increasingly became a basis for collective identity at a regional or even national level (Metcalf & Metcalf, 2006). Adiga’s novel attends to such caste clashes which eventually result in the formation of Balram’s shadow and shadow projection on both individual and collective levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW: SHADOW AND SHADOW PROJECTION

Jung (1971) regarded the shadow as the location for the hidden or repressed aspects of the self (Reeves, 2000). In Zweig and Abrams’s analysis, the development of the shadow occurs in every child naturally and in tandem with the development of the ego. The self develops out of the individuals’ identification with ideal personality characteristics which are reinforced by their environment; they bury in the shadow those qualities that do not fit their self-image. Therefore, the ego and the shadow create each other out of the same life

experience (Zweig & Abrams, 1991). While the self-image is constructed out of what is permitted expression by forces such as parents, siblings, peers, teachers, clergies, and authorities, the shadow comprises what is not permitted expression; it is, therefore, “mean-spirited, shameful, and sinful” (Zweig & Abrams, 1991, p. xvii). Bly (1991) used the metaphor of a bag which individuals unavoidably dragged by and was replete with the prohibitions imposed by their environments.

The shadow has been given different names such as the disowned self, the lower self, the dark twin or brother in the Bible and myth, the double, repressed self, alter ego, and id. It contains all the feelings and capacities that are rejected by the ego. However, not all of these are negative traits. For Frey-Rohn, “this dark treasury includes our infantile parts, emotional attachments, neurotic symptoms, as well as our undeveloped talents and gifts” (as cited in Zweig & Abrams, 1991, p. xvii). The shadow is negative only from the point of view of consciousness; it potentially contains values of the highest morality (Zweig & Abrams, 1991).

Tuby enumerates six ways in which the shadow gets activated in everyday life. These include exaggerated feelings about others, negative feedback from others, in impulsive and inadvertent acts, in situations when humiliation is experienced, in interactions one has the same troubling effect on several different people, in exaggerated anger about other people’s fault (as cited in Zweig & Abrams, 1991).

Whitmont (1991) defined the shadow as that part of the personality which had been repressed for the sake of the ego ideal. He further contended, "Since everything unconscious is projected, we encounter the shadow in projection – in our view of 'the other fellow'" (Whitmont, 1991, p. 12). Shadow projection occurs because the shadow resists conscious awareness and it is uncomfortable to acknowledge. In Reeves's words, projection "occurs when one sees in another aspects of one's own shadow" (Reeves, 2000, p. 81). Therefore, in shadow projection, the shadow is seen quite indirectly, "in the distasteful traits and actions of other people, *out there* where it is safer to observe it" (Original emphasis; Zweig & Abrams, 1991, p. xviii). Shadow projection, as an unconscious outlet, is inevitable because as an aspect of the self, the shadow demands expression (Jung, 1971). As defined by W. A. Miller, projection is "an unconscious mechanism that is employed whenever a trait or characteristic of our personality that has no relationship to consciousness becomes activated" (W. A. Miller, 1991, p. 39).

For Jung (1971), projections involve emotions. It manifests itself in one's intense reaction to a quality in an individual or a group. When this reaction overtakes the individual with great loathing or admiration, it may be the shadow showing. In Zweig and Abrams's words, "We *project* by attributing this quality to the other person in an unconscious effort to banish it from ourselves, to keep ourselves from seeing it within" (Original emphasis; Zweig &

Abram, 1991, p. xviii). Seen as causing pain, anger, or shame, the other is then regarded at fault and reprehensible.

Projections involve emotions and personal characteristics. In projecting one's shadow, the individual attributes one's inferior trait to another person. In Whitmont's analysis, a projection invariably blurs one's view of the other person. Even when the projected qualities happen to be real qualities of the other person, "the affect reaction which marks the projection points to the affect-toned complex in *us* which blurs our vision and interferes with our capacity to see objectively and relate humanly" (Original emphasis; Whitmont, 1991, p. 13).

Whitmont examined several kinds of possible reactions to the shadow; these included denial, elimination, evading the responsibility for it, and constructive acceptance (Whitmont, 1991). Upon being refused, the shadow exerts its power in a negative, compulsive projected form. This results in an increasing separation of the individual from the surrounding world; instead of a real relation to the world, only an illusory one is formed which is the outcome of the individual's projections. In the power struggle between the ego and the shadow, the former attempts to eliminate the latter. The ego's attempts are in vain because the shadow "represents energetically charged autonomous patterns of feeling and behavior" and this energy "cannot simply be stopped by an act of will" (Whitmont, 1991, p. 17). Discipline and repression are two ways of exerting

control over the shadow. Discipline runs in contrast to feelings and repression leads to irresponsible act (Whitmont, 1991).

If the projectors have power, they can use that power to harm the target of their projections. Projectors may justify their projections, but the projection itself occurs unconsciously as an escape from self-awareness (Jung, 1971). This study approaches Adiga's and Ishiguro's novels as biographies of the protagonists' shadows rather than of their selves. For this, the paper relies on von Franz's idea that,

The shadow plunges man into the immediacy of situations here and now, and thus creates the real biography of the human being, who is always inclined to assume he is only what he thinks he is. It is the biography created by the shadow that counts (as cited in D. P. Miller, 1991, p. 21).

METHODS

This study is both analytic and comparative. It focuses on the theme of servitude in each novel and investigates how the autobiographers-protagonists relate to their masters. The study concerns itself with the shadow projection of each protagonist as it manifests itself in their different scapegoatings. It first scrutinizes each novel separately and then compares them together in Discussion. Therefore, Analysis comprises two parts.

The first part deals with Ishiguro's *The remains of the day*, the protagonist of which, Stevens, stands as a butler first to the British Lord Darlington, and then to Mr. Farraday, an American gentleman. Stevens's butlership is mostly formed and spent under the lordship of Darlington whose codes of a British colonial gentleman stand as disciplines for Stevens. There are three main relationships via which Stevens constructs his ideal ego and avoids his shadow: Stevens-Lord, Stevens-Miss Kenton, and Stevens-his father. While Stevens-Lord relation represents his collective shadow projections, his relations with his father and Miss Kenton stand for his relatively more personal projections.

The second part is concerned with Adiga's *The white tiger* whose protagonist, Balram, projects his shadow in social interactions with his Americanized Indian master, Ashok. Balram's servitude to his master is mostly conducted through psychoanalytic strategy of repression. His autobiographical narrative includes many repressive forces in his psychosocial environment, the prominent of which are his Indian family, his school, and his workplace. The study investigates how Balram's repressed feelings and behaviors under these forces find expression in his master-servant relationship. The comparison of the findings of each part constitutes Discussion of the paper.

ANALYSIS

This part consists of two main sections and each section focuses on one novel.

Ishiguro: *The Remains of the Day*

Ishiguro's novel is narrated through Stevens's first-person point of view. The whole story reads like an autobiographical narrative which recounts the narrator's lifelong dedications to his master(s). Shaffer (1998) provided a detailed analysis of the psychic mechanisms of Stevens's political and sexual repressions. His study focused just on the mechanisms of repression, whereas here the emphasis is on the way(s) all those repressions get projected onto others. Mechanisms of his shadow projections can be studied in his main socio-cultural interactions.

Stevens - Lord. Stevens's servitude to Lord Darlington constitutes the core of his psychosocial interactions. His relation to his master is one of devotion. He takes Lord Darlington as his cultural or class father (Shaffer, 1998). Being born to a socially lower class family can well justify his shadow projections onto a male master whom he takes as an ideal master. He comes from a low class of society which is stricken by social humiliation, shame, depravity, and a strong sense of inferiority. What he tries to construct for himself, his audience, and his master(s) is the ideal ego of a devoted servant. However, this ideal ego is cast at the cost of repressing the shame of his class inferiority.

Avoiding depravity and powerlessness, he seeks sources and means of achieving greatness. His ambition for greatness, therefore, feeds on his repressed sense of shame. Lord Darlington is the other

onto whom Stevens projects his repressed longing for power. In Stevens's psychic mechanism, he has the role of a perfect master. Stevens feels devoted to him to the extent that he sacrifices his personal life for achieving ideals of servitude. The more he gets near to Lord, the more he feels empowered and secured, and the more his sense of inferiority is appeased.

His shadow projection is a case in which the projection holds and a tight relationship is constructed between the sender and the receiver of the projection. Stevens's admiration for Lord Darlington indicates his own shadow showing. He projects by attributing greatness to Lord in an unconscious effort to banish its lack (inferiority) from himself, to keep himself from seeing it within. In this attribution, he goes so far as thinking Lord as an infallible man. To Mr. Cardinal, who tries to convince Stevens of Lord's being manipulated by Germans, Stevens states, "I have to say that I have every trust in his lordship's good judgement" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 153).

No wonder does Stevens's narrative center on greatness, dignity, and honor – the very codes of lordship. For him, greatness has a political and a psychological significance. Important political figures "in whose hands the destiny of civilization truly lies" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 136) stand for greatness. In attaching himself to these sources of greatness, Stevens forgets/represses his sense of inferiority. The world he creates for himself is a delusory one wherein his true position as an exploited servant is blurred. Psychologically, greatness

lies in emotional self-restraint (Ishiguro, 1989). Self-restraint means discipline which is a psychic strategy through which the ego exerts its control over the shadow. Stevens's autobiographical narrative is a narrative of discipline which moulds his ideal ego and banishes his shadow to the dark recesses of his psyche. In master-servant relation, self-discipline means eradication of the personal dimension of his life. Stevens's narrative reveals quite few details about his personal life. He is mostly seen interacting with lords, peers, and subordinates only as a butler; the same accounts for his belief in professionalism as a butler.

Stevens's strict self-discipline turns him into a professional butler and helps him define "dignity" in his own way. He compares "dignity" to a gentleman's suit which "he will not let ruffians or circumstance tear . . . off him in the public gaze" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 29). This notion of dignity gives the least space to his shadow which thus remains repressed by the ethos of discipline as propagated in lordship system. Stevens's blindfold admiration for Lord Darlington and all the sociopolitical cognates his lordship has obliquely shows his shadow marked with inferiority and humiliation.

Stevens - His Father. Stevens's self-discipline makes him censor the emotional dimension of his relation with his father. He avoids any emotional disclosure. He praises his father, an under-butler, from the eyes of a professional butler, not from the eyes of a son. He worships dignity in his father but

it lasts as long as his father does his duties quite well. From the time errors are seen in him due to aging and being senile, he averts from him, "even the brief exchanges necessary to communicate information relating to work took place in an atmosphere of mutual embarrassment" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 43). Such rare occasions show his shadow is filled with embarrassment and shame because in his father's senility he finds that repressed sense of humiliation and inferiority he has taken pains to escape from. Substituting Lord Darlington as his father with his natural father is the psychic mechanism, he adopts to evade his dark shadow.

All through his narrative, he happens to enter his father's personal room only two times: once, for informing him of the cut down on his duties due to his errors; and the second time he appears on his deathbed. On the night his father lies dying, Stevens prefers serving Lord's important guests downstairs to staying at his death chamber. Upon his father's repeatedly stating, "I hope I've been a good father to you" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 67) which implicitly calls for Stevens's emotional and intimate involvement, Stevens suffices to say, "I'm so glad you're feeling better now" (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 67). The response is an evasion from this personal involvement. Stevens thus continues to stick to the codes of dignity and professionalism until the last breath of his father.

Stevens - Miss Kenton. In his relation with the housekeeper, Miss Kenton, Stevens

adopts the same professional profile as he has with his father. Even after twenty years of separation from her, he thinks of her as a professional solution (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 32). In their “cocoa evenings, while maintaining their essentially professional character”, he allows “room for a little harmless talk” about the staff, important meetings and conferences at the Hall, or some guests (Ishiguro, 1989). Not only does he avoid revealing his emotional involvement, but he also relates how he evaded her temptations. His personal room is invaded two times by Miss Kenton in an attempt to strike more intimacy with him, and each time, he sticks to his professionalism and code of dignity to escape her. Once, she intrudes upon him with a vase of flowers, stating, “I thought these would brighten your parlour a little” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 34). Stevens reacts to this quite coldly, “But this is not a room of entertainment. I am happy to have distractions kept to a minimum” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 34).

In her second intrusion upon his privacy, she catches him reading a sentimental love story, a book that she gets hold on only after she corners him (Ishiguro, 1989). He then justifies his choice of this book has been to get a better command of English language (Ishiguro, 1989). Psychologically, however, the book shows his repressed desires and emotions that he allows expression only through reading.

Also, two times he remembers having stood before the closed door of her parlor while she was crying inside. Once, she receives the news of her aunt’s death. The

thought of Miss Kenton crying “provoked a strange feeling to rise within me, causing me to stand there hovering in the corridor for some moments” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 119). The rise of “a strange feeling” within him indicates the rise of his repressed emotions which he immediately controls; he decides to wait for another opportunity to express his sympathy (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 119). The second time that he stands alone before her door is on the night, she has to announce her decision about her acquaintance’s proposal. To this, Stevens reacts quite coldly and indifferently, dismissing her for “events of a global significance are taking place in this house at this very moment” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 148).

Adiga: *The White Tiger*

The white tiger deals with the issue of servitude in an Indian modernized context. Studying the discourse of entrepreneurship in the novel, Haitham (2013) represented how the individualism of this discourse ran in contrast to the ethos of collectivism in an Indian context. Al-Dagamseh (2013) reinscribed the novel within the context of global neoliberal capitalism and argued how this novel took issue with the globally hegemonic discourses of success and story narratives. While most of the readings focus on the socio-cultural aspects of the novel, the psychosocial dimension has received relatively less attention. This study focuses on three important social environments which expose the protagonist, Balram, to repressive forces

Balram's Family. Adiga's family is a typical one of poverty-stricken families in India. Poverty makes individuals repress many unaffordable desires. Balram grows up in such a family which is also caste-ridden. Although caste is one of the determining factors in an Indian context, in Balram's time it has paled away under the force of money. He puts his father, a rickshaw-puller, among those who "had not had the belly to fight" (Adiga, 2008, p. 38). Of the two groups, "Men with Big Bellies, and Men with Small Bellies", his father belongs to the latter, doomed to "get eaten up" (Adiga, 2008, p. 38).

The leading figure in Balram's family is his granny, Kusum, "every son and daughter-in-law lived in fear of her" (Adiga, 2008, p. 11). Kusum proves to be an exploitative force in their family. She deprives Balram of education. At her behest, he is taken from school and put at a tea shop to work. She decides that he become a car driver and pays for his driving sessions. When he finds the job as a servant to Ashok, she forces Balram to send his wages to her (Adiga, 2008). When he stops sending her money, she threatens him and then sends his cousin, a boy of ten, to him to Delhi to be taken care of. When Kishan, Balram's brother, marries, Kusum gets hold of the dowry the new wife brings to the family, the Hero cycle, and the thick gold necklace (Adiga, 2008).

Balram's repressed and repressive family has an important share in constructing his shadow. Comparing life in Dark India to a Rooster Coop, Balram speaks of the Indian family as the major factor that gets people

"trapped and tied to the coop" (Adiga, 2008, p. 104). The structure of the family sacrifices autonomy and individualism for the sake of the whole family. Therefore, what constitutes Balram's shadow is his desire to live and be treated as an individual. He knows costs for procuring individualism are quite heavy, "only a man who is prepared to see his family destroyed – hunted, beaten, and buried alive by the masters – can break out of the coop" (Adiga, 2008, p. 104).

The first time Balram projects his shadow is when he returns to his village in a khaki uniform and his master's Honda City. Not submitting to Kusum's decision about his marriage, he rebels and walks out of the house. He loathes his own people because he projects onto them the depravity, submissiveness, dirt, misery, and slavery that are part of his own shadow. In ignoring and rejecting them, he tries to distinguish himself, and escape from them who embody his loathsome alter self. His disgust blurs his world vision and makes him react inhumanly.

Leaving his family, he goes to the Black Fort; there, he identifies with Iqbal's Devil who rebelliously says "No" to God's servitude and goes mad with anger. Balram's anger is another show of his shadow projection through which he attributes all the mean qualities of servitude and dependence to his family and banishes them forever from his life vision, "I see the little man in the khaki uniform *spitting* at God again and again" (Original emphasis; Adiga, 2008, p. 53). In rejecting and driving past his family, Balram's anger projects his helplessness

onto them and thus claims his individualism. This anger finds its expression in his act of spitting (Adiga, 2008, p. 26).

Balram's Workplace. Balram starts working in his master's house as a driver and a servant. Here, Balram is treated in the most inhumane manner. Ashok's brother, the Mongoose, has the same role in his workplace as his granny, Kusum, has in the family; he is like her mean and stingy. He insults Balram and accuses him of stealing a rupee coin he lost while getting out of the car. He degrades Balram and makes him feel like an animal, "I got down on my knees. I sniffed in between the mats like a dog, all in search of that one rupee" (Adiga, 2008, p. 80).

The inhumane way in which Balram is treated marks his shadow with strong senses of anger, shame, humiliation, and degradation. The main source of these negative and destructive feelings is the widening gap between the rich and the poor. Ashok lives in a new apartment called Buckingham Towers A Block which is one of the best in Delhi, while the servants are pushed downstairs and locked up in damp, dark, and dirty rooms in the basement. Ashok spends a lot of time visiting malls along with his wife and his brother; and Balram should wait outside the malls ready to carry their shopping bags. They humiliate and laugh at him for mispronouncing some words such as pizza and mall (Adiga, 2008). They call him "half-baked" because "He can read and write, but he doesn't get what he's read" (Adiga, 2008, p. 7). On Pinky

Madam's birthday, Balram is forced to dress up like a maharaja with a red turban and dark cooling glasses and serve them food (Adiga, 2008). When Pinky kills an Indian man in drunken driving, Balram is first coaxed then threatened into taking the full charge (Adiga, 2008). Such social discriminations imbue a sense of degradation and humiliation in him which finally erupts when his shadow projects itself onto his master and makes him slit his throat on the road.

The act of killing Ashok is not a shadow projection, because it has been pre-planned by Balram and is therefore an act of will. But in the sense of freedom he feels, he is actually projecting his long repressed shadow onto Ashok in compensation for all the humiliations and depravities he has suffered in his life, "I was blind. I was a free man" (Adiga, 2008, p. 173). Killing Ashok, Balram feels free to become a master like him, an entrepreneur, who like him bribes, exempts himself from murder, and despises others. Having killed Ashok, he projects his thirst for power and control onto him, blames and condemns him to death, and thus banishes that sense of mastery from himself. In this way, Ashok plays the role of a scapegoat for him.

Balram's role changes after the murder incident, "Once I was a driver to a master, but now I am a master of drivers" (Adiga, 2008, p. 182). He has a contractual relationship with his drivers and enacts an employer-employee interaction "I don't treat them like servants – I don't slap, or bully, or mock anyone. I don't insult any of them ... I'm their boss, that's all" (Adiga, 2008, p.

182). The claim that Balram finds his own shadow in Ashok can well be supported by analyzing two car accidents he narrates in his autobiography. In the first, he is a servant who is forced to take full responsibility of the car accident Pinky Madam has caused while she was drunk (Adiga, 2008). He finds himself a cornered, helpless creature forced to play the role of a scapegoat for his master. In the second accident, he is the master who in complicity with the police corners the brother of a boy who gets killed in an accident by one of his drivers (Adiga, 2008). The car scene gets manipulated by the police so that some unknown person becomes the scapegoat (Adiga, 2008, p. 186). Ashok and his family bribe politicians to escape taxes; similarly, Balram bribes the police to survive accidents and continue his entrepreneurial business. This draws lines of comparison between the two, making each shadow of the other.

DISCUSSION

This study analyzes the process of shadow projection in the protagonists of two completely different novels. Balram's caste-ridden Indian context intensifies his demarcation. He is humiliated not only for his race but also for his caste. These elements directly influence the shadow that he unconsciously constructs in his social interactions especially with Ashok. By contrast, Ishiguro's protagonist is mostly exposed to social discrimination in which his shadow emerges out of the class distinctions he suffers from in the house of Lord Darlington.

Ishiguro's *The remains of the day* displays how the butler's shadow projection onto his master draws the former's admiration for the latter and thus guarantees lifelong servitude. But Adiga's *The white tiger* narrates how the servant's shadow projection onto the master leads to the master's murder. It thus stands in opposite direction to Ishiguro's narrative of loyalty. Stevens is attracted towards Lord Darlington for bearing codes of greatness and dignity. Far from confronting his real position as a mere manservant to Lord, Stevens seeks to link himself with sources of power and influence. He is blind to the way he is exploited by Lord; his infatuation with greatness makes him unaware of being deprived of his human needs as an individual and the personal side of his life. He claims mastery over his subordinates because he feels he is closer to the source of greatness.

Adiga's protagonist is, by contrast, not blind to his real situation with respect to Ashok. What he is blind to is his having nurtured all the qualities he despises in his master such as bribery, thirst for power and domination, dishonesty, and exploitation. All these qualities get manifested in the second phase of his life when he becomes a master.

While Stevens sacrifices his personal life at the cost of serving dignity and socio-political greatness, Balram sacrifices his family at the cost of gaining power and individualism. Stevens is a prejudiced English man who like his master takes up a paternalistic attitude towards others. He serves a colonial lord, a relic of Victorian

lordship system, and all the behavioral and social codes that are attached to the lord. Thus, like his lord, Stevens has a paternalistic, anti-Semitic, classed, and gendered perspective. His life story shows how internalization of codes of lordship makes him blind to the exploitation he is forced into. He cries at the end of his narrative when he realizes all his honest loyalty has reached him to the status of being “part of the package” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 164) when the Hall is transferred to an American gentleman. Stevens’s loyalty to his lord displays how the self gets assimilated into the dominant ethos of lordship, colonialism, and exploitation. Stevens’s story goes so far as showing how the self sacrifices, and represses the longing for, individualism in its shadow, so that even when left alone, it cannot think of anything other than the assimilating agent, the British lord or the American gentleman.

Ishiguro’s novel shows the gradual change from British colonialism to American imperialism. Mr. Farraday comes to Stevens’s life with a claim to autonomy. He lets him take a tour alone and enjoy the beauties of his country; when Stevens mentions Miss Kenton, Mr. Farraday’s immediate reaction is to take her as his “lady-friend” (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 11). This erotic freedom is against the professional and highly conservative outlook Stevens has secured for himself under Lord Darlington. Furthermore, with Mr. Farraday, Stevens realizes he has to learn the skill of bantering if he wants to serve him with dignity. Therefore, instead of breaking away from

ties of exploitation, he decides to remain faithful to Mr. Farraday just as he was to Lord Darlington.

Adiga’s novel is situated in an Indian context wherein the inherited British system of servitude has already been influenced by American ethos. The India Balram describes and lives in is an Americanized India which witnesses cultural clashes between Western individualistic and Eastern collectivist outlooks. As Iyengar and Lepper’s (1999) study shows, American culture stresses individualism whereas Asian cultures emphasize collectivism. In the American culture, people tend to feel volitional and autonomous while making their own decisions; but the Asians may feel more volitional and autonomous when they endorse and enact values of those with whom they identify (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Balram’s longing for entrepreneurship reflects his being assimilated into the American codes of individualism which have dominated India’s markets at that time. This tilt marks his distance from his Indian collectivist culture with its emphasis on family. However, all through his narrative, he is well aware of the connotations his choice has within an Indian culture. Being aware that his venture to kill Ashok would lead to the total destruction of his family by Ashok’s family, he calls himself, a “virtual mass murderer” (Adiga, 2008, p. 27).

Unlike Stevens, Balram is an angry, disloyal servant who blames his society and environment for his sufferings. Arguing he comes from Dark India marked with poverty, unemployment, depravity, and humiliation,

Balram justifies his rebellion against his master. Yet his shadow projection identifies him with the very master he has killed. The same applies to Stevens. All through his narrative Stevens attaches himself to sources of power and greatness and shuns away from humiliation, exploitation, and depravity a manservant experience. In all of his socio-cultural interactions he adopts and enacts the same policies as his lordship. Only at the end is he given a glimpse of what his real position has been and will be at Darlington Hall.

As stated above, Bly (1991) compared metaphorically the shadow to a bag which was dragged by the individual and replete with environmental prohibitions. Stevens can be claimed to bear his bag full of self-humiliations in which he ignores his self and sense of individuality; in the narrative of his shadow, he projects his authoritarian master onto himself, escaping the realities of his servitude. By contrast, Balram's bag is full of other-humiliations in which he ignores others for securing his sense of individuality. The narrative of his shadow shows how he projects his shadow onto the master who thus plays the role of a scapegoat.

Stevens's story of exaggerated servitude makes the novel a postcolonial narrative of colonial assimilation. The vanity of dignity, greatness, and honor which form the basis of Stevens's butlership is well exposed to critique and derided, when Ishiguro makes his protagonist doubt his biased definitions which have cost him long years of servitude. Although his decision to serve Mr. Farraday

marks no change in his outlook, Stevens is given a glimpse of his real position at Darlington Hall. The glimpse arouses fear and remorse in him which are immediately repressed by the self who decides "to be in a position to pleasantly surprise" the new master (Ishiguro, 1989, p. 166).

Similarly, Balram's narrative is an instance of postcolonial crime fiction. His crime becomes the means through which Adiga targets the sweeping wave of Americanization and its imperializing neoliberalism. Balram's narrative can serve as the psychological continuation of Stevens's blindfolded admiration for the master. Stevens's loyal servitude turns into Balram's disloyal act of crime. By killing Ashok, Balram tries to kill the master in himself but in vain. That inward urge to dominate and control others remains working in Balram just as it does in Stevens.

CONCLUSION

Ishiguro's and Adiga's novels are narratives of shadow projection on both individual and collective levels. Individually, they are fictional figures constructed out of the psychosocial discourses to which their writers respond. The exposure accords them a collective angle as well. On the collective scale, class discrimination is the common ground addressed by the deprived class. This discrimination gets a race-and-caste base in Adiga's novel. Ishiguro's hybrid identity as a Japanese-British writer gives his treatment of a British servant a latent race-based dimension.

Therefore, Balram's self-oriented shadow projection for securing his individual identity can embody the classed and racialized psychosocial reactions to the local and global socio-political demands. Stevens's other-oriented projection may justify the spirit of psychosocial submissiveness which reinforces the enduring hold of the dominant self.

Focus on shadow and shadow projection proves beneficial to character analysis. However, it falls short at addressing the novels' narrative and rhetorical strategies that may contribute more to character analysis. Stevens's good command of English language and Adiga's ironical tone are not attended to by this approach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my sister, Marzyeh Farsi, for her psychological comments that greatly improved the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adiga, A. (2008). *The white tiger: A novel*. New York, USA & London, England: Free Press.
- Al-Dagamsch, A. (2013). Adiga's *The white tiger* as world bank literature. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 15(6), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2364>
- Bly, R. (1991). The long bag we drag behind us. In C. Zweig & J. Abrams (Eds.), *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of human nature* (pp. 6-12). Los Angeles, USA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Evans, G., & Tilley, J. (2017). *The new politics of class: The political exclusion of the British working class*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Haitham, H. (2013). *Discourse of entrepreneurship in The white tiger* (Master thesis, paper 1499), Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Ishiguro, K. (1989). *The remains of the day*. London, England: F. A. Thorpe.
- Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the values of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 349-366.
- Jung, C. (1971). The transcendent function. In J. Campbell (Ed.), *The portable Jung* (pp. 273-300). New York, USA: Penguin Books.
- Metcalf, B. D., & Metcalf, T. R. (2006). *A concise history of modern India* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Miller, D. P. (1991). What the shadow knows: An interview with John A. Sanford. In C. Zweig & J. Abrams (Eds.), *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of human nature* (pp. 19-26). Los Angeles, USA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Miller, W. A. (1991). Finding the shadow in daily life. In C. Zweig & J. Abrams (Eds.), *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of human nature* (pp. 38-44). Los Angeles, USA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Mines, D. P. (2009). *Caste in India*. n.p. Association for Asian Studies.
- Reeves, K. M. (2000). Racism and the projection of the shadow. *Psychotherapy*, 37(1), 80-88.
- Shaffer, B. W. (1998). *Understanding Kazuo Ishiguro*. Columbia, USA: University of South Carolina Press.
- Whitmont, E. C. (1991). The evolution of the shadow. In C. Zweig & J. Abrams (Eds.), *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of*

- human nature* (pp. 12-19). Los Angeles, USA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Zweig, C., & Abrams, J. (1991). Introduction: The shadow side of everyday life. In C. Zweig & J. Abrams (Eds.), *Meeting the shadow: The hidden power of the dark side of human nature* (pp. xvi-xxv). Los Angeles, USA: Jeremy P. Tarcher.

