Separateness with Communication

George Eliot, Nation States, and Global Consciousness

Dr. Sung-Ae Lee

The transformative power attributed to literature through reflecting and influencing society is an implicit premise of George Eliot’s novels, and especially evident in her deployment of utopian tropes to depict both negative, dystopian elements in society and positive, utopian elements. Her last novel Daniel Deronda (1876) is a critique of contemporary (1860s) British society, mainly focusing on its relationship with Jewish people and their religion, but broadening this focus to envision the future of the world and the idea of “progress.” By drawing an analogy between gender and race relations, whereby female subordination is presented in such a way that female habitus is a space colonized by men, Eliot interrogates the assumptions underpinning imperialism and racial domination. Colonized space is dystopian space, and within it individuals become abjected (in Julia Kristeva’s sense), because women, people of color, and people of subordinate class are subjected to the monologic values of the colonizer. Eliot’s use of utopianism is particularly suited to a Bakhtinian analysis, since it points to the view that perspective should be negotiated among a variety of voices (that is, dialogically). Daniel Deronda is perceived as an inspirational force behind Zionism and the establishment of Israel in 1948, but its own dialogical principles, and grounding sense of the relationship between colonizing and colonized peoples, would preclude the displacement of indigenous people such as Palestinians. Eliot’s stated principle of “separateness with communication” affirmed Jewish nationalism as well as nationalism in general as a way of ensuring cultural and political identity for people (as folk), but at the same time disavowed the implication in such identity that “exiles,” or “foreigners,” might thereby become abjected as “other.” Daniel Deronda’s proto-Zionism was influential within the movement which led to the establishment of Israel in 1948, although the novel had not envisioned the constant conflict that has racked the region ever since: the moral difficulties facing Israel today and, more broadly, the difficulties inherent in any national movement as it moves from an ideal to a reality.

A major difference between Eliot’s earlier novels and Daniel Deronda is that the earlier novels had embodied their social comment as a critique of the dystopian elements of British society, whereas in her final novel she presents a powerful, concrete vision as a utopian alternative as well. In Daniel Deronda her vision is extended to international relationships among nations and the issue of
race is more prominent, and hence the novel introduces themes pertaining to nationalism and multiculturalism. That is, her utopian vision is extended to a global level rather than to the improvement of British society, so that progress of world society is now at issue. By criticizing her own country as dystopian and presenting an ideal Jewish nation as utopian, she suggests the unfolding of a new world order. In *Daniel Deronda* Eliot juxtaposes English female and Jewish male protagonists in nineteenth-century British society and discloses its dystopian elements by depicting both characters’ abjection, the former as female, and the latter as exile. In seeking a resolution to these abjected states in the context of imagined globalization, the novel’s utopian impulse valorizes the pursuit of cultural variety over uniformity.

Instead of the defamiliarizing effect of historical distance characteristic of Eliot’s previous novels, the novel’s setting in 1865-66, only a decade prior to its publication in 1876, invokes recent memory and compels a reinterpretation of contemporary British imperialism and colonialism and its influence on other nations such as Jamaica. It juxtaposes and contrasts the lives of two protagonists, Gwendolen Harleth and Daniel Deronda, who respectively represent English and Jewish culture, British imperialism/materialism and colonialism and Jewish spirituality. Gwendolen marries Grandcourt to avoid her family’s economic ruin, thinking that she could rule him, but in fact Grandcourt marries her to rule *her*. Grandcourt sees marriage as a relationship of the colonizer/colonized and master/slave, and his cruel treatment of Gwendolen is compared with Governor Eyre’s in his treatment of Jamaicans, who are subject to cruel imperial domination (Meyer: 165). Eliot’s critique of dystopian elements of British society is manifested by exposing the abjection of both protagonists. Julia Kristeva compared society to a human body and anything that is outside the orifices is dirt, impurity, that is abject, that should be eliminated in order to make society “clean.” With regard to Eliot’s novels abjection falls on society’s “others,” women, lower-class people, foreigners, and people with different ideas. Gwendolen is a suppressed figure, as her young aspiration of domination and mastery is destroyed by the gender politics of marriage, while Daniel is abjected because he is illegitimate and does not know his origin (parentage) and finally proves to be an exile, a Jew, a different race. Eliot’s critique of British society stems from recognition of the immorality of imperialism and colonialism and its analogy with the position of women as the colonized, contrasted with that of men as the colonizer. Eliot concretely suggests a transformative utopian model in the

---

1Susan Meyer gives a succinct account of the Jamaican uproar in 1865, where Governor Eyre responded to the rebellion of the emancipated, landless and exploited blacks with the cruel murder of 430 men and women, the flogging of 600, and the destruction of more than 1,000 black homes (165).

2Julia Kristeva’s theory of abjection is highly relevant to my discussion of shaping new world orders because it is the abjected figures who are marginalized and expelled that contribute positively to the direction of history when they wrest agency through transgression. Quite often they have been made abject by unscrutinized prejudices.
form of a Jewish nation state by criticizing elements that constitute a British dystopia where women, foreigners, and people with different ideas are rendered abject and eliminated out of insistence on a conformity to values that themselves should be under scrutiny.

Imperialism and colonialism are the product of a degenerate “worldly” religion, and their impact is represented in the novel by marginalized Jews living in a segregated East End of London, allusions to the Jamaican uprising which recur throughout, and subjugated female characters. Nineteenth-century England perceived Jewish people as the very model of abjection: alien, other, a dispersed and degraded people, practicing a superseded form of belief, apt (in a Darwinian conception of things) to die out, a cancer within a healthy society. But there is another side to this, as Oliver Lovesey explains: the racial and cultural exclusiveness of Jewish nationhood, characterized by admirably pure blood lines and coherent national aspirations, was also a model for Victorian England, proffering a culturally homogeneous and ethically pure identity that some Victorians nostalgically longed for in the 1870s (3-4). Given the latter, it is less surprising that Eliot suggests a model Utopia in the establishment of a Jewish nation as a contrast with dystopian British society. In her essay “The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” Eliot makes it clear why she chose Jewish people as an exemplar for utopian thought:

Unquestionably the Jews, having been more than any other race exposed to the adverse moral influences of alienism, must, both in individuals and in groups, have suffered some corresponding moral degradation; but in fact they have escaped with less of abjectness and less of hard hostility towards the nations whose hand has been against them, than could have happened in the case of a people who had neither their adhesion to a separate religion founded on historic memories, nor their characteristic family affectionateness. Tortured, flogged, spit upon, the corpus vile on which rage or wantonness vented themselves with impunity, their name flung at them as an opprobrium by superstition, hatred, and contempt, they have remained proud of their origin. Does any one call this an evil pride?… The pride which identifies us with a great historic body is a humanising, elevating habit of mind, inspiring for the sake of that ideal whole; and no man swayed by such a sentiment can become completely abject. (“The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” Impressions of Theophrastus Such (henceforth referred to as ITS), 156, emphases added)

Jews are thus a dispersed people with no geographical center to call their nation, scattered throughout the world in permanent exile. Living as foreigners in other people’s nations, and identifiably “other,” they are abjected, marginalized, and alienated. However, that they have preserved their tradition and their spirituality, in contrast to the degenerating British culture, is interpreted as a powerful regenerating force. Monica Cohen also argues that how a group affiliation can dignify and refine becomes an argument on behalf of Jewish nationalism and a nationalist movement, and it suggests that a national identity and a national homeland offer unifying values that can rescue a people from the baser forms of temptation that degrade them when they must live in abjection as a minority in another culture (329). According to Gillian Beer, the Jewish people
represents a stable race because of its survival despite genocide, keeping a culture intact (203), which shows the survival of the favored races in both Darwinian and biblical terms. “The absence of a homeland raises the question of the relationship between nationality and race — and between race and culture. Jewish people are considered one of the most developed races — they resisted extinction, and had not been obliterated by genocide, scattering or intermarriage, an old and chosen (or ‘favored’) people, who survived culturally by a hermeneutic process — through interpretation and reinterpretation — rather than through transformation” (Beer: 203). Peter Hodgson, in making note of “the spirituality of Judaism, its communal ethos, its ethical universalism, its sense of divine presence and historical process” (136), comments that “Judaism offers a more realistic and less dangerous assessment of history in that the Messiah has not yet come, there is no single way to God, and redemption occurs as an ongoing, unfinished process in a diverse and pluralistic world” (136), whereby human agency and choice play an important role in determining future directions of the world, contrasted with “the triumphalism and absolutism of much Christian theology” (136).

Eliot’s presentation of a powerful vision of utopia is in the form of the Jewish theocratic nation, specific in geography, race, religion, culture and politics, where religion, law, and moral life are combined. The Jewish state is an exemplar which will enrich other nations, not through any imposition of its uniform, monologic values, but through multiculturalism and diversity — what the novel’s principal Jewish theoretician, Daniel’s grandfather, articulates as “the balance of separateness and communication” (Daniel Deronda, 724; henceforth referred to as DD) or “separateness with communication” (DD, 725):

What he used to insist on was that the strength and wealth of mankind depended on the balance of separateness and communication, and he was bitterly against our people losing themselves among the Gentiles; “It’s no better,” said he, “than the many sorts of grain going back from their variety into sameness.” (DD, 724, emphasis added)

This is a denunciation of the monologic uniformity that, in a nation such as England, pressures Jews to convert to Christianity, and an affirmation of distinct cultural identities and diversity that leads to multiculturalism. In inheriting his grandfather’s mission, Daniel wishes to exercise his agency and choice:

“I shall call myself a Jew,” … “But I will not say that I shall profess to believe exactly as my fathers have believed. Our fathers themselves changed the horizon of their belief and learned of other races. But I think I can maintain my grandfather’s notion of separateness with communication. I hold that my first duty is to my own people, and if there is anything to be done towards restoring or perfecting their common life, I shall make that my vocation.” (DD, 725, ellipsis mine, emphasis added)

In developing this as a novelistic principle, Eliot anticipates what Mikhail Bakhtin was later to formulate as the dialogic accommodation of difference and otherness — that is, his argument that every “voice” in a novel is “a point of view,
a socio-ideological conceptual system of real social groups and their embodied representatives” (411). If not, the novel will represent a colonization, a subjugation of other cultures under monologic authoritative values which require assimilation. Visions and ideas become reality through their transforming power, where human agency and choice are important determining factors. The Utopia imagined by Eliot in this novel is not confined to one society, but concerns the coexistence of multiple nations with different religions, politics and cultures, aiming to embrace the entire world in its progress.

Through the dying prophet Mordecai, Eliot suggests a powerful utopian scheme: build a nation of their own on the historical site of their race, enable it to flourish organically and with dignity, and from this coherent center let it then, as a center of wisdom and knowledge, interact with the world. Mordecai thus demands that people exercise their agency, make choices and make a difference in history. Arguing that disengagement from socio-historical processes is “the blasphemy of this time,” his vision entails the transformation of desire into agency so that a “better future and the better future of the world” can be actualized through human will (DD, 538). The “divine principle,” he maintains, is “action, choice and resolved memory” (DD, 538). National separateness does not mean isolation but a balancing of distinctiveness and the betterment of the world through communication. Rejecting the injunction, “Let us be as if we were not among the populations,” he instead admonishes, “choose our full heritage, claim the brotherhood of our nations, and carry into it a new brotherhood with the nations of the Gentiles” (DD, 538).

In contrast with the materialism prevalent in “mainstream” British society, Mordecai pursues spiritual welfare and a better future and has faith that the world progresses. In a materialistic society that only sees manifest appearances, he is doomed to be alienated, marginalized, and abjected. But he has an unyielding spirit and a vision for his people, and shows that great ideas that become realities stem not from material wealth but from spiritual wealth. Eliot compares his ideas with those of Copernicus and Galileo, who overturned the geocentric perspective of Ptolemy, in his offering of a “social vision, an alternative to the stultifying, enclosed life of English society” (Shuttleworth: 278). Copernicus and Galileo are said to be “immovably convinced in the face of hissing incredulity” (DD, 511), which is the power of Mordecai who has dwelt alone in his belief until he met Daniel.

For Daniel to relinquish the privileged English status bestowed upon him to embrace his Jewish identity is, for English society, almost unimaginable. Although his transgressive spirit is acknowledged by Sir Hugo, who says it is impossible to “ticket him off easily, he has notions of his own” (DD, 322), Sir Hugo finds his decision unpalatable. Daniel, however, says that his Englishness will remain in him even though he chooses to be a Jew (DD, 661). As Edward Said comments on exiles, this shows Daniel’s “contrapunctual” — or polyphonic — worldview as an exile because exiles, conscious of their own liminality, are aware of at least two perspectives (1990: 366). Allegorically, this means he will embody in his consciousness the whole Judeo-Christian tradition (Bonaparte: 38).
As Carl T. Rotenberg comments, Daniel is a person in search of a core identity. Is he an Englishman or a Jew, or is he both? If both, how can he reconcile this conflict? He encompasses core manifestations of abjection as a person who has no place in society, a wanderer, a man uprooted from his origins who must define his identity for himself (3). Through abjection and transgression Daniel finds his mission in life — social captainship: “the heart and brain of a multitude — some social captainship, which would come to [him] as a duty” (DD, 750) — to re-establish a national homeland for his race. In his own words, “restoring a political existence to my people, making them a nation again, giving them a national center” (DD, 803).

In line with Bakhtin’s dialogic principles of recognition of multiple consciousnesses, Paula Cohen argues that Daniel Deronda pivots on a paradox, attempting to balance two opposing principles: the ideal of distinct national and cultural identity; and a “religion of humanity” which preaches a dissolution of barriers between peoples — a willingness to be open to the other point of view and cultivate the empathy and intellectual openness which Eliot embodies in Deronda himself (198). The greatness of the novel lies in its vision of these elements in mutual coexistence, in “the balance of separateness and communication,” (DD, 724) or “separateness with communication” (DD, 725). This vision seems to embody an attempt on Eliot’s part to counteract “the kind of levelling, or creeping sameness and disintegration of experience which threatens English society at large and is, by implication, associated with imperialism. Race, separateness and nationality thus ally themselves against money, uniformity and assimilation” (Lesjak: 34). Eliot censures the imperialist habit of the English diaspora: “We do not call ourselves a dispersed and a punished people: we are a colonizing people, and it is we who have punished others” (“The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” ITS, 146). As Beer explains, “English exploration and diaspora takes always the form of dominance through colony and empire. Their journeying is always unreceptive, their repose a kind of annulment” (200).

The three pillars of community, which are the basis of nationality, are family, geography, and shared belief and purpose — that is, “an assertion of belonging in and to a place, a people, a heritage” (Said 1990: 359). When Daniel sets out at the end of the novel to pursue the (proto-)Zionist dream, all three pillars are in place. For all the talk of Jewish separateness leading ultimately to world community, Daniel’s task is the forging of an individual nation. His pilgrimage, in addition, runs counter to organicist theory of the folk, according to which society is a growth, not a transmutation and transplantation. In affirming growth through transmutation and transplantation, and translating an inchoate vision of community into concrete reality, the closing action of the novel makes questionable the organic wholeness of society (Graver: 225, 242). However, von Herder’s eighteenth-century Romantic theory that the nation state is shaped from the culture of the people was already in its time opposed by Rousseau’s theory of civic republicanism (a state is based on collective assent rather than cultural history). Von Herder’s theory has been used to justify the constitution of various states since the eighteenth century (and indeed the idea of cultural continuity
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justifies the existence of the modern state of Israel), but it is also inescapable that collective assent will come into play in determining the necessary political structures. The organicist theory really only works if the “pillar of place” has been more or less constant, so that it might be sufficient to invoke “shared belief and purpose” as sufficient foundation for a nation, as Mordecai himself does in citing the example of “the great North American nation” forged from diverse elements within a period of two hundred years (DD, 537). The marriage of Daniel and Mirah thus functions as a metonymy of nation building: both are displaced wanderers, and effectively parentless, but their marriage establishes a family grounded in shared belief and purpose.

This nation is to be in the form of a republic, physically between the East and the West, mediator of feud and promoter of peace, which will thereby contribute to the progress of the world. Articulation of the relationship of separation to nationality within Judaic history assigns to Judaism the status of a national collective which carries “the culture and the sympathies of every great nation in its bosom” as the transmitter of “the brightness of Western freedom amid the despotisms of the East” (DD, 535). Lesjak comments that in this argument representation of the East or Easterners is relegated to a purely marginal status, referenced only in order to reinforce through repetition an “oriental despotism” in contrast to Western freedom (31). To theorize this position she cites two central points made by Said: first, he underscores the view of the despotic ‘orientalized’ East upon which the Zionist project is premised and which is supported by the vision of Palestine as an unpopulated piece of land; secondly, he points out the way in which such an attitude toward the East says less about the east than it does about the Occident’s construction and representation of itself vis-à-vis the ‘Orient’ (Said 1985 [1978]: 56-114). The Easterner is never represented as only despotic; in fact, the Easterner is never really represented at all (Lesjak: 31), which results from the absence of consciousness of the Other.

The debate about national consciousness and the stirring of old memories into the reconstruction of a nation with a specific geographic location produces a debate within the novel divided between assimilation and separateness of Jewish nationality, with Pash and Gideon in opposition to Mordecai. Pash’s opinion is that “the sentiment of nationality is destined to die out” (DD, 525). He argues that the idea of nations is becoming obsolete and believes the “current of progress” (DD, 525) is heading toward a global state. Gideon’s opinion is also that Jews should melt gradually into the populations they live among (DD, 527), because he considers assimilation to be progress and Judaism as regressive in its adherence to “superstition and exclusiveness” (DD, 527). Gideon rejects the historical connection of Jewish people with Palestine as “perverted by superstition” (DD, 534) and argues that, instead, rationality demands an abandonment of “a literal fulfilment of the prophecies about restoration” (DD, 534). If this were done, a union between Jewish people and the rest of the world could be brought about. Mordecai, on the other hand, opposes mixing with the Gentiles, and thus assimilation into the Christian world, on the basis that eighteen centuries of “slow deposit” of cultural identity cannot be undone by newly earned citizenship — his
view is that “host” societies lack a sense of fellowship and brotherhood with their own race (DD, 528). As Eliot writes on British nationalism, people need somewhere to anchor, emotionally, sharing the same cultural identity:

... England itself shall not be subject to foreign rule. The fiery resolve to resist invasion, though with an improvised array of pitchforks, is felt to be virtuous, and to be worthy of a historic people. Why? Because there is a national life in our veins. Because there is something specifically English which we feel to be supremely worth striving for, worth dying for, rather than living to renounce it. Because we too have our share — perhaps a principal share — in that spirit of separateness which has not yet done its work in the education of mankind, which has created the varying genius of nations, and, like the Muses, is the offspring of memory. (“The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep!” ITS, 160, ellipsis mine)

The debate about nationalism or assimilation of the Jewish people is not dialectic, but dialogic, hence the opposing ideals of distinct national and cultural identity and a religion of humanity do not cancel each other out. As Clifford J. Marks argues, Eliot describes how political, religious, and philosophical questions can be debated without the kind of rancor usually associated with disagreement. These debates inform a language that allows individuals to assert their beliefs within a dialogic principle without their core identities being threatened (3). However, as Terence Cave comments, “the emphasis of the book is firmly in favor of ethnic identity and against assimilation, or the ‘melting-pot’ ” — which is the cosmopolitanism of Klesmer (DD, 242) or Gideon (DD, 527) (xxiii). Eliot seems to side with Jewish nationalism and multiculturalism by the decision she allots to the main characters and by the turn of events, thus cancelling out the principles of dialogism. However, the content of nationalism and multiculturalism tend more toward Bakhtinian principles; in fact, assimilation, whether by the fusion of races or cosmopolitanism, implies a much more monologic culture. Because Eliot has chosen the issue of Jewish homeland as an exemplary model for the kind of Utopian society she envisaged, she was perhaps blinded to implications this would have for the indigenous Arabic people.

A utopian impulse is pursued in Daniel Deronda by criticizing the dystopian elements of one society and envisaging another, better society that implies positive future directions. Eliot does not insist that reason should be abandoned for a vague, implausible, mystical faith, but rather admits that appearances can be challenged and hitherto unexplored alternatives or different forms of thought can be accommodated (Shuttleworth: 275). To her Daniel Deronda indeed turns out to be a successful experiment in life, but it has elided an abiding problem.

As Gideon’s practical viewpoint shows, invoking a literal interpretation of the Bible to identify Palestine as the organic center to be revived is very problematic (DD, 533-34), and Mordecai’s attempt to refute this does not address that problem but instead argues that the land is in a dystopian state and could become a utopia with the application of international Jewish capital, that it needs to be redeemed “from debauched and paupered conquerors” (presumably the Palestinian Arabs and the Turks) and prevented from becoming an arena for endemic European
wars. He, and presumably Eliot, fails to grasp the significance of Palestine being an already populated land, nor to anticipate the conflict between Israelis and the Palestinians which still continues as the conflict between colonizing and colonized peoples, as once abjected and marginalized Jews are now abjecting and marginalizing people in Palestine. Eliot’s novel, in anticipating an early version of globalization, thus fails to fully realize the stated principle of “separateness with communication,” which affirmed Jewish nationalism as well as nationalism in general as a way of ensuring cultural and political identity for people (as folk), but at the same time disavowed the implication in such identity that “exiles,” or “foreigners,” might thereby become abjected as “other.” The novel failed to foresee that globalization also displaces and abjects.

Critics such as Reina Lewis (216-17) and Susan Meyer (183-84) argue that, historically, there were two reasons that Britain supported the migration of Jews to Palestine: one is the opportunity to remove undesirable Jews from Britain and the other is to extend the power of the British empire in the name of “protection of European Jews” — thus Jews are regarded as “aliens at home and Britain’s abroad” (Lewis: 216). As Cave comments, Eliot’s neglect of the political and ethical problems of the displacement of the Palestinian peoples can be criticized, but it was conditioned by the assumptions of the day: Palestine was perceived as a poor, under-populated country, inured to centuries of rule by a power that was now bankrupt and inefficient. Meyer asserts throughout her article that what the novel ultimately does with the Jews, the opposing race with its submerged connection to female rebelliousness against social constraints, is precisely what it does with female rebellion: it firmly ushers both out of the English world of the novel (183-84) — in Kristeva’s terms, expulsion and elimination of the abject. It moves those who have strayed and transgressed; it returns them, in the euphemistic language of the novel, “safely to their own borders”:

... the beautiful story Plutarch somewhere tells of the Delphic women: how when the Maenads, outworn with their torch-lit wanderings, lay down to sleep in the market-place, the matrons came and stood silently round them to keep guard over their slumbers; then, when they waked, ministered to them tenderly and saw them safely to their own borders. (DD, 195, ellipsis mine)

However mild and euphemistic in its presentation, there is a stern exclusion of foreigners whose very existence is regarded as a “transgression of the borders.” In order to make their own society clean from dirt, those abjected figures, they have to expel the foreigners. Because Daniel is both English and Jewish he figures as both a continuation of and a break with English culture. His proto-Zionism and ultimate emigration with Mirah (the racial other) — and failure to marry Gwendolen Harleth — safeguards English culture and tradition from miscegenation. The departure of Daniel and Mirah for Palestine is prompted in part by emerging ideology and in part by their abjected state: once they have wrested agency from abjection, they can make active choices and contribute to the progress of the world by working toward the establishment of a Jewish
commonwealth. Without abjection in another people’s nation, they would not think about leaving and re-establishing a homeland.

If Lewis’s and Meyer’s comments can be interpreted as a critique of the dystopian elements of British society, that is, its propensity to reject “others” and to impose majority values in an effort to preserve a homogenized culture, they point forward to multiculturalism in one nation in the globalized world. That the Zionist movement and the establishment of a geographic center for the Jewish people in fact entails the removal of the Jews — “other,” unwanted people — from Britain, and thus expulsion and elimination of the abject, raises questions of migration and multiculturalism within one nation. Should people not migrate; and if they do enter another people’s nation, should they assimilate to their culture? What kind of culture should be in the mainstream to be assimilated into? Would their national consciousness allow them to adapt to other culture?

Despite all these entailments, as indicated by the epigraph to Chapter 41 — “It is a part of probability that many improbable things will happen,” (Aristotle, Poetics; DD, 509) — history proves that improbable ideas by an abject prophet, Mordecai, are in fact realized through followers like Daniel. It is a celebration of all abjected characters with ideas at odds with the society they are located in and the power of human agency and choice in the making of history.
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